**INTERNET**

The Journals for the Senate are available at http://www.aph.gov.au/senate/work/journals/index.htm

Proof and Official Hansards for the House of Representatives, the Senate and committee hearings are available at http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard

For searching purposes use http://parlinfo.aph.gov.au

**SITTING DAYS—2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7, 8, 9, 27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9, 10, 11, 29, 30, 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RADIO BROADCASTS**

Broadcasts of proceedings of the Parliament can be heard on ABC NewsRadio in the capital cities on:

- ADELAIDE 972AM
- BRISBANE 936AM
- CANBERRA 103.9FM
- DARWIN 102.5FM
- HOBART 747AM
- MELBOURNE 1026AM
- PERTH 585AM
- SYDNEY 630AM

For information regarding frequencies in other locations please visit http://www.abc.net.au/newsradio/listen/frequencies.htm
FORTY-THIRD PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION—SIXTH PERIOD

Governor-General
Her Excellency Ms Quentin Bryce, Companion of the Order of Australia

Senate Office holders

President—Senator Hon. John Joseph Hogg
Deputy President and Chair of Committees—Senator Stephen Shane Parry
Temporary Chairs of Committees—Senators Christopher John Back, Thomas Mark Bishop, Suzanne Kay Boyce, Douglas Niven Cameron, Patricia Margaret Crossin, David Julian Fawcett, Mary Jo Fisher, Mark Lionel Furner, Scott Ludlam, Gavin Mark Marshall, Claire Mary Moore, Louise Clare Pratt and Ursula Mary Stephens
Leader of the Government in the Senate—Senator Hon. Christopher Vaughan Evans
Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate—Senator Hon. Stephen Michael Conroy
Leader of the Opposition in the Senate—Senator Hon. Eric Abetz
Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate—Senator Hon. George Henry Brandis SC
Manager of Government Business in the Senate—Senator Hon. Joseph William Ludwig
Manager of Opposition Business in the Senate—Senator Mitchell Peter Fifield

Senate Party Leaders and Whips

Leader of the Australian Labor Party—Senator Hon. Christopher Vaughan Evans
Deputy Leader of the Australian Labor Party—Senator Hon. Stephen Michael Conroy
Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia—Senator Hon. Eric Abetz
Deputy Leader of the Liberal Party of Australia—Senator Hon. George Henry Brandis SC
Leader of The Nationals—Senator Barnaby Thomas Gerard Joyce
Deputy Leader of The Nationals—Senator Fiona Nash
Leader of the Australian Greens—Senator Christine Anne Milne
Chief Government Whip—Senator Anne McEwen
Deputy Government Whips—Senators Carol Louise Brown and Helen Beatrice Polley
Chief Opposition Whip—Senator Helen Kroger
Deputy Opposition Whips—Senators David Christopher Bushby and Christopher John Back
The Nationals Whip—Senator John Reginald Williams
Australian Greens Whip—Senator Rachel Mary Siewert

Printed by authority of the Senate
## Members of the Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator</th>
<th>State or Territory</th>
<th>Term expires</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abetz, Hon. Eric</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back, Christopher John</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernardi, Cory</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilyk, Catryna Louise</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham, Simon John</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Thomas Mark</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boswell, Hon. Ronald Leslie Doyle</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyce, Suzanne Kay</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandis, Hon. George Henry, SC</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Carol Louise</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushby, David Christopher</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, Douglas Niven</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Hon. Kim John</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carr, Hon. Robert John (3)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Michaelia Clare</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colbeck, Hon. Richard Mansell</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins, Jacinta Mary Ann</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conroy, Hon. Stephen Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cormann, Mathias Hubert Paul</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossin, Patricia Margaret (1)</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di Natale, Richard</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Sean</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggleston, Alan</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans, Hon. Christopher Vaughan</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell, Donald Edward</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkner, Hon. John Philip</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fawcett, David Julian</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeney, David Ian</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fierravanti-Wells, Concetta Anna</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifield, Mitchell Peter</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Mary Jo</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furner, Mark Lionel</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallacher, Alexander McEachian</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanson-Young, Sarah Coral</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heffernan, Hon. William Daniel</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogg, Hon. John Joseph</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphries, Gary John Joseph (1)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, Hon. David Albert Lloyd</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce, Barnaby Thomas Gerard</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroger, Helen</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludlam, Scott</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lundy, Kate Alexandra (1)</td>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald, Hon. Ian Douglas</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madigan, John Joseph</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>DLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEwen, Anne</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie, Bridget</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLucas, Hon. Jan Elizabeth</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall, Gavin Mark</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>State or Territory</td>
<td>Term expires</td>
<td>Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Hon. Brett John</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne, Christine Anne</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, Claire Mary</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash, Fiona Joy</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry, Stephen Shane</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne, Marise Ann</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polley, Helen Beatrice</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratt, Louise Clare</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhiannon, Lee</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronaldson, Hon. Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Scott Michael</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullion, Hon. Nigel Gregory</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td>CLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siewert, Rachel Mary</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singh, Hon. Lisa Maria</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinodinos, Arthur (2)</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Dean Anthony (4)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens, Hon. Ursula Mary</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterle, Glenn</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistlethwaite, Matthew</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urquhart, Anne Elizabeth</td>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waters, Larissa Joy</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, John Reginald</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>NATS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Penelope Lesley</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2017</td>
<td>AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Hon. Penelope Ying Yen</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon, Nicholas</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.6.2014</td>
<td>IND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Term expires at close of day next preceding the polling day for the general election of members of the House of Representatives.

(2) Chosen by the Parliament of New South Wales to fill a casual vacancy (vice H. Coonan, resigned 22.8.11), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

(3) Chosen by the Parliament of New South Wales to fill a casual vacancy (vice Hon. M. Arbib, resigned 5.3.12), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

(4) Chosen by the Parliament of Western Australia to fill a casual vacancy (vice J. Adams, died in office 31.3.12), pursuant to section 15 of the Constitution.

**PARTY ABBREVIATIONS**


**Heads of Parliamentary Departments**

Clerk of the Senate—R Laing
Clerk of the House of Representatives—B Wright
Secretary, Department of Parliamentary Services—C Mills
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Hon Julia Gillard MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Stephen Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Social Inclusion</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Mental Health Reform</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Public Service and Integrity</td>
<td>The Hon Gary Gray AO MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on the Centenary of ANZAC</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Secretary</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jan McLucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer (Deputy Prime Minister)</td>
<td>The Hon Wayne Swan MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Financial Services and Superannuation</td>
<td>The Hon Bill Shorten MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>The Hon David Bradbury MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer</td>
<td>The Hon Bernie Ripoll MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Science and Research (Leader of the Government in the Senate)</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Chris Evans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Industry and Innovation</td>
<td>The Hon Greg Combet AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Small Business</td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting for Industry and Innovation</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Industry and Innovation</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Higher Education and Skills</td>
<td>The Hon Sharon Bird MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy (Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate)</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Stephen Conroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Regional Australia, Regional Development and Local Government</td>
<td>The Hon Simon Crean MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Arts</td>
<td>The Hon Simon Crean MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Sport</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence (Deputy Leader of the House)</td>
<td>The Hon Stephen Smith MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence Materiel</td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Veterans' Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence Science and Personnel</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence</td>
<td>The Hon Dr Mike Kelly AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Defence</td>
<td>Senator the Hon David Feeney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Immigration and Citizenship (Leader of the House)</td>
<td>The Hon Chris Bowen MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kate Lundy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Parliamentary Secretary for Infrastructure and Transport)</td>
<td>The Hon Anthony Albanese MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General</td>
<td>The Hon Nicola Roxon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Emergency Management</td>
<td>The Hon Nicola Roxon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting on Queensland Floods Recovery</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Joe Ludwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Home Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Justice</td>
<td>The Hon Jason Clare MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Jenny Macklin MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Disability Reform</td>
<td>The Hon Jenny Macklin MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Housing</td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Homelessness</td>
<td>The Hon Brendan O'Connor MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Community Services</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Status of Women</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jan McLucas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Bob Carr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Trade and Competitiveness</td>
<td>The Hon Dr Craig Emerson MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Trade</td>
<td>The Hon Justine Elliot MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Pacific Island Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Richard Marles MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Richard Marles MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and</td>
<td>The Hon Tony Burke MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities (Vice-President of the Executive Council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Sustainability and Urban Water</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Don Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Penny Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Minister of State</td>
<td>The Hon Gary Gray AO MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister Assisting for Deregulation</td>
<td>The Hon David Bradbury MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth</td>
<td>The Hon Peter Garrett AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>The Hon Bill Shorten MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Early Childhood and Childcare</td>
<td>The Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment and Participation</td>
<td>The Hon Kate Ellis MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Employment and Economic Development</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Collins MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Jacinta Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Manager of Government Business in the Senate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Joe Ludwig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry</td>
<td>The Hon Sid Sidebottom MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Resources and Energy</td>
<td>The Hon Martin Ferguson AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Tourism</td>
<td>The Hon Martin Ferguson AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>The Hon Greg Combet AM MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>The Hon Dreyfus QC MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Health</td>
<td>The Tanya Plibersek MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Mental Health and Ageing</td>
<td>The Hon Mark Butler MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Indigenous Health</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Snowdon MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Secretary for Health and Ageing</td>
<td>The Hon Catherine King MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Human Services</td>
<td>Senator the Hon Kim Carr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SHADOW MINISTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Shadow Minister</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leader of the Opposition</strong></td>
<td>The Hon Tony Abbott MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Parliamentary Secretary Assisting the Leader of the Opposition</td>
<td>Senator Cory Bernardi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>The Hon Julie Bishop MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Trade (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Parliamentary Secretary for International Development Assistance</td>
<td>The Hon Teresa Gambaro MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Leader of The Nationals)</td>
<td>The Hon Warren Truss MP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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Tuesday, 19 June 2012

The PRESIDENT (Senator the Hon. John Hogg) took the chair at 12:30, read prayers and made an acknowledgement of country.

COMMITTEES

Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Legislation Committee

Meeting

Senator CROSSIN (Northern Territory) (12:31): by leave—I move:

That the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee be authorised to hold a private meeting otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1) during the sitting of the Senate today, from 1:50 pm.

Question agreed to.

BUSINESS

Days and Hours of Meeting

Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (12:32): I move:

That—

(1) On Tuesday, 19 June, Thursday, 21 June, and Tuesday, 26 June 2012, any proposal pursuant to standing order 75 shall not be proceeded with.

(2) On Wednesday, 20 June and 27 June 2012, consideration of government documents shall not be proceeded with, and instead the routine of business shall be government business only.

(3) Divisions may take place on:

(a) Thursday, 21 June and 28 June 2012, after 4.30 pm; and

(b) Monday, 25 June 2012, before 12.30 pm.

(4) On Tuesday, 19 June and 26 June 2012:

(a) the hours of meeting shall be 12.30 pm to 6.30 pm and 7.30 pm to 10.40 pm;

(b) the routine of business from not later than 7.30 pm shall be government business only; and

(c) the question for the adjournment of the Senate shall be proposed at 10 pm.

(5) On Thursday, 21 June 2012:

(a) the hours of meeting shall be 9.30 am to 6 pm and 7 pm to 10.40 pm;

(b) the routine of business from not later than 7 pm shall be government business only; and

(c) the question for the adjournment of the Senate shall be proposed at 10 pm.

(6) The Senate shall sit on Friday, 22 June 2012, and that:

(a) the hours of meeting shall be 9.30 am to 3.40 pm;

(b) the routine of business shall be:

(i) notices of motion, and

(ii) government business only; and

(c) the question for the adjournment of the Senate shall be proposed at 3 pm.

(7) On Wednesday, 27 June 2012, consideration of the business before the Senate be interrupted at approximately 5 pm, but not so as to interrupt a senator speaking, to enable Senator Whish-Wilson to make his first speech without any question before the chair.

(8) The following government business orders of the day shall have precedence over all government business, be called on in the following order and be considered under a limitation of time, and that the time allotted for all remaining stages be as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill / Amendment</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and a related bill</td>
<td>commencing from not later than 4.10 pm until 8 pm on 19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 9 pm on 19 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Title</td>
<td>Commencement Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations Amendment (Future of Financial Advice) Bill 2012 and a related bill</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until noon on 20 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Laws Amendment (Medicare Levy and Medicare Levy Surcharge) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 12.40 pm on 20 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Broadcasting Legislation Amendment Bill 2010</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item, or not later than 5.30 pm, whichever is the earlier, until 6.20 pm on 20 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health Amendment (Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 7 pm on 20 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral and Referendum Amendment (Maintaining Address) Bill 2011 and a related bill</td>
<td>commencing from not later than 7 pm until 9.30 pm on 21 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Amendment (Supporting Australian Victims of Terrorism Overseas) Bill 2011</td>
<td>commencing not later than 9.40 am until 10.30 am on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation Bill (No. 5) 2011-2012 and a related bill</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 11.20 am on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliamentary Counsel and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 12.20 pm on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Vocational Education and Training Regulator (Charges) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 1 pm on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Services Amendment (Digital Television) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 1.50 pm on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Framework Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 2.50 pm on 22 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Human Rights Commission Amendment (National Children's Commissioner) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing from not later than 10.10 am until 11 am on 25 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Services Amendment (Improved Access to Television Services) Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 11.50 am on 25 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Energy Finance Corporation Bill 2012</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item, or not later than 5.30 pm, whichever is the earlier, until 8.20 pm on 25 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Energy Legislation Amendment Bill 2012 and 2 related bills</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 8.40 pm on 25 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation (Parliamentary Departments) Bill (No. 1) 2012-2013 and 2 related bills</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item until 9.30 pm on 25 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Stronger Super) Bill 2012 and a related bill</td>
<td>commencing immediately after the preceding item, or not later than 12.30 pm, whichever is the earlier, until 1.20 pm on 26 June 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This motion aims to structure Senate debate on legislation over the next week so that the budget and other critical bills can be passed in these sittings while still providing opportunity for debating private senators' business, general business and several MPIs. The Senate was scheduled to sit only three weeks in these winter sittings. This is a relatively short period for the major pieces of legislation that arise from the budget—

**Senator Cormann**: Who put the program together?

**Senator JACINTA COLLINS**: and the government's reform agenda. As Senator Cormann knows, the winter session is generally a reasonably short period.

I recognise that the Senate has made very good progress in considering legislation in the days that we have sat for the winter sittings. In particular, I take the opportunity to thank all senators for a very productive day yesterday. The passage of 19 bills, or 12 packages of legislation, was outstanding. Many of these bills were noncontroversial, and that reduces debate time. If we could guarantee this level of productivity in terms of legislation considered by the Senate on more sitting days then time management motions would be redundant. Time management motions by a government in the last weeks of sitting are, as the opposition knows, not unusual. Governments of all persuasions are faced with the same options in managing their legislation program. Inevitably, they make the same decision.

When they can, governments use time management motions to structure debate. The only differences are in how generous these motions are and how much time they allow for the scrutiny of sometimes contentious matters arising from legislation. Without a doubt, the Senate plays a central role in the scrutiny of legislation, and this role should not be overly constrained. However, scrutiny is not always the same as open-ended consideration of legislation. The aim is to ensure sufficient consideration for thorough scrutiny by Senate committees and through debate in the chamber.

This motion aims to provide relatively lengthy periods for debate of bills of major significance, with less time provided for less contentious bills. It has also accounted for referrals to committees so that committee consideration can be given to bills to inform debate and policy implementation. This
government will aim to avoid situations where major policy reforms are subject to very limited committee inquiries. Generous committee time has been provided for the most significant bills in this motion.

I do not apologise for the use of a time management motion when the alternative is extended weeks and hours of sitting to grind through sometimes repetitious debates. It is true that without a time management motion senators' contributions to debates on legislation and other matters are not constrained. Perhaps this is ideal. I say 'perhaps' because sometimes there is a very important role for focused debate for concentrating on the chamber's role as a house to consider legislation in a measured and productive way. Sometimes this is only achieved through the majority of this chamber supporting the use of time management. I recommend the motion to the chamber.

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (12:36): We should not be surprised that a government that cannot run a budget surplus, cannot control our borders and cannot administer a pink batts scheme without people being killed and houses being burnt down cannot run the Senate either. The motion moved by the Manager of Government Business tells us three things about this government: first, the government is untrustworthy; second, the government has no legislative agenda; and, third, the government is administratively incompetent.

Let us turn to those things in detail—first, that the government is untrustworthy. On 13 June, just a few days ago, I was provided with a letter from the Leader of the Government in this place, Senator the Hon. Chris Evans. He said, in part:

The government has a number of key appropriation and budget related bills which require passage before 1 July 2012. I have attached a list of these bills for your consideration.

That list numbered 55 bills—55 bills which, in the Leader of the Government in the Senate's own language, are 'key appropriation and budget related bills'. If ever the people of Australia needed to be told that those opposite are ex trade union bosses, there is a classic example. We have the classic example of the ambit claim—the ambit claim that 55 bills have to be rammed through within this sitting fortnight. Then yesterday we were given two motions, one dealing with 30 bills and another with nine bills. So what happened to the 55 bills that were 'key appropriation and budget related bills'? Depending on what the Greens allow Labor to do, the list could collapse from 55 right down to nine. Somehow the Greens have acquiesced to motion No. 1 rather than motion No. 2 and, as a result, under motion No.1 we have, I think, 34 bills, some of which have now already been passed.

This is a classic case of the Labor Party making a big statement, coming in with an ambit claim and then saying, 'Aren't we really being reasonable, because we've taken 20 bills off the list?' That is not reasonable; that is dishonest. To suggest that those pieces of legislation were 'key' and had to be passed by 1 July and then meekly take off about 20 of those bills indicates that they were not key bills in the first place and did not require passage before 1 July 2012. But why should that surprise us? This is the same government that went to the Australian people saying 'there will be no carbon tax'. This is the same government that said they would not seek to change the definition of marriage. And so it goes on and on. This is a government that is untrustworthy.

With this motion to ram through all these bills, very important accountability measures that the Senate has had in place, on its books, for years and years will be discarded,
including opportunities such as the consideration of government documents—documents that deal with literally billions of dollars of government expenditure that come before this place for discussion. Courtesy of the Greens-Labor alliance, these documents will be tabled but we will be denied the opportunity of discussing them properly and ensuring accountability for these huge sums of taxpayers' money.

Let us recall that, after the 2010 election, we were promised by the Australian Greens and the country Independent that parliamentary processes would no longer be abused but be allowed to take their course, that they would allow for transparency and accountability. Indeed, the Prime Minister herself said the government would 'let the sun shine in'. Well, guillotining legislation through this place and denying the opposition the opportunity to discuss government documents is not about transparency; it is not about accountability. Matters of public interest has been wiped out as well, so private members' time to discuss matters that are of genuine public importance to our constituencies has been denied us; it has been shut down. We have been shut out, and it is not to be discussed. And how is the Labor government able to do this? Because the Australian Greens have said so. What an embarrassment for any self-respecting government to have to come into this place and say, 'We've got a management issue; we've got motion No. 1 if the Greens like us today and, just in case they don't like us today, we've also got a backup motion, No. 2, that only lists nine bills.' So it clearly shows us—and no wonder; the government is so administratively incompetent—it is the Greens that are dictating what Labor are allowed to do.

Of course, that is why we have a carbon tax—because the Greens insisted on it and the Australian Labor Party, in breach of their promise, succumbed to it. That is why we are debating gay marriage—because the Greens insisted on it and the Labor Party succumbed to it, in breach of their election promise. And so it goes on and on with this government. It is the Greens that are dictating not only the policy of this government but also how matters dealt with in this place.

I say to those opposite, because I know that there are many who share my view on this: the more the Labor Party are identified with the Greens, the more the Labor Party vote haemorrhages. When I say 'the Labor Party vote', I am mindful of the fact that we have a Democratic Labor Party senator in this place and of course I am not directing my comments to him. But the more the Labor Party are beholden to the Greens, the more the Labor Party vote haemorrhages. From a coalition point of view, that in itself is not necessarily a bad thing. But it is a bad thing when policy and the administration of this place are being dictated by that small wedge of nine Greens senators being able to wag the Labor Party dog and, as a result, together determine the outcome of Senate proceedings.

There was some criticism when the Australian people, in their kindness, gave the coalition the privilege of having the numbers in the Senate from 2004 to 2007. During that time, I remind those opposite, especially the Greens, they railed and rallied against the coalition having control because so many bills were being rammed through the Senate without proper accountability. Let me remind Senator Milne and the Australian Greens: in those three years under the coalition, only 36 bills were so guillotined. As a result of today's motion, since the Green-Labor alliance have taken control of the Senate, over 110 bills will have been guillotined and by the time the full three-year term expires, we could well expect that to be 200 bills on the current rate of guillotining.
As a result of this, people can come to the conclusion that a coalition controlled Senate is a much safer bet for proper parliamentary accountability and scrutiny than a Green-Labor alliance controlled Senate. What we have seen is abuse of power by the Greens. During the Howard government, the Greens said to the electorate, 'What an abuse of process to guillotine bills through this place'—36 bills, how horrendous! But under this government it is 110 and, by the end of the term, it will be 200 bills being guillotined, so you see a wonderful democratic process at work here! Do you know what the difference is? It is that the Greens voted for these guillotines. Whether it is accountable and transparent depends on Senator Milne and the Greens agreeing with the guillotine. If she happens to disagree with the guillotine, it is an abuse of process.

The Australian people are more intelligent than not to see through this nonsense from the Australian Greens and, might I add, the country Independents, and Messrs Windsor and Oakeshott need to take responsibility for this as well. They promised that there would be accountability, that there would be transparency, that they would not allow the government to run roughshod over parliamentary process. Yet here they are maintaining, as they do constantly, a guilty silence about the guillotine process being abused in this place, as it is day after day by the Green-Labor alliance with whom the country Independents are in cahoots. There is no wonder that those two country Independents are so anxious to see the government serve their full term. They will not be serving another term because the electorates are a wake-up to the government and the Australian people will cast their judgment on the Australian Greens and the Labor Party on election day. By the end of this term, the Greens-ALP alliance—if they go for their full three years—will have used the guillotine for the most unprecedented number of bills ever in the history of the Senate, to a factor of six times more than under the coalition. I simply repeat: the Australian people should think very carefully at the next Senate election because a vote for the Greens is a vote for the Labor Party. A Green-Labor alliance will be six times more likely to guillotine matters through this place, without due parliamentary process and without due accountability.

Let me refer to one bill of which I have carriage, the Fair Work (Registered Organisations) Amendment Bill 2012, the one that is trying to clean up the mess after the member for Dobell, Craig Thomson.

Senator Jacinta Collins: It is going to a committee.

Senator ABETZ: The Manager of Government Business might also like to interject to say, 'When will it be referred to a committee and by what date would the committee need to report?'

Senator Jacinta Collins: It is being referred today by Selection of Bills.

Senator ABETZ: It is being referred today and by what date would the committee need to report? The reporting date is Monday, 25 June—that is, less than seven days to consider the bill. This is a classic example of the Labor Party saying, 'Sure we are sending this bill to the committee,' but the parliament will be sitting on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, according to this motion. Can you tell us when the committee will have time to consider the bill? That would be on Saturday and Sunday, of course, so that we can report on Monday and have the bill passed with due process! You know, Manager of Government Business, that this is nonsense. You know that the Australian people do not accept that, especially when the Labor Party and the Greens were so outspoken in relation to the
small number of guillotines under the Howard government. I say to Senator Milne and Senator Collins that it is not by your words that you will be judged; it will be by your votes and you have voted for six times as many bills to be guillotined than the number of bills guillotined under the Howard government.

Let us return to the bill that will be guillotined and slid through this place. I wonder why it is that Labor are so anxious to guillotine this bill to ensure that we have only three hours of debate. In fact, I am not even sure whether we will have three hours of debate, with or without a dinner break. We will have only three hours of discussion about the failures of Fair Work Australia and Mr Bill Shorten's bill. Mr Bill Shorten is an ex-union boss who is trying to cover up for union bosses' mismanagement, to put it politely—'abuse' would be a better word—of hard-working union members' money. We have ex-union bosses coming up with a regime which is a smokescreen to be administered by another ex-union boss, to ensure that we have accountability from union bosses! I do not think so. No wonder the Labor Party want to sneak that one through and conveniently put it into the parliamentary timetable between 5 pm and 8 pm to ensure that the evening news bulletins will all be too late to have it mentioned and by the next day, of course it will be old news. That is the way the Labor Party play their game of politics in this place. It is a disgrace and we as a coalition will continue to stand up to ensure proper accountability.

Under this Greens-Labor alliance controlled Senate, we will have, as a result of proceedings ending next week, over 110 bills guillotined in about 20 months of the parliament. So, if we have even more time with this Greens-Labor alliance, we will undoubtedly see a lot more guillotining of legislation.

We will also see the demise of government documents being considered and the demise of matters of public importance—times interest.

Senator Jacinta Collins: The Wednesday lunch time.

Senator ABETZ: No, not the Wednesday lunch time one, Manager. I am referring to matters of public importance, which are dealt with on a regular basis to allow private senators to deal with matters. It will also be discarded. I would have thought that would be something that the Australian Greens would seek to champion. No, they are more than happy to use the jackboot of the guillotine to ensure that the coalition is denied the opportunity to voice its concerns, if it helps the Greens-Labor alliance agenda. Make no mistake, when I say 'Greens-Labor alliance', it is a Greens-Labor alliance, because the Greens are the ones who are dictating policy and it is the Greens who are dictating the administration of the Senate, as well. That is why the Manager of Government Business in the Senate was reduced, in such a humiliating way, to coming into this place with two separate motions. We knew straight away. We could not be told which motion would be favoured until the Labor Party had that puff of white smoke coming out from the Greens as to which motion they were going to vote for. They needed the permission of the Greens to determine which motion they would go for. How humiliating for a government to have to say, 'Well, we do not know what we are
doing until we get word from the Australian Greens, and we only got the word this morning.'

We believe that the use—abuse, in fact—of the guillotine has now got to such an extent that we as a coalition will fight the abuse of the guillotine all the way. Senator Milne and the Labor Party will try to justify the unjustifiable, but all I would remind them is to remember what they said when the coalition used the guillotine 36 times. By the end of today you will have voted for the guillotine on over 110 bills in about half the time coalition guillotined 36. It is by your actions that you will be judged, not by your words.

Senator MILNE (Tasmania—Leader of the Australian Greens) (12:55): By one's actions one will be judged, not by their words. I think the level of hypocrisy we have just heard from Senator Abetz actually goes to that.

Senator Ian Macdonald: You can talk about hypocrisy!

Senator MILNE: I would remind fellow senators—

Senator Ian Macdonald: What you used to say in the old days when it was a coalition government—

Senator MILNE: that the Howard government guillotined the privatisation of Telstra.

Senator Ian Macdonald: What did you say about that? Hypocrisy in the 10th degree.

Senator MILNE: We have just heard Senator Abetz ranting and raving and mixing his metaphors here. So far, we have had jackboots, the guillotine and the puff of white smoke. But let us actually go to what happened. The coalition actually guillotined the privatisation of Telstra after 14 hours of debate and only a one-day inquiry. Let's just get that on the record. Not only that, but the coalition also guillotined the Northern Territory intervention.

Senator Ian Macdonald: What hypocrisy. The carbon tax—18 bills, 10 mins each.

Senator MILNE: I know that Senator Macdonald thinks that the 1,900 people who have lost their jobs from Fairfax have done so because of carbon pricing. That is the lunacy of the coalition, and we hear that day in and day out. That was one of their more lunatic statements yesterday.

Senator Ian Macdonald: How much time did you allow to debate that?

Senator MILNE: The coalition also guillotined the water reform package. So, let us go to those three things: the privatisation of Telstra, the intervention in the Northern Territory, and water reform in Australia.

Senator Ian Macdonald: What about the Regional Forest Agreements Bill? Your former leader went for 27 hours on that.

Senator MILNE: Mr Acting Deputy President Cameron, I am having difficulty speaking here because of the constant harping from Senator Macdonald. Thank goodness he is now learning to be quiet.

Senator Ian Macdonald interjecting—

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Cameron): Order, Senator Macdonald!

Senator MILNE: Senator Abetz says that he should be judged on his actions rather than his words.

Senator Ian Macdonald interjecting—

Senator MILNE: I want to remind the Senate that when the coalition controlled the Senate his bragging in here went to the issue of the time management of the Senate. I want to remind the Senate that when the coalition had control they completely abused the Senate by changing the Senate committee
process, and gave the coalition itself control of every single Senate committee.

Senator Ian Macdonald: And your guillotine fixes that? What hypocrisy.

Senator MILNE: What is more, they used their numbers in here to block Senate inquiry after Senate inquiry. They blocked every single move for a Senate inquiry that the Greens put up between 2004 and 2007, except for two. One of those was the inquiry into peak oil and the impact of Australia’s dependence on foreign oil.

Senator Ian Macdonald: How can you, bare faced, get up and repeat this hypocrisy?

Senator MILNE: The other, after many times of trying, was when Senator Siewert and I managed to get an inquiry into the impacts of climate change on Australian agriculture. Had the coalition allowed the kinds of inquiries the Greens tried to get up through those years, we would have had an awareness of the impacts of climate change across all sectors a lot sooner. So, when the coalition talk about time management, they need to refer to the fact that they tightly controlled the Senate committee process as to what committee inquiries could be held, for how long and so on. Also, they not only controlled the outcomes, by controlling the numbers on those committees, but they actually blocked many inquiries. Unlike that, in this period of government, when there has been shared power, we have seen not only a large number of Senate inquiries go forward from all parties; we have also seen particular select committee inquiries get up which the coalition have moved ad infinitum and have had many inquiries around the country on particular matters. So there has been a much more democratic representation of the concerns of the community, represented through those Senate inquiry processes, than ever occurred when the coalition had control of both houses.

When Senator Abetz talked about a coalition controlled Senate, he failed to mention one of the most appalling scandals in modern Australian history—that is, the Wheat Board scandal. People around Australia still shake their heads and wonder how it could have been that, at a time when Australia had our troops serving in Iraq, the Australian Wheat Board was paying off, to the tune of $220 million, transport companies—bribery, I think it is called. That occurred when the coalition had control of both houses of parliament. So, when you talk, be judged on your actions and not on your words. Australia will never forget the scandal of the Wheat Board inquiry.

Senator Ian Macdonald interjecting—

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Cameron): Order! Senator Macdonald, I draw your attention to the fact that interjections are usually accepted as part of the process, but continual interjections are disorderly—and you are getting to the stage of being disorderly. Senator Milne.

Senator MILNE: Thank you, Mr Acting Deputy President. As I was saying about the Wheat Board scandal—where $220 million in bribes was paid—when the royal commission was set up Minister Ruddock made the terms of reference so narrow that ministers could not be called before the Cole royal commission. So, if we want to get to talking about what actually happens when there is no accountability, when you have one party controlling both houses of parliament: you get anti-democratic outcomes. I was here this week—

Senator Ian Macdonald: But this is okay, is it? When you guillotine debates, that’s okay, is it?

Senator MILNE: Mr Acting Deputy President, it is rather tedious to have someone so lacking in imagination that there is no repartee or excitement or interest in
this; it is just a drone from over there. But, never mind, I will continue. The Northern Territory intervention was a disgrace, and indeed there is no evidence base to support it, which is why the Greens continue to oppose it—and, indeed, oppose the government’s proposed Stronger Futures, because there is no evidence base for that. I can assure you that, at least in a democratic parliament, where power is shared, there will be a serious—

Senator Ian Macdonald: This is democratic!

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Order! Senator Macdonald!

Senator MILNE: Thank you, Mr Acting Deputy President. There will be a proper investigation into Stronger Futures, and I will ensure that that is the case—having held a press conference earlier this week, with a number of Aboriginal elders from around the country, putting on the record their opposition. I raise that in the context that it was the Howard government, with several of the members still in this parliament here at the time, who guillotined that debate on the Northern Territory intervention.

We had Senator Abetz talking about the fact that the Greens, in a balance-of-power parliament, where there is the opportunity for all parties, all Independents—

Senator Ian Macdonald: Except the coalition!

Senator MILNE: All parties, including the coalition, have an opportunity to actually cooperate and work on constructive outcomes. That is one of the real benefits of a shared-power parliament, and smart oppositions recognise that they actually have some power in those contexts—

Senator Ian Macdonald: You are delusional!

Senator MILNE: and work with other parties to get constructive outcomes. But the coalition has chosen not to be constructive and use the power it has in a balance-of-power parliament. Instead, it has chosen to run a negative agenda from day one, opposing everything and filibustering for days and days. The filibuster that occurred around the Carbon Farming Initiative is a classic case of this. For weeks in the Senate the coalition, the National Party and the Liberals stood up one after the other and said how bad it was, how shocking it was, what a disaster it would be for rural Australia—and then, when finally we got through the Carbon Farming Initiative, we heard from the coalition that it no longer opposed that part of that clean energy package; no, it was going to support it and keep it, in the event that the coalition ever got back into power.

The issue here is that the coalition absolutely wasted the time of the parliament. They railed full of complete and utter rubbish, put up all kinds of propositions that were unsubstantiated and then, when they lost and it passed, they said, ‘Oh, no, we will keep it as it is’—having just spent hours, weeks, saying how bad it was. That is the kind of nonsense that you get when an unintelligent opposition refuse to use a shared balance-of-power parliament to actually get constructive outcomes. Senator Abetz was criticising the Greens for using a balance-of-power parliament to get constructive outcomes. Well, I say that the most productive periods of parliament are balance-of-power or shared-power parliaments, because it is in those circumstances that ideas have to be negotiated and talked about, that amendments are brought forward and significant progress is made. For example, we are addressing climate change. Unfortunately there are still members of the coalition who do not believe that climate
change is happening and that it is human induced. And I see that Senator Bernardi has his hand up. He is still—

Senator Ian Macdonald: It has been happening for millions of years.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Cameron): Order! Senator Macdonald, you are continually interrupting. Your conduct is disorderly. You know the standing orders as well as, if not better than, most people in the Senate. I ask you to show some respect to the Senate and some respect for the speaker.

Senator MILNE: Yes, Senator Macdonald is demonstrating a lack of respect for the Senate. On addressing climate change, this is the most compelling issue that any parliament right around the world is ever going to have to deal with. I point out to the Senate that Christine Lagarde, the head of the International Monetary Fund, came out with a report this week that said that emissions trading and carbon pricing were indeed the way to address—

Senator Ian Macdonald: Mr Deputy President, I rise on a point of order on relevance. This speaker is trying to rehash a debate on climate change, which everybody knows has been happening for millions of years.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Senator Macdonald, that is not a point of order.

Senator MILNE: I am merely responding to Senator Abetz. I noticed that Senator Macdonald found Senator Abetz riveting and totally relevant but does not find the same issue relevant now. Senator Macdonald needs to recognise that the IMF has exactly the same position as the Greens on emissions trading. It says that $20 a tonne is an appropriate carbon price and that there needs to be a pathway to increase that over time consistent with the scientific imperative.

On the issue of marriage equality, I am very delighted and proud of the fact that the Greens are playing a very strong role in working towards marriage equality, just as we are on the issue of addressing climate change. This is an issue of discrimination in the Australian community. We want to get rid of discrimination in Australia and that is why we opposed the Stronger Futures legislation and the Northern Territory intervention—they are discriminatory. It is why we take such a strong view on social justice when it comes to people seeking asylum in our country. It is also why we support marriage equality. We happen to think that the removal of discrimination is a key component of a healthy life in a democratic society that is progressive and pursuing long-term change for the better. That is where the Greens are coming from.

If the coalition had demonstrated that they were able to use the shared balance of power in a constructive way and not spent all their time on useless filibusters and in making ridiculous claims—such as the claim that Fairfax is reducing its workforce by 1,900 because of carbon pricing, which is complete and utter nonsense—then we would not need to pass this kind of motion. Because their nonsense goes on for days and days, we want to make sure that we get legislation through this parliament for the long-term betterment of the country.

One of the bills that will be coming before the Senate soon is to establish the Clean Energy Finance Corporation. That will provide $10 billion to support renewable energy and low carbon emissions technology in Australia. That will help drive the kinds of change that the community wants us to pursue. We are trying to make this country more responsive to the climate task and more
innovative. We want new manufacturing to be built in Australia to make up for the hollowing out of the manufacturing sector that occurred under the Howard government.

We also want to see a major investment in education in Australia and particularly the implementation of the Gonski review. As the Secretary of the Treasury said last night, Australia cannot expect to continue to base its prosperity on mineral extraction. We have to invest in increased productivity. He called it hard work but I say that it has to do with investing in education and training. That is the key way in which we will improve productivity in Australia. That productivity increase has to come from maximising our investment in education and training.

For a democratic parliament to work well all parties need to be positive and need to want to bring about long-term change for a better future for Australia. That does not mean filibustering debates; that does not mean stacking and changing parliamentary committees to make sure that you can never get outcomes other than those the government wants; that does not mean blocking other people from being able to set up Senate inquires. The Senate inquiry process is one of the strengths of the Senate and that process was completely destroyed under the Howard government. It does not augur well to hear someone like Senator Abetz speaking with such hypocrisy about time management while failing to acknowledge that the Howard government chose to guillotine the privatisation of Telstra, the Northern Territory intervention and the water reforms.

The Greens will be supporting this motion. We want to see constructive outcomes for Australia in the long term. We want a stronger and better Australia. That is where we come from. We are going to put our shoulders to the wheel and make sure that we get good legislative outcomes for Australia. We will do that while the coalition continues with its harping negativity, its complete denial of science and reality and the intent to uphold discrimination in Australia. If that is what the coalition stands for, then it will be judged by its actions.

**Senator IAN MACDONALD** (Queensland) (13:13): The Australian Human Rights Commission Amendment (National Children's Commissioner) Bill 2012 will be debated for a total of one hour and 40 minutes under the motion that we are now addressing. There could not be a more important bill relating to human rights, something that the Greens are always carrying on about. Yet they are restricting debate on that particular bill to one hour and 40 minutes. And Senator Milne has the gall to call others hypocrites. The hypocrisy of the Greens knows absolutely no bounds whatsoever. I thought that the Greens—or so they are always telling everyone—were the party of human rights. But when are we going to debate this bill on human rights? In one hour and 40 minutes—that probably works out to two minutes per senator. What a great debate that will be!

The Passenger Movement Charge Amendment Bill is a bill which will again put pressure on the already overstressed tourism industry in Australia. It is a bill that, no doubt, will pass with the support of the Labor-Greens political alliance. The debate on that particular bill, which will add some 17 to 20 per cent to the cost of inbound passengers coming into Australia, is going to last exactly one hour and 40 minutes. One of the most important bills for all those small businesses around Australia, which will be absolutely devastated by this increase in the passenger movement charge, will be debated for fully one hour and 40 minutes.
I remember the days when the Howard government was in charge and we used to get these speeches from Senator Milne and Senator Brown, as he then was, about how undemocratic it was to curtail debate. I remember Senator Brown speaking for 27 hours solid on the Regional Forest Agreements Bill, a bill that established a regime in Tasmania which, had it continued, would have allowed for the jobs of the workers in that industry to build a first-class timber industry for Australia. The Greens opposed that; they spent 27 hours filibustering to try to prevent that bill. In that instance, the Labor Party, for once, stood up for forestry workers and supported the government's Regional Forest Agreements Bill. But the Greens filibustered for 27 hours, and there was no guillotine moved. We allowed the Greens to have their say, even though it was so repetitive that Senator Brown spoke the same words every time he got to his feet. But did we guillotine that? We allowed the Greens to have their debate on that because we knew it was important to them. As Senator Abetz has pointed out, what hypocrisy from the Greens political party.

When it controlled both chambers, the Howard government had only 36 bills that were time-managed in three years. The Greens and the Labor Party now have well over a hundred bills that will be guillotined and debate curtailed. I need to remind listeners that this carbon tax that will start in a few days' time—the one that the Labor Prime Minister promised before the last election would never be introduced under her government—amounted to 18 bills with every senator having only a couple of minutes to debate those bills. The result, of course, was that few of those bills were debated fully and properly, because of the Greens and the Labor Party getting together to substantially restrict debate on that.

Senator Milne has prattled on about climate change again, again accusing coalition members of not recognising climate change. Of course, we recognise climate change—the climate has been changing for millions of years. Once upon a time, the earth used to be covered in ice and snow, but it is not now. Clearly, climate has changed over a long, long period of time, but will imposing the world's greatest carbon tax do anything about the changing climate of the world? As everyone knows, Australia emits less than 1.4 per cent of the total emissions of the world. This world's greatest carbon tax is going to reduce emissions by five per cent. This tax will continue to increase. It is not just a tax this year; it is a tax that continues to rise every year. No matter what compensation or what voting bribes the Prime Minister might send out to the Australian people, nothing will ever compensate for the increases in the cost of living that every Australian will suffer as a result of this Labor-Greens tax. Did members of this chamber have the right to debate those bills and to point out the very obvious flaws in those bills? Clearly they did not.

Senator Abetz also mentioned the fact that every time bills are guillotined, it is government documents that are thrown to the wind. Why do you think this would be? The Greens have little interest in accountability, but you will also note that by Thursday afternoon, when government documents come on, most of the Greens have left parliament and gone home.

Senator Birmingham interjecting—

Senator IAN MACDONALD: Jetting their way home, as Senator Birmingham says. They never bother to participate in that. Yet, Mr Acting Deputy President Cameron, as you would know, those hundreds of government documents that come through every week give the Senate the ability to
look at the expenditure, to look at the
decisions of government, to really make
accountable government actions and
expenditure. But the Greens and the Labor
Party want to get rid of the time for those
government documents. Why? Because it
takes away the Senate's opportunity to keep
the government accountable for its
expenditure. Anything this government can
do with the support of their Green allies to
stop accountability, they will do. This
guillotine motion before the chamber at the
moment is yet another example of this. How
can the Greens get up and with a straight
face and actually promote this guillotine, this
undemocratic action, when you read what
they used to say when a different
government on a very few occasions sought
to time manage the important bills through
the parliament? I am just aghast with the
hypocrisy. But then I think most people who
would be listening to this debate know of the
hypocrisy of the Greens political party.

Not many of us take too much notice of
opinion polls but when the Labor Party is
currently supported by less than 30 per cent
of Australians you can understand why the
Australian public are just sick of the way the
Greens and the Labor Party get together to
runt—or ruin, I should say—this parliament.
So many people ask me why the Labor and
Greens parties get together to curtail debate.
They have got the numbers to pass things
anyhow, but why prevent the elected
representatives of the people from exploring
evry avenue and looking at every
opportunity to perhaps suggest ways of
improving bad legislation, to perhaps try and
convince some of those in the Labor Party
that what they are doing is wrong?

Mr Acting Deputy President Cameron,
you and I both know that there are many
members of the Labor Party who are totally
opposed to a carbon tax, not only because it
is bad policy but also because it is electoral
oblivion for many Labor politicians. But
because of the pressure put on by the Greens
political party and then the Labor Party being
so weak, with their leadership so weak and
divided that they can do nothing else but roll
over to the Greens, we have this type of
government that we have at the moment
which brings in this undemocratic form of
management of this chamber. Why is it that
the government and the Greens do not allow
full debate?

The Manager of Government Business in
the Senate says a lot of the bills were
noncontroversial and they had the support of
the opposition and therefore we should allow
only five minutes to debate them. I say to the
Manager of Government Business she does
not understand that around all of those bills
there is a lot of issues which need to be aired.
Whilst the opposition does sometimes
support some of those bills, it is done
reluctantly. There are ways those bills could
be improved. There are other issues relating
to bills which are classed as noncontroversial
which should be debated. Yet if members of
this chamber exercise their democratic rights
and their procedural rights to discuss those
bills we get the Manager of Government
Business saying it is a filibuster. So,
according to the manager, free speech and
proper debate on any bill is a filibuster.

I do not want to take too much more time
on this debate as I know my colleagues have
an interest in this motion before the chair at
the moment that they want to expose as well.
But I wonder about the future and think of
when governments change and when perhaps
a time management regime might be put in
place on rare occasions. Mr Acting Deputy
President, could you imagine the howls of
outrage that you will get from the Greens
political party then! I could write their
speeches for them because I would only have
to go back to what Senator Milne and
Senator Bob Brown used to say on the rare occasions that time management was introduced under the Howard regime. I will be here for a while and I am sure I will be in the parliament when the government changes and, while it would be unlikely that the Abbott government would introduce too much of a time management regime, on the rare occasion that it will be necessary I cannot wait to hear the Greens then. You can just imagine now hearing Senator Milne, holier than thou, with great umbrage being taken, yet here she is today spending 20 minutes trying to justify the Greens' unholy alliance with the Labor Party in curtailing free speech in this parliament. I hope that perhaps the debate here has convinced some members of the Labor Party to appreciate—and I know the Greens will never do it—that free speech is more important than this motion before the chamber and will vote against it. I would certainly urge all senators to vote against the motion.

Senator JACINTA COLLINS
(Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (13:27): I move:

That the question be now put.

The PRESIDENT: The question is that the question be now put.

The Senate divided. [13:31]

(The President—Senator Hogg)

Ayes.....................33
Noes.....................26
Majority..............7

AYES

Bilyk, CL
Brown, CL
Carr, KJ
Conroy, SM
Di Natale, R
Faulkner, J
Gallacher, AM
Hogg, JJ
Ludwig, JW
Madigan, JJ
McEwen, A
Milne, C
Polley, H (teller)
Rhiannon, L
Stephens, U
Thistlethwaite, M
Wright, PL

NOES

Abetz, E
Bernardi, C
Boswell, RLD
Bushby, DC
Cormann, M
Eggleston, A
Fifield, MP
Johnston, D
Kroger, H
Mason, B
Nash, F
Payne, MA
Smith, D

PAIRS

Carr, RJ
Evans, C
Feeney, D
Siewert, R
Waters, LJ
Wong, P

AYES

Lundy, KA
Marshall, GM
McLucas, J
Moore, CM
Pratt, LC
Singh, LM
Sterle, G
Urquhart, AE

NOES

Back, CJ
Birmingham, SJ
Boyce, SK
Colbeck, R
Edwards, S
Fierravanti-Wells, C
Humphries, G
Joyce, B
Macdonald, ID
McKenzie, B
Parry, S
Scullion, NG
Williams, JR (teller)

Senator Fisher did not vote, to compensate for the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Sherry.

Senator Heffernan did not vote, to compensate for the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Bob Brown.

Question agreed to.

The PRESIDENT (13:35): The question is that the motion moved by Senator Collins be agreed to.
The Senate divided. [13:35]
(The President—Senator Hogg)

Ayes....................32
Noes.....................27
Majority...............5

AYES
Bilyk, CL.................................................................................................................. Bishop, TM
Brown, CL................................................................................................................... Cameron, DN
Carr, KJ...................................................................................................................... Collins, JMA
Conroy, SM.................................................................................................................. Crossin, P
Di Natale, R.................................................................................................................. Farrell, D
Faulkner, J..................................................................................................................... Furner, ML
Gallacher, AM............................................................................................................... Hanson-Young, SC
Hogg, JJ......................................................................................................................... Ludlam, S
Ludwig, JW..................................................................................................................... Lundy, KA
Marshall, GM.................................................................................................................. McEwen, A
McLucas, J..................................................................................................................... Milne, C
Moore, CM..................................................................................................................... Polley, H (teller)
Pratt, LC.......................................................................................................................... Rhiannon, L
Singh, LM....................................................................................................................... Stephens, U
Sterle, G.......................................................................................................................... Thistlethwaite, M
Urquhart, AE.................................................................................................................. Wright, PL

NOES
Abetz, E........................................................................................................................... Back, CJ
Bernardi, C..................................................................................................................... Birmingham, SJ
Boswell, RLD................................................................................................................... Boyce, SK
Bushby, DC..................................................................................................................... Colbeck, R
Cormann, M................................................................................................................... Edwards, S
Eggleston, A..................................................................................................................... Fierravanti-Wells, C
Fifield, MP..................................................................................................................... Humphries, G
Johnston, D..................................................................................................................... Joyce, B
Kroger, H........................................................................................................................ Macdonald, ID
Madigan, JJ..................................................................................................................... Mason, B
McKenzie, B..................................................................................................................... Nash, F
Parry, S............................................................................................................................ Payne, MA
Scullion, NG................................................................................................................... Smith, D
Williams, JR (teller)....................................................................................................... 

PAIRS
Carr, RJ............................................................................................................................ Ronaldson, M
Evans, C.......................................................................................................................... Fawcett, DJ
Feeney, D........................................................................................................................ Ryan, SM
Siewert, R....................................................................................................................... Brandis, GH
Waters, LJ....................................................................................................................... Cash, MC
Wong, P............................................................................................................................ Sinodinos, A

Senator Fisher did not vote, to compensate for the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Sherry.

Senator Heffernan did not vote, to compensate for the vacancy caused by the resignation of Senator Bob Brown.

Question agreed to.

NOTICES
Withdrawal


BILLS
Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011
Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011

Second Reading

Debate resumed on the motion:

That these bills be now read a second time.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (13:38): I rise to speak on the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. The coalition will not be opposing either of the bills or the amendments to the bills being introduced.

Can I, at the outset, say that the coalition has a strong record on investing and delivering in e-health. For example, it was under a coalition government that the computerisation of general practice increased from 17 per cent in 1997 to 94 per cent in 2007. This was achieved through a $740 million investment over those years. The coalition has always supported the concept of shared electronic health records. Indeed, it was the coalition that originally started the
focus on a shared electronic health record. At this point, I pay tribute to the work of past health ministers Michael Wooldridge, Kay Patterson and Tony Abbott, who did a lot of work in this area.

Unfortunately, despite the focus and direction that was established under the Howard government towards e-health, Minister Roxon and the Labor Party's implementation of the system since taking government in 2007 has received severe criticism from industry for its poor management of the programs being developed. One only has to look at the press in recent days to see that this rollout still has major problems—not that that is surprising given the record of both the Rudd and the Gillard Labor governments in quite a number of areas of health.

It is the government's fault that we are now at this point where we will not be ready to go on 1 July. I draw an analogy with the GST. When it was introduced, the legislation had been in place for 12 months before the start date; whereas it is very, very clear that we have so little to show at this point because of the government's poor track record here. Basically, this government has been gradually winding back expectations of what will be available on 1 July. In fact, it was so typical of Kevin Rudd to go for the big bang approach. Yesterday we were talking about his so-called health reform as the incoming Prime Minister. He had the grand plan, but we realise that there was not even anything about it written on the back of an envelope. It is the same thing with e-health. He wanted to go for the big bang approach, but as we approach 1 July there will not be much to show for it.

One only needs to look at an article in today's Australian entitled 'E-health record service delayed by incomplete infrastructure'.

Here we have an article in the Australian today telling us that the plans that Minister Plibersek had to mark the start of the $1.1 billion e-health records service are on hold as key parts of the system are not ready for the much feted 1 July launch. I quote:

Sources who declined to be named—

I am not surprised—
say a ceremony planned at St Vincent's Hospital in Sydney on Monday, July 2—the first working day of the new system—has been cancelled.

The minister's office was tight-lipped when The Australian asked whether the event had been postponed to a later date.

This, of course, is not surprising. The spokesman for the minister tells us, 'We look forward to the launch of e-health', but we do not know when that launch is going to be. The pilot sites of e-health that were reported last month—and one of the most successful had apparently been at St Vincent's and Mater Health in Sydney, which lends credence to the launch being there—had recruited only 4,446 consumers to its East Sydney Connect shared e-record out of the hoped for 46,800 participants.

There was no comment at all from the minister or her spokesperson in relation to the recent visit by Mr Peter Fleming, the Chief Executive of the National E-health Transition Authority, to deliver the bad news. This, understandably, includes the lack of readiness of the national IT infrastructure that is being built by NEHTA according to specifications, at a cost of $91 million, and that is yet to go live. Here we are, a couple of weeks before 1 July and, no, we are not going live on e-health—which I thought would have been obvious. We know that there are still some critical user verification, authentication, issues. We are going to an interim system, which is going to be provided by Medicare. You cannot go online to register. You can do it by phone or in
person at the Medicare office, but you cannot do it online. Also the records system is unlikely to be operational any time soon. So there was a great e-health launch with a great big bang, but we are not seeing very much for our money.

Meanwhile, the costs to take e-health to this point have been topped up to $1.1 billion. The recent budget allocation was of another $224 million and another $50 million for adoption by Medicare Locals. We do not know what Medicare Locals are going to do, let alone what they are going to do in the e-health space. And of course it is more than doubling previous commitments.

Since 2007 there have been problems upon problems in relation to how this government has rolled out e-health. Just to name a few of those problems, the government has repeatedly stated that it would be able to take the user registrations from 1 July this year. Of course, we know that that is not going to happen. One industry expert has been quoted as stating that it will be many years before the system is ubiquitous. Like with so many other announcements by this government, they announced a major project and now they are scrambling to meet their own deadlines.

Legislation was brought on for debate in the House of Representatives long before the Senate inquiry into these bills had concluded. The Senate inquiry in its public hearing on 6 February heard testimony highlighting quite a number of stakeholder concerns with these bills and yet the government pressed on debating them in the House.

Let us just go to some of those concerns. These concerns were outlined by, in particular, the dissenting report by the coalition senators. It indicates that:

There is currently a concerning dissonance between the assurances of the Government and the very real concerns raised by practitioners and experts in the e-health industry.

Naturally the coalition has been concerned that the government's political need for the big bang approach to introducing e-health on a given date is being given primacy over common sense and a proper rollout of the system. The majority of the witnesses that appeared before the Senate inquiry expressed serious concerns with the process so far and the consequences of the legislation if it were to proceed in its present form.

Those concerns broadly covered four major issues: functionality and interoperability of the system; confidence of consumers and clinicians in the proposed e-health system; governance and conflicts-of-interest problems in the system designed to hold the health records of every Australian; and risk and patient safety. These four major concerns are the very spine of a high-quality and safe system and yet in the Senate inquiry a very short period of time ago many witnesses questioned aspects of the potential for successful adoption, functionality and operability of the system within the legislated system, particularly within the time frame. Certainly the major concerns were about adoption, functionality and interoperability.

Issues were raised in the Senate inquiry about the absence of no-access controls, which go to the very heart of the system and further undercut the claims that have been made by the Department of Health and Ageing and NEHTA that the key design features of the system are present. Some have not been. Consumer concerns were raised, and they were also reported. There was much criticism of the consumer complaints provision of the proposed legislation. As I said, issues were raised pertaining to structure and transparency.
A point that was highlighted by coalition senators and raised in evidence as well was that:

... NeHTA is not subject to the standard Government accountability processes, including FOI, this has led to perceived culture of secrecy and a lack of responsiveness to key stakeholders around strategic issues.

Privacy has been a major issue. The Information Commissioner also raised concerns about the adequacy of the proposed legislation in dealing with data breaches. None of these were adequately dealt with in the legislation.

Also there are unanswered questions about medical indemnity and legal liability and the concern that the government has not developed satisfactory processes. There are clearly doubts about the liability in the event of medical misadventure predicated on information contained in the system. All of this casts doubt on the integrity and viability of the proposed legislation.

There is a concern about risks to patient safety. Patient safety is the bedrock of any health system. Those concerns were also highlighted in evidence to the inquiry. They came from industry experts, clinicians, consumers and privacy advocates. Many stakeholders basically said that they had lost confidence in those who were developing the e-health system.

At that stage, when the report was finalised by the Senate, we were barely four months away. We are now two weeks away and we are still debating this issue and concerns are being raised about the system. As I said, with all these concerns, it would have been prudent for the Minister for Health and the government to defer debate on these bills until the Senate inquiry had publicly reported on its findings. Instead, the legislation was rushed through and now we have amendments to the legislation which have to pick up problems. Some of those problems are yet to be resolved and I would like to highlight a number of them that are still of concern. There are concerns about the costs so far and the ongoing number of them that are still of concern. There are concerns about the future costs of managing and operating the system. We know that NEHTA's funding agreement expires on 30 June, the day before the system is supposed to go live on 1 July. The Standing Council on Health, as part of the COAG process, has agreed to fund NEHTA after 30 June, but no details have been released as to the level of funding agreed to. Until the budget was released, this uncertainty prevailed.

I have referred to other measures that have been announced. For example, there has been no comment or discussion on the long-term costs relating to the ongoing maintenance of the system, upgrades to the system or the provision of help desk or support staff for the system. One only needs to look at the situation in the United Kingdom, where they spent £12 billion on the e-health record equivalent, which was scrapped in late 2011. This is not a scenario that we can afford to impose on Australia's taxpayers.

When you look at the evidence that was given to the Senate committee and the concerns that were raised by software vendors, they were almost unanimous in their concerns about NEHTA's and their own legal liabilities under the proposed legislation. So I think this is of great concern.

Another concern that has been regularly raised is the lack of encouragement or incentives for general practitioners to create the shared health summaries which are proposed to be part of the system. The health
summary is a collection of a patient's medical history and will make up one important part of the system. There have been concerns in relation to confusion from general practitioners over whether they will be able to claim the higher Medicare rebate that would normally apply if setting up an e-health record pushes the consultation into a higher band. There are a number of stakeholders who claim that there was a significant lack of proper and thorough consultation with them. So the list of concerns goes on.

In the remaining time I want to focus on the amendments. As I indicated, the coalition will support the amendments. Whilst these amendments go towards addressing some of the recommendations of the Senate inquiry, there are still some major issues to be looked at, certainly given the media reports that are out there today, to ensure that this system is effectively rolled out.

I would like to underline for the record that it was the coalition that originally referred these bills for inquiry. As I said, the bills were forced through the House of Representatives before the Senate inquiry's report had been handed down. At the time, the coalition called for the deferral of the debate in the House of Reps until the Senate inquiry had been completed, and perhaps we would have saved ourselves a lot of time and angst. But of course the government refused this call and forced the debate regardless. It would have been easier to correct the legislation rather than having to do a patch-up job, and it is very clear now that the bills do not actually achieve all that needs to be done. This is just another example of the incompetence of this government. As we saw today, this is a government that cannot manage its own legislative agenda. How can we expect it to manage something as important as this, manage the budget or indeed manage our country? But we will not go there at this point.

These amendments were introduced following the committee's inquiry. The amendments seek to broaden the scope of the future review of the legislation in two years time, which will include reviewing the identity of the system operator, alternative governance structures for the system and the opt-in nature of the system. I know, having participated in a number of inquiries, these issues were raised directly as a result of various community affairs committee inquiries. Hopefully the amendments will also strengthen the consultation that will be required before PCEHR rules are made and adopted.

One of the major concerns of the Senate inquiry surrounded privacy. Whilst these amendments go some way to resolving particular issues which were raised in the inquiry by clarifying and strengthening the Australian Information Commissioner's functions and powers with respect to investigating breaches, it will be interesting and important to see how these privacy concerns roll out. Under the amendments, the role of the system operator in providing de-identified data for research and public health purposes will be clarified. Provisions contained within the amendments will also strengthen consent arrangements in a number of circumstances. There are also a number of other minor technical amendments. As I said, the coalition will not be opposing these bills.

**Senator DI NATALE** (Victoria) (13:58): That was a terrific speech from Senator Fierravanti-Wells. I would be interested in hearing a speech where you were going to oppose the government's legislation, because that did not sound like somebody who rose to speak in support of the government's bills. I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of the Personally Controlled Electronic
Health Records Bill 2011 and a related bill, because I believe they do advance Australia down the road towards a modern, more efficient and much better connected health system. In this day and age Australians are very familiar with the use of technology. Most Australians, from kids to their grandparents, are now very familiar with the world of instant connectivity. Emails, text messages, sending photos on Facebook—it is all part of their daily lives and it helps individual businesses to thrive.

Debate interrupted.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE
Carbon Pricing

Senator CORMANN (Western Australia) (14:00): My question is to the Minister representing the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Senator Wong. Minister, is the government negotiating any last-minute changes to the carbon tax?

Senator Conroy interjecting—

Senator CORMANN: Sorry, I will repeat the question, because Senator Conroy obviously does not want to listen to it. My question, Mr President, is to the Minister representing the Minister the Climate Change and Energy Efficiency: is the government negotiating any last-minute changes to its carbon tax?

Senator Conroy interjecting—

Senator CORMANN: Sorry, I will repeat the question, because Senator Conroy obviously does not want to listen to it. My question, Mr President, is to the Minister representing the Minister the Climate Change and Energy Efficiency: is the government negotiating any last-minute changes to its carbon tax?

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:00): I thank the senator for his question; I am surprised it was not on Mr Abbott's speech. I would have thought that would have been the first question, backing the leader.

Senator Cormann: Yes or no!

The PRESIDENT: Continue, Senator Wong.

Senator WONG: I am trying. He is very anxious. It has only been 21 seconds.

Opposition senators interjecting—

Senator WONG: Settle down, Senator.

The PRESIDENT: Senator Wong, ignore the interjections. The question has been asked.

Senator WONG: The last time I looked, the clean energy future package, including the carbon price mechanism, had passed the Senate. If Senator Cormann is aware of a way that we could retrospectively amend a bill after it has passed the Senate—I am not aware of such a way—I am sure he could tell me about that. But the legislation has already passed and the government has made its position very clear.

Honourable senators interjecting—

Senator WONG: I will take the interjection. I know there are a range of things that need to be dealt with through policy and regulation, and the government are proceeding with a number of those. We have the Clean Energy Finance Corporation legislation, which will be dealt with in this Senate, hopefully in the near future, and we have the Climate Change Authority appointments to be made. There is a range of such matters. I am not sure what the senator is referring to, but I can say to him very clearly that we have put out a great deal of detail in relation to the clean energy future package. It is an economically cogent package which puts a price on pollution and is the most efficient way we know to reduce pollution in the Australian economy—in fact in any economy. That point has been made by economists worldwide and also by the IMF. I would hope that those opposite would be aware of that and would read those comments, because they continue to persist with a policy that will cost Australia more.

Senator CORMANN (Western Australia) (14:03): I take that as a no. Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. At what point in time will the government formally assess
whether its carbon tax, the world's biggest carbon tax, has been a success or failure?

Senator Wong (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:03): First, there is another lie contained in Senator Cormann's question, which I will respond to.

Opposition senators interjecting—

Senator Wong: It is a lie.

Senator Brandis: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. Senator Wong effectively called Senator Cormann a liar. That is unparliamentary. She should be ashamed of herself and she should be required to withdraw at once.

The President: There is no point of order. That is not what was said.

Senator Wong: I suspect that Senator Cormann may be a little more robust than Senator Brandis at the moment, for whatever reason that might be. He seemed quite fine.

Honourable senators interjecting—

The President: Order! Senator Wong, resume your seat. Order! On both sides.

Senator Wong: One of the propositions put to me in the supplementary was that well-known phrase 'world's biggest carbon tax'. We know that is inaccurate. We know that a number of countries—

Senator Cormann: Mr President, a point of order in relation to the requirement for the minister to be directly relevant to the question. That is not what was said.

Senator Wong: I ask a further supplementary question. Is there any circumstance at all in which the government would water down its carbon tax—the world's biggest carbon tax—which will push up the cost of electricity, push up the cost of living, push up the cost of doing business and reduce our international competitiveness while doing nothing to help reduce global greenhouse gas emissions?

Senator Cormann (Western Australia) (14:06): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Is there any circumstance at all in which the government would water down its carbon tax—the world's biggest carbon tax—which will push up the cost of electricity, push up the cost of living, push up the cost of doing business and reduce our international competitiveness while doing nothing to help reduce global greenhouse gas emissions?

Senator Wong (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:07): That was not really a question, if I may say. It was yet another iteration of a set of inaccurate propositions—if they get worried about the word 'lies', I will say 'falsehoods' or 'untruths'—that the opposition continue to put in relation to pricing carbon. What they do not tell Australians is that they are signed up to the same reduction by the end of the decade that the government is, but what they want to do is get taxpayers to fund it and make the economy bear a greater cost. That is what the opposition want to do. But they do not want to talk about that; all they want to talk about are a set of propositions which are wrong. What we are seeing is the opposition, even Senator Cormann, backing away from some of the more ridiculous propositions which are being made,
including the tax being death to industries and towns being wiped off the map, all of which are simply untrue.

**Education Funding**

*Senator MARK BISHOP* (Western Australia) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Human Services, Senator Kim Carr.

*Senator Abetz interjecting—*

*Senator MARK BISHOP: That is right—Senator Carr. Stop interrupting, you!* Can the minister inform the Senate what the government is doing to ensure that children from low-income families get a fair crack at a good education?

*Senator KIM CARR* (Victoria—Minister for Human Services) (14:09): I thank the senator for his commitment to equity in education. From tomorrow, families will see the schoolkids bonus in their bank accounts. The Department of Human Services expects to deliver $1.4 billion to 1.3 million households before the month is out—

*Opposition senators interjecting—*

*Senator KIM CARR: And I am sure those opposite are delighted to hear that! The measure is fundamentally about equity. It is about a just society, and that begins—*

*Opposition senators interjecting—*

*The PRESIDENT: Senator Carr, just resume your seat. There are a few people that are a little bit excited this afternoon. We might just wait until they settle down. When there is silence, we will proceed.*

*Honourable senators interjecting—*

*The PRESIDENT: When the chatter across the chamber ceases, we will proceed. The time to debate it is after question time. Senator Carr.*

*Senator KIM CARR: It is a sorry thing that we hear from the knuckle-draggers on the other side of the chamber, who have failed to face up to their responsibilities when it comes to ensuring a just society—because we know that a just society begins with a good education. It is the only way to give every Australian the chance to realise their full potential for themselves and for their country. It is the path to the high-wage, high-skill, high-tech jobs that people are entitled to expect. That is why this Labor government has made education the foundation of a richer, fairer and greener Australia. The schoolkids bonus is one of the steps we are taking along that path.*

*The old education tax refund was a worthy initiative, but less than 20 per cent of eligible households were claiming the benefit in full. It was bypassing the poorest, those most in need. That is why the government has acted on the recommendation of the Henry tax review by replacing the refund with a schoolkids bonus. This is the sort of practical assistance that struggling families need to give their kids a fair go in school and in life. It is a shame that those opposite do not support these practical measures to help people get a good start in life.*

*Senator MARK BISHOP* (Western Australia) (14:11): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Senate what the government is doing to help families manage their entitlements in the interests of their children?

*Senator KIM CARR* (Victoria—Minister for Human Services) (14:12): I am aware that this is a matter of some concern to the Leader of the Opposition, because he takes the view that we should deny our kids their bonus; he takes the view that people cannot be trusted to spend this money wisely.

*This is a government that wants to help families make the right decisions, and that is why the Department of Human Services provides financial information services for families. It is a free and confidential service.*
delivered by professional officers with specialist knowledge of income support systems. Anyone can speak to an officer by phone or set up an appointment to discuss any questions in depth. In the financial year to date, officers have assisted over 164,000 people through these channels. A further 77,000 people have attended over 2,600 public seminars. The Australian people have a clear choice: practical assistance for families or fear and smear from those opposite. (Time expired)

**Senator MARK BISHOP (Western Australia) (14:13):** Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Given the significant costs of some essential equipment, such as laptops and computers, can the minister advise what the government is doing to ensure fair access?

**Senator KIM CARR (Victoria—Minister for Human Services) (14:13):** The schoolkids bonus is simply one measure we are taking to combat the educational divide in this country. Another is the government's major investment in technology for schools. In 2007—Senator Mason would recall this—Labor promised that we would provide enough computers in schools for every senior high school student in the country, and we are delivering on that promise. Education authorities across the country have installed more than 950,000 computers, exceeding the original target of 786,000 computers by the beginning of the current financial year. This is what the National Secondary School Computer Fund means to our kids: it is a guarantee that they will not be left behind. And the opposition have promised to rip it away. The opposition want to drag our kids back to the cave in which they dwell. This is a government that always look to the future, and we urge the opposition to change their—(Time expired)

**Carbon Pricing**

**Senator SINODINOS (New South Wales) (14:14):** As an apprentice knuckle-dragger, my question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Senator Wong. Is the minister aware of the announcement by the New South Wales Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal that electricity prices in my home state of New South Wales will rise by up to 20 per cent this year, with around half of the rise directly attributable to the carbon tax? How much does the government expect electricity demand to fall as a result of these increases?

**Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:15):** I thank Senator Sinodinos for his question and I thank him also for his past support for a price on carbon when working with then Prime Minister Howard. I wish someone with his understanding of public policy could put paid to some of the ridiculous propositions such as those we saw from Senator Brandis and as we see consistently from the shadow minister. In relation to the electricity price issue, it is the case that IPART has released its determination, which shows that the impact on electricity prices by the carbon tax is a shade under what the Treasury modelling advice at just over nine per cent—the Treasury estimate was 10 per cent. All of this has been factored into the government's assistance package, including the tax cuts, which the opposition will roll back should they ever win government and which the opposition will roll back because they want people in this country earning under $80,000 per year to pay more tax not less tax.

It is very clear from what the regulator has said that the main reason for rising electricity prices is the billions of dollars being invested in poles and wires for the network. In many
Australian states, there have been very substantial increases over past years, which have nothing to do with the carbon price. These increases are all about investment in the network. We know that those opposite—

Senator Brandis: I rise on a point of order, Mr President. On the question of direct relevance, the minister is more than three quarters of the way through her answer. The principal question she was asked is, but how much does the government expect demand to fall? She has not come close to addressing that issue.

The President: That was part of the question, Senator Brandis. The question was broader than that. The minister is addressing the question and the minister has 24 seconds remaining.

Senator Wong: I can say that certainly whatever impact there is on demand, it will be more efficient and cheaper than the impact on reductions in emissions that the opposition's policy would have, which would cost Australian households of $1,300 a year—a very inefficient policy being proposed.

Senator Sinodinos (New South Wales) (14:18): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. I quote the New South Wales Independent Pricing and Regulatory Tribunal:

Many households spend an increasing proportion of their income on electricity bills, particularly those in low-income high consumption households.

In other words, it is a very regressive tax. What does the minister estimate the elasticity of demand to beef electricity from people in that situation?

Senator Wong (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:18): The senator is suggesting that it is important to consider the impact on low-income Australians. I am very pleased the Liberal Party have worked that out. If that is the case, perhaps the Liberal Party could tell us that they will not proceed to the election as they currently are proposing to do, rolling back the tax cuts which are part of the clean energy package, which will give everybody in this country earning under $80,000 a year a tax cut. You cannot have it both ways, Senator Sinodinos. You have had people on your side saying that this is socialism masquerading as environmentalism because somehow we are redistributing too much. Then they come in here and suggest that we are not redistributing enough. The reality is that our package absolutely and unashamedly targets low- and middle-income Australians and the only people opposed to that are the opposition.

Senator Sinodinos (New South Wales) (14:19): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Can the government guarantee that low-income high electricity consumption households in New South Wales with special needs, such as the aged and the disabled, who require additional heating, cooling or electricity used for medical equipment will not be worse off as a result of the carbon tax contribution to price rises of up to 20 per cent?

Senator Wong (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:20): I can guarantee that a Labor government will ensure that low-income Australians will get a tax cut through the tripling of the tax free threshold—opposed by those opposite. They will get an increase in their pensions, also opposed by those opposite who do not want to give age pensioners and disability support pensioners an increase. Those who are eligible will receive an essential medical equipment payment of $140 for concession card holders who rely on essential medical equipment. There is additional assistance to people who receive allowances, as well as additional
assistance through family tax benefit. We have a very comprehensive tax and benefit assistance package associated with the carbon price, in contrast to those opposite who want to impose another $1,300 per tax year on Australian households, including on low-income households, to pay for a policy which will not— (Time expired)

Media

Senator LUDLAM (Western Australia) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Senator Conroy. In light of your comments in the last 24 hours and noting also the comments of shadow communications spokesperson Mr Malcolm Turnbull this morning, will you move or support legislation to enshrine the principle of editorial independence to ensure that media owners and board members do not obstruct objective and independent journalism?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:21): I thank Senator Ludlam for his question. The announcement made by Fairfax Media yesterday reflects the significant changes that have occurred and are continuing to take place in the communications and media landscape, domestically and internationally. The loss of 1,900 jobs makes it an extremely difficult time for the employees and their families. It is an anxious time for many Fairfax workers. What we are not going to do is start legislating to interfere in any way with editorial independence.

At the moment people should be focused on wanting to ensure maximum support for Fairfax workers and their families. My colleague Mr Shorten's department has been in touch with Fairfax to talk to the company about how the government can assist. But in terms of legislating and the editorial position, the answer is, no.

Senator LUDLAM (Western Australia) (14:23): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. I thank the minister for his answer and in particular the information that the government is seeking to look after the workforce that has been so badly impacted by this announcement. My question is simply that the minister enshrine in legislation the principle that he spoke so eloquently of over the last 24 hours. If the government does not intend to do this, will the minister explain why not?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:23): Fairfax Media is grappling with the challenges and opportunities brought about by technological change.

Senator Brandis: Not to mention the carbon tax.

Senator CONROY: Not to mention the carbon tax! Yes, it is on the internet, idiot. You might have met it. Possibly not, given the knuckle draggers on the other side. What is crucial in this process is that the board and management of Australia's oldest newspaper company must not lose sight of its core objective—that is, its values. One of the strengths of Fairfax Media is the importance the company has placed on editorial independence.

The Gillard government has long been aware of the changes resulting from the emergence of the digital economy. We have recognised these challenges. That is why we set up the convergence review. That is why we specifically set up, as the terms of
reference, our supplementary media inquiry—(Time expired)

Senator LUDLAM (Western Australia) (14:25): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. I thank the minister for his rant. Does the minister agree that strengthening media diversity in this country is greatly enhanced by the national broadcasters and also by independent and community broadcasting, and will he therefore commit to greatly increasing their funding to fully utilise the NBN and counter the 'Ginafax', Murdoch and Stokes dominance of our airwaves, broadsheets and TV screens?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:25): Australia's national and community broadcasters play a vital role in the health of our democracy and in the diversity of our media landscape. The government recognises both the ABC and SBS as being amongst Australia's most important and trusted cultural institutions. In the last triennial funding round, in 2009, the Labor government provided the ABC with the largest increase in its operational base funding since 1983, consisting of an additional $165 million between 2009 and 2012. In this year's budget, ahead of next year's triennial funding for the national broadcasters, the government provided an additional $158 million over five years to the SBS to ensure that it remains a vibrant and dynamic broadcaster. Again, this was the largest increase in SBS's history.

**Carbon Pricing**

Senator BIRMINGHAM (South Australia) (14:26): My question is to Senator Wong, the Minister representing the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency. I refer the minister to the announcement of South Australia's Essential Services Commission last week that we will see electricity prices rise by 18 per cent and gas prices rise by 17.7 per cent over the next year, with more than a quarter of the increase related to the Labor government's carbon tax. Will the minister inform the Senate just how much carbon emissions are expected to drop by as a direct result of these steep power price increases?

Senator Cameron interjecting—

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:27): There are a number of interjections, but I will not take them. I will leave them to Senator Cameron to make. The first point I would make is that the government's position in terms of the reduction of emissions is the same as the opposition's: five per cent on 2000 levels by 2020. Again, the difference is that our plan is more efficient and it will work, whereas the opposition's plan is more expensive and it will not work. That is the key difference.

In terms of the facts that Senator Birmingham put to me, he well knows, because he is not Senator Bernardi, that the electricity price increase in South Australia is in fact significantly lower, in terms of the component attributable to a carbon price, than was in fact modelled by the Treasury. The result is that the increase in price due to the carbon price is 4.6 per cent.

You do not want to hear this, do you, Senator Birmingham, because you do not want the facts to get in the way of your scare campaign? You would not want to hear the facts, would you? It is an increase of 4.6 per cent. In other words, it is significantly less than Treasury models, and our assistance package is predicated on the higher price increase. Let us remember this: in South Australia the component of price increase
that is attributed to a carbon price is 4.6 per cent. The Treasury modelling was double that—nine per cent. Our assistance package is predicated on the higher amount. So, in terms of federal government policy, South Australians are obviously doing better than a number of consumers in other states. I would have thought that Senator Birmingham, as a South Australian, would be pleased to know that the assistance package for South Australians was higher than the actual cost—

(Time expired)

Senator BIRMINGHAM (South Australia) (14:29): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. Why will a typical South Australian small business's electricity bill rise by hundreds of dollars a year as a direct result of the carbon tax and associated climate change policies, when Ms Gillard told a lie at the last election promising that there would be no carbon tax under a Gillard government?

(Time expired)

Senator Jacinta Collins: Mr President, on a point of order: I ask you to ask Senator Birmingham to retract that comment.

Honourable senators interjecting—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Senator Brandis?

Senator Brandis: Mr President, on the point of order: when I took a point of order against Senator Wong, who accused Senator Cormann of telling a lie in his question, you ruled that it was not out of order for Senator Wong to phrase her response in that way. Senator Birmingham has used, quite deliberately, precisely the same phrase—

Senator Jacinta Collins: That is not true! He did not use precisely the same phrase.

The PRESIDENT: Order! No, there were not precisely the same terms there, Senator Brandis, thank you very much.

Senator BIRMINGHAM: Mr President, I withdraw and ask the minister why South Australian small businesses will face this price increase, given the lie that was told at the last election about there being no carbon price under a Gillard government.

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:31): The first point I would make in relation to small business is that those opposite should be very careful about some of the propositions they are putting forward in their very dishonest scare campaign. The average price impact across the economy will be 0.7 per cent. The data provided to the government by COSBOA shows the electricity costs of a typical small retail business make up less than two per cent of total costs. On the basis of the Treasury modelling, the cost increase of the carbon price will therefore only be 0.2 per cent of overall expenditure for the typical small business.

If the senator is concerned about South Australia's economy, however, perhaps he should go into his party room and deal with issues such as the submarines project, which is so important to the economy of South Australia and which the coalition is refusing to support. (Time expired)

Senator BIRMINGHAM (South Australia) (14:32): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Given the minister highlighted the lesser contribution the carbon tax makes to electricity price rises in South Australia, will the minister confirm that South Australia faces a different impact than, say, New South Wales, because it already has the highest electricity generation costs in the nation? Will the minister further confirm that the carbon tax is simply
designed to impose these higher electricity generation costs on the rest of Australia too?

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:32): That is, frankly, an extraordinarily ridiculous question—particularly from a South Australian Liberal, who I assume supported the privatisation of the electricity companies in South Australia, of ETSA, which in part has been the precursor to the high electricity prices. I also neglected, in answer to his previous supplementary—

Senator Ian Macdonald: Mr President, I rise on a point of order. Is there anything you can do to stop this hopeless minister spending the first half of every answer attacking the questioner or attacking the question?

Government senators interjecting—

The PRESIDENT: Order! That is not a point of order. Senator Wong, you have 40 seconds remaining.

Senator WONG: Thank you, Mr President. I was actually wanting to respond, because I neglected to respond to Senator Birmingham's small-business question by reminding him that, of course, the government has put in place a number of tax relief measures for small business. The instant asset write-off will ensure that small business can write off up to $6½ thousand on an asset as well as the first $5,000 on a vehicle. We also introduced in the previous budget the loss carry-back rule, which we anticipate will significantly benefit primarily small business.

Broadband

Senator MOORE (Queensland) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Senator Conroy. Can the minister provide an update to the Senate on research into the opportunities of our digital economy, and research into the broadband capacity we need to realise these opportunities?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:34): I thank the senator for her question and her interest in the future of Australia's economy. The Gillard government recognises that today our economy is already a digital economy, and the pace of change continues to increase. The need for high-speed broadband has been demonstrated in Cisco's latest forecasts, which stated that 'internet traffic will grow in Australia sevenfold from 2011 to 2016'. That is a compound annual growth rate of 49 per cent. In Australia the average broadband speed will quadruple in the next five years from eight megabits to 36 megabits. An analysis by Ericsson released last year showed that doubling an economy's broadband speed increases GDP by 0.3 per cent. A report released last week by IBM identified the growth that will be fuelled by high-speed broadband and the industries like mining, education and retail that will gain the most.

Mr Turnbull has previously championed President Obama's broadband plans—as the Americans were the inventors of the internet, he told us. I am sure Mr Turnbull has kept his colleagues informed that the President has this week committed the US to the need for a national network, supporting one-gigabit connection—one gigabit. This is what President Obama had to say:

Building a nationwide broadband network will strengthen our economy and put more Americans back to work ... By connecting every corner of our country to the digital age, we can help our businesses become more competitive, our students become more informed and our citizens become more engaged.
What we have seen is Malcolm Turnbull champion New Zealand— (Time expired)

The PRESIDENT: Order! I remind senators to refer to people in the other place by their correct titles.

Senator MOORE (Queensland) (14:37): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. Can the minister outline to the Senate what the Australian government is doing to realise these opportunities?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:37): The trends are clear. The economic benefits are undeniable. Australia must invest in a broadband future or we will be left behind. That is why this government is investing in the National Broadband Network: to deliver one gigabit networks to 93 per cent of premises in Australia. The joint committee on the NBN unanimously told the government that it should do more to communicate about the NBN and the government's policy. We have taken that advice on board. One of those initiatives is the NBN truck, which is making its way around the country. This week, it is in Canberra. It is just down the road behind Old Parliament House. I encourage all those knuckle draggers over there to go down to the truck and get an education. Maybe then you will not have people like Mr Hockey making idiotic comments, such as the one that he made last week about 4G having more capacity than the National Broadband Network. (Time expired)

Senator MOORE (Queensland) (14:38): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Is the minister aware of any alternative policies in this area?

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:38): Unfortunately, I am aware of many. We have a confusion of alternative policies. In August 2010, Mr Turnbull said that he could do everything that he needed to do with a 3.5 megabit connection. Then in October 2010 he claimed that a 12 megabit connection to the home would be enough for everybody. Then in May this year he asserted that residential premises have no need for anything more than 25 megabits. Then last week, as I have just mentioned, Mr Hockey said that 4G mobile has the capacity to be far superior to the National Broadband Network. In August of last year, the National Party emerged from under their rock to announce their policy of placing a priority on rolling out fibre optic cable to a majority of consumers in regional Australia. (Time expired)

Carbon Pricing

Senator HUMPHRIES (Australian Capital Territory) (14:39): My question is to the Minister representing the Minister for Climate Change and Energy Efficiency, Senator Wong. Is the minister aware of the announcement of the ACT's independent competition and pricing regulator that electricity prices in the ACT will rise by 17.74 per cent or around $273 a year for an average Canberra household, with the majority of the price rise a direct result of the Labor government's carbon tax?

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:40): I am aware that analyses of price increases across Australia have been released by various authorities. I do not have the full detail of the ACT's one. I say again to the senator that the government has included in its assessment of household assistance price increases which are broadly comparable—
and in some cases the reality has been smaller price increases— with what we are seeing. In other words, we have assessed correctly the price impact of a carbon price. We are making sure that we deliver assistance to Australian households. That assistance comes in the form of a tripling of the tax-free threshold, which is a tax cut for everybody earning under $80,000 a year. It is a particularly good reform for second income earners, because it ensures that they keep more of every dollar that they earn. That means that it has the added benefit of enhancing participation, a reform that was overdue and a reform that has been delivered by a Labor government in the context of the clean energy package and the tax reform associated with that package.

ACT pensioners and recipients of the disability support pension and recipients of other allowances will receive assistance that the government has announced. Pensioners get $338 per annum for singles and $510 per annum for couples combined. There are increases to the family tax benefit on a per child basis and to family tax benefit B, as well as assistance to self-funded retirees in receipt of the Commonwealth seniors healthcare card.

Senator HUMPHRIES (Australian Capital Territory) (14:42): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. Thank you, Minister. Are all Canberra families and households being compensated for the average cost of living rise of more than $640, according to an ACT government budget cost-of-living statement, with $460 of that attributed to the impacts of Labor's carbon tax? If not, what proportion or number will be worse off because of Labor's carbon tax?

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:43): The government has been completely upfront from the day that this was announced that assistance will focus on low- and middle-income Australia. I assume that Senator Humphries is not suggesting that he should get assistance. I assume that he would concede— because on some issues he is reasonable—that it is sensible for the government to ensure that assistance is targeted to those who need it most. That is why, while nine out of 10 households will receive some assistance, six out of 10 will get tax cuts or increased payments that cover the entire average cost impact. About four million Australian households will get an extra buffer of assistance over and above the cost impact. Compare that with the policy that the senator supports: $1,300 more tax paid by every Australian household every year. That is what your policy costs.

Senator HUMPHRIES (Australian Capital Territory) (14:44): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Is the minister aware that the ACT Labor government has estimated that 60 per cent of Canberra households will be undercompensated for the carbon tax and 22 per cent will be totally uncompensated? With thousands of households facing electricity price rises of more than 17 per cent and a $640 increase in their cost of living, when will Ms Gillard admit that she went to the last election with the promise that there would be no carbon tax under a government that she led and that she has not told the truth to the Australian people?

Senator WONG (South Australia—Minister for Finance and Deregulation) (14:45): We have provided assistance on the basis of income levels, the eligibility for particular Commonwealth entitlements such as family tax benefit, the disability support pension and pensions, and, obviously, the tax-free threshold. We have unashamedly done that because we believe it is important that when introducing a policy such as this it
is necessary to fund and to assist as a priority low- and middle-income Australia. If Senator Humphries cares so much about the people who elect him, then I wonder why it is he cannot stop the shadow Treasurer constantly boasting about the number of public servants he will sack. That is all that Joe Hockey wants to talk about—I apologise, Mr Hockey. He is not prepared to talk about any other savings; he only wants to talk about your constituents. You remain very silent, Senator. *(Time expired)*

**Migration**

Senator HANSON-YOUNG (South Australia) (14:46): My question is to the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Senator Ludwig. I refer the minister to recent reports that the Indian-based transnational energy and mining company, the Adani Group, has brought a foreign workforce to Australia on incorrect short-stay visas with restricted work rights with the full knowledge of Australian immigration officials. The company was later permitted by the immigration department to transfer this workforce onto the correct 457 work visas without them having to leave the country, as they would under any other circumstance. I ask the minister: when did any official from the department of immigration, or indeed the minister's office, first become aware of the arrival of Adani's foreign workers on incorrect visas?

Senator LUNDY (Australian Capital Territory—Minister Assisting for Industry and Innovation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Sport) (14:48): The Department of Immigration and Citizenship assesses allegations and takes appropriate investigative action where breaches are identified. The department also conducts campaigns across various sectors focusing upon particular sponsorship obligations in order to assess whether sponsors are complying with their obligations. As a matter of course, the government takes any allegation seriously and looks into issues or concerns raised by workers, unions or the community. The government is committed to addressing the skill needs of various employment sectors while maintaining job opportunities for local workers and securing strong investment in domestic training. Importantly, employers are required to employ such workers at market rates and no less than they pay Australian workers, meaning they cannot be used to undercut local wages or labour costs.

We remain committed to strengthening the integrity of Australia's skilled visa programs by identifying and penalising employers who do the wrong thing. For example, a labour agreement for on-hire 457
workers was recently terminated because the company was found to be employing its subclass 457 visa workers on a casual basis, underpaying them, and providing false and misleading information to the immigration department. An ongoing compliance action has resulted in an increase in the number of infringement notices served.

Senior officials from the Department of Immigration and Citizenship met with representatives of the Adani Group on a number of occasions to discuss appropriate visa options and the officials reiterated the importance of complying with visa conditions and employer obligations. I understand that this meeting prompted Adani to commission an Ernst and Young audit to review its business practices, and this is entirely appropriate. The department is meeting with Adani to discuss the audit.

**Senator HANSON-YOUNG** (South Australia) (14:50): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. In my original question, I asked when the department was first made aware and, if indeed there were meetings with the Adani, when did they first happen and why was it that Adani was able to shortcut the visa requirements for those workers at that particular time? Minister, could you please also inform the Senate whether a broader audit of these visas being used by companies bringing in foreign workers has been audited—(Time expired)

**Senator LUNDY** (Australian Capital Territory—Minister Assisting for Industry and Innovation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Minister for Sport) (14:52): I certainly do not have that information with me but I would like to say once again that this government has a very responsible approach to the way in which we manage our Migration Act. I know of the changes that we made in protecting the provisions of the 457 class visa holders. Again, reflecting on past experience with the former coalition government, there were several instances where there was no regard as to the working conditions of 457 class visa holders in Australia.

**Senator Hanson Young:** On a point of order, Mr President, I am reiterating that I asked a specific question about whether the
answers to the questions the minister does not know will be taken on notice.

The PRESIDENT: The minister has answered that. Minister, you have now got 30 seconds remaining if you have got further comments.

Senator LUNDY: Thank you, Mr President. As I was saying, under the former government these provisions in relation to 457 class visa holders and other visa holders were in urgent need of attention. That was done when the Labor government came to office. Of particular importance is, of course, not allowing 457 class visa holders or temporary skilled migrant workers to undercut local wages and conditions. This is an important principle of our labour market, it is one we uphold proudly and one on which we were happy to step in and ensure when we came to office. (Time expired)

Marine Sanctuaries

Senator BOSWELL (Queensland) (14:53): My question is to the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Senator Conroy. I refer the minister to the fact that Australia has the world's third largest ocean territory, at 8.5 million square kilometres, but from our territory we extract less than 30 kilograms of marine catch per square kilometre. Because of this we import 70 per cent of our seafood from other nations. We import the most from Thailand, who extract almost 6,000 kilograms of marine catch from their oceans—more than 200 times the rate of our extraction. Why is the government simply exporting an environmental issue to another country by further shutting down Australia's fishing industry through its declaration of 1.3 million square kilometres of marine reserve parks? And what guarantees can the government give that the lower fishing production in Australia will not simply be displaced to other countries with a less enviable environmental record?

Senator Chris Evans: On a point of order, Mr President: at the risk of making a habit of this, the minister for fisheries, Minister Ludwig, is in the chamber and, quite frankly, is probably better placed to answer that question as most of it goes to Fisheries. Senator Conroy is happy to take it but, as the fisheries minister is—

Opposition senators interjecting—

Senator Chris Evans: The question was all about fisheries catch and the impact on the fishing industry. But if you would rather have an answer from Senator Conroy, in representing the environment minister, we are very relaxed. I was just trying to help Senator Boswell.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Senator Conroy.

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (14:55): Thank you, Mr President. I am happy to explain how the NBN can help the fishing industry! But for generations Australians have understood the need to preserve precious areas on land as national parks. Our oceans contain unique marine life which needs protection too. We have an incredible opportunity to turn the tide on protection of the oceans and Australia can lead the world in marine protection. The government's network of marine reserves is the most comprehensive network of marine protected areas in the world and represents the largest addition to the conservation estate in Australia's history. This new network of marine reserves will help ensure that Australia's diverse marine environment and
the life it supports will remain healthy, productive and resilient for future generations. The development of a national system of marine reserves has been underway in Australia for 20 years since the signing of the intergovernmental agreement on the environment in 1992. A national agreement to establish a national representative system of marine protected areas was reached in 1998 by Commonwealth, state and territory environmental ministers meeting under the chairmanship of the then federal environment minister, Senator Robert Hill.

Government senators: Robert Hill!

Senator CONROY: That is right—Senator Robert Hill. The south-east marine reserves network was finalised by the Howard government in 2007. The Howard government developed—

Honourable senators interjecting—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Senator Conroy, resume your seat for the moment. I now call Senator Conroy.

Senator CONROY: The Howard government developed what are known as the goals and principles for the establishment of a national representative system of marine protected areas—(Time expired)

Senator BOSWELL (Queensland) (14:58): Mr President, I ask a supplementary question. I refer the minister to the ABARES fisheries status report. On page 52 of that report there is a table reporting the status of fish stocks in the Coral Sea and it says not one fish species is listed as overfished. Why then is the government locking up the Coral Sea from all fishing? Can the minister name one fish species that is currently threatened from overfishing other than the commercial fishermen?

The PRESIDENT: The minister can answer that which pertains to the portfolios that he represents.

Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (15:00): As I was saying, there is a representative system of marine protected areas in Commonwealth waters. They are the guidelines by which the marine reserves are being identified. The guidelines were set out in the bioregional profile for the south-west marine region, a document released by the then Minister for the Environment and Water Resources, Mr Malcolm Turnbull. But there is recognition, too, that marine reserves are not the only way to protect a marine environment and they must work in tandem with effective fisheries management, where Australia is an acknowledged leader, and the effective regulation of other marine industries. It would be unfair of me not to acknowledge the contribution in this area of the then fisheries minister, Senator Abetz, who was also involved in many of these initiatives. Perhaps you have not met him recently. (Time expired)

Senator BOSWELL (Queensland) (15:00): Mr President, I ask a further supplementary question. Given that the minister cannot justify the government's Coral Sea decision based on science, is this government's decision simply pandering to the Greens? Can the minister justify why the government's announced policy is almost a carbon copy of the Greens Coral Sea policy announced at the last election, which proposed a Coral Sea marine reserve which was no-take, with only two specific zones open to recreational fishing?
Senator CONROY (Victoria—Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, Deputy Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on Digital Productivity) (15:01): The identification of the marine reserves network is underpinned by science. We know we were in the Dark Ages in the case earlier in question time, but the goals and principles draw heavily on the scientific knowledge of our marine environment which has identified the diversity of marine ecosystems and habitats being considered for protection. But there is recognition, too, that marine reserves are not the only answer and must work in tandem with effective fisheries management and effective regulation of other marine based industries. Mr President, the government has conducted an extensive consultation process. This included a formal 90-day consultation period for each region between May 2011 and February 2012. All up, there was—

(Time expired)

Senator CHRIS EVANS: I ask that further questions be placed on the Notice Paper, Mr President.

QUESTIONS TO THE PRESIDENT

Parliamentary Language

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (15:02): Mr President, I do not expect a ruling now, but there was an overuse of the term 'idiot' during question time applied to members of the House of Representatives, and I would invite you to have a look at the Hansard to see whether that was parliamentary and whether or not it needs to be withdrawn.

Senator Conroy: It has taken nearly 30 minutes for those opposite to rise to defend Mr Hockey!

The PRESIDENT (15:03): Order! Senator Abetz, I will review the Hansard and if there is a need I will come back to the chamber.

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (15:03): Mr President, I thank you for that. Given Senator Conroy's immature intervention just then, it is quite obvious that that is what Senator Conroy did. As a result, it could all be truncated by Senator Conroy having the decency to get up now and withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: I have said I will look at the Hansard.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE: TAKE NOTE OF ANSWERS

Carbon Pricing

Senator COLBECK (Tasmania) (15:03): I move:

That the Senate take note of the answers given by the Minister for Finance and Deregulation (Senator Wong) to questions without notice asked by Opposition senators today.

In her answers today, Senator Wong again refuses to acknowledge that this whole carbon tax legislative process is based on one of the greatest political lies in recent political history—that is, 'there will be no carbon tax under the government I lead', a statement made by the Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, six days before the last election and then repeated in the days preceding the election. The government puts forward economy-wide percentages in the context of the cost increases that will apply to households, to business and to power prices but, as we have seen from questions asked by the opposition today, those things are quite variable and in some cases, like the ACT, they appear to be in excess of the predictions made under the modelling.

The modelling is economy-wide modelling, which does not take into account regional differences. In small regional communities such as Flinders Island or King
Island, which are dependent on shipping to get all their goods and services on and off the island, or, for that matter, in a state such as Tasmania, which again is dependent on shipping and airlines for freight service on and off the island, there is a disproportionate effect. According to the advice that people on King Island have recently been given, for shipping the additional cost of the fuel levy and the carbon tax combined will be 12.9 per cent, and that is before GST. There will be about another 1.3 per cent on top of that for the fuel levy and the carbon tax, just for shipping things on and off King Island. As I indicated yesterday, King Island beef and King Island cheese are two significant brands in the Australian food sector—iconic brands, I would have to say. They are the best known brands in the country. The employees of those small businesses and the farmers who support them are disproportionately affected by the carbon tax, which is based on the lie: ‘there will be no carbon tax under a government I lead’.

But the government has taken no account of that. It has not done any modelling to understand those regional impacts or the small business impacts. There is no support for small business. The owners of the little coffee shop next to my office tell me that their power bill is going to go up in excess of $6,000. They are not seeing any support. They are going to have to make a couple of thousand extra coffees, for example, to pay for that increase. A number of other imposts are being placed on businesses by this Labor government, particularly around their employment and wage costs. So, again, incremental increases in costs are being imposed by this government across the board. The government tries to separate them out by indicating that they are small in their own right and do not have a major impact; but, when you add them all up, you have a significant impact on the cost of doing business and that cost is being driven up by this government and its broader policies.

With respect to the carbon tax and agriculture, dairy farmers will be looking at an additional $10,000 on average for power costs for an irrigated dairy farm. Let us not mention the fertiliser and other input costs that farmers also have. Of course, we know that the processors will not be interested in giving dairy farmers extra money. The processors are more likely to pass back costs to the dairy farmers because they are playing in a global market and their competitors are not subject to the carbon tax that is being imposed on Australian dairy farmers. There will be the additional $10,000 cost on average for an irrigated dairy farm, and then farmers will be looking at a similar amount coming back from the processors. All of this is adding up—and of course there is no assistance. There is the Carbon Farming Initiative. However, we understand, after having properly scrutinised that piece of legislation, that it is unlikely to have much effect before the next election at least. But we know that the carbon tax starts at the end of next week.

The government continues to dishonestly suggest to the Australian community that there is going to be a small impact from this carbon tax, but every single business and every single household is going to be impacted by it and they are going to feel it. For small businesses that are not compensated, I think they are quite justified in feeling the lie: ‘There will be no carbon tax under a government I lead.’ (Time expired)

Senator GALLACHER (South Australia) (15:09): I would like to begin my contribution on this motion to take note of answers by applauding the contribution of Senator Sinodinos where he asked the question about what was to be done for
people with special needs in the state of New South Wales. Perhaps his great influence in the Liberal Party would be put to better use if he were to get the O'Farrell government to withdraw from increasing public housing rents exactly at the same time as those households will receive their compensation for the carbon price. Pensioners and self-funded retirees will get an extra $338 per year if they are single and there will be $510 for couples combined. This will all go towards ameliorating the impact of the carbon price, yet we have a state government that is putting up the cost of public housing and hitting those who can least afford it. If Senator Sinodinos is so concerned about these people, perhaps we could see some intervention on his part in relation to this matter.

The simple fact of the matter—and I suppose we will be indulging in the same repetition that the coalition indulges in—is that the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party are both committed to a five per cent carbon reduction and renewable energy target by 2020. So the objectives are the same but our plan is simply to price the 500 biggest polluters. It is as simple as that. There are about 20 in South Australia. The other side of the argument is that the coalition will pay polluters to stop polluting. This seems to me to be counterintuitive. Under that scenario it is a case of the longer you pollute the more you get paid—and the coalition will use tax dollars to do it. So low-income households or taxpayers will be paying extra tax to tell people to stop polluting. Pricing carbon will change behaviour. That is an economic fact. If there is a monetary disincentive to do something then people will find another way to do it, either through innovation investment or changing their behaviour. If you are getting paid to pollute, I am not sure that you would change all that quickly.

Let us return to the simple fact that we are going to compensate nine out of 10 households. Nine out 10 households will receive compensation. As I said, pensioners and self-funded retirees will get $338 per year if they are single and $510 if they are couples. Families receiving family tax benefit A will get an extra $110 per child per year. Eligible families will get an extra $69 under family tax benefit part B per year. Allowance recipients will get $218 per year for singles. There will be $234 per year for single parents and $390 per year for couples combined. Importantly, the tax free threshold will rise to $18,000. Over a million workers will pay no tax at all. They will not have to lodge a tax return. These are some of the most vulnerable in the community—people working part time, young kids at university doing a part-time job. They will not have to lodge a tax return. That is a very important issue for a lot of people who are struggling to make ends meet. On top of this, 7.5 million taxpayers with an annual income of under $80,000 will also receive a tax cut. Most will receive at least $300 per year. The interesting thing now is that Tony Abbott and the coalition—Senator Abetz: 'Mister' to you.

Senator GALLACHER: I will take that interjection as it is appropriate. Mr Tony Abbott, the Leader of the Opposition, has committed to repealing the carbon price as well as somehow taking away tax cuts and increased payments that the most vulnerable in the community and those earning under $80,000 will receive. I did hear his speech either today or yesterday where he said that as an incoming government, 'I'm going to do all of this.' I wonder how that is to be done legislatively. It will take some time. I note that his has committed to bulldozing the changes through parliament should he win government—and that is up to the Australian electorate. But the reality is that most people,
particularly in South Australia, fundamentally like clean energy. With a 20 per cent renewable target already achieved—

(Time expired)

Senator McKenzie (Victoria) (15:14): I rise from my rock to take note of all answers by Senator Wong, dragging my knuckles all the way. The carbon tax: I did want to touch on something Senator Carr mentioned in one of his answers that tickled my fancy. He said that he did not want to deny—

The Deputy President: Order, Senator McKenzie! You cannot take note of the answers given by Senator Carr as the motion is to take note of answers only of Senator Wong.

Senator McKenzie: Yes, I am getting on to that. I will focus on that then. Senator Wong was answering a lot of questions about the carbon tax, which arrives on our doorstep in less than a month. The Treasurer and Acting Prime Minister, Mr Swan, told his caucus colleagues this morning that the carbon tax would be a 'game changer'. You can bet your bottom dollar it is going to be a game changer. You know what is really important in playing any sort of game, particularly field games? It is a level playing field. We will not have one. Australian businesses will not have one. They will be snookered. They will be behind the eight ball, thanks to being lumped with this carbon tax.

Last Friday, the Gillard Labor government released a further list of local councils that will experience a significant carbon tax hit due to their landfill operations. In my home state of Victoria the outermetropolitan councils of Hume and Wyndham will be affected, as will the City of Greater Bendigo, and the great regional city of Geelong will be severely impacted. Councils will then have to charge ratepayers. This is in addition to the local councils that were previously mentioned, particularly Wagga Wagga, with their significantly increased bills for landfill issues because of the carbon tax that many of them have not put into their forward planning. They are going to be slugged.

Some on the other side have been raising the issue of compensation. Nine in 10 households, I heard it said, will be compensated. My question is: where is the incentive to change behaviour if we are going to be compensating households to the extent that we are? We have the same policy as the government. We do want to reduce greenhouse gases by 2020 by five per cent. That will require all of us to change our behaviour.

That brings me to the incentives and the strategies in this policy implementation phase that this government has been undertaking over recent weeks and to the advertising campaign around the carbon tax. What a waste of money it is when we are talking about behaviour change. We had a carbon tax ad that did not even mention it. $70 million was spent to tell people that they would find money in their bank accounts. You do not have to do anything to get it; it is just going to be there. When questioned during estimates on the folly of this sort of policy, it was acknowledged that, 'Sometimes we advertise so that those who are not eligible know they are not eligible.' I thought it was an odd strategy to pursue and a waste of money, but this government has form on that sort of behaviour with their policy implementation.

What I think is not being spoken about enough is the annual increases in electricity prices due to the carbon tax—year in and year out. It comes at the worst possible time for Australian families and businesses. Business is already hurting. One company on the big polluters list is Australia's largest
dairy company, Murray Goulburn, which recently announced 300 job losses. I would like to take note of two mayors representing great Murray Goulburn dairy-producing districts in the gallery today—Kevin Simpson and Alex Monk from the Victorian region. Australian businesses are under pressure as they struggle with the continued high dollar and increased input costs, as admitted by Minister Combet last month. But the coming carbon tax for a business like Murray Goulburn slugs the producer and the shareholders. That is not to mention the dairy farmers', the actual producers, $10,000 electricity cost before we get the milk out of the farm gate. My state's largest exporter off the dock every day and a regional success story, Murray Goulburn is now bearing the brunt of the government's failed policy—and we are sick to death of it.

Senator URQUHART (Tasmania) (15:19): I rise on the motion to take note of the answers given by Minister Wong on the government's clean energy future package. As much as those opposite want it to, climate change is an issue that is not going to go away. It cannot be chased away simply by the scaremongering of those opposite. Their current scare campaign is focused on power price rises and trying to do their bit to discredit the professional price estimates conducted by the independent utility regulators in each state. For example, the New South Wales pricing regulator estimates that for the typical small business customer for each of the three New South Wales networks the increase would be less than $5 a week. The Council of Small Business Organisations of Australia has confirmed that the impact on small business consumers will be around $5 per week.

However, the government is still committed to assisting small businesses through a range of measures, including $27.5 million to extend the highly successful Small Business Advisory Services program for a further four years, allowing incorporated small businesses carrying up to $1 million worth of losses to get a refund of tax paid in the previous year. Also, the small business instant asset write-off will increase from $1,000 to $6,500 from 2012-13. This will improve cash flow for small business operators and provide additional incentives for investment and productivity improvements.

As part of the clean energy future package, the government has tasked and resourced the ACCC to investigate and take action against businesses that make false or misleading claims about the impact of carbon pricing on their prices. Those opposite have spent a good while scaremogering that the forecasted electricity prices are wrong and that electricity prices will rise by exorbitant amounts under a carbon price. On 12 June 2012 the chairman of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, Mr Rod Sims, said he could not see any circumstances where an average small business would have a carbon related price increase of anything like 25 per cent.

One thing is absolutely clear: it is in Australia's long-term national interest to deal with climate change. In this chamber we have heard for many years from Minister Wong as well as many others on this side of the chamber and even some opposite about the positives of using an emissions trading scheme in tackling climate change. At the core of our emissions trading scheme is a cap on carbon pollution. The cap will guarantee reductions in carbon pollution and allow us to achieve our long-term goal of an 80 per cent reduction from the 2000 levels by 2050. That is 17 billion tonnes of carbon pollution out of the atmosphere between now and 2050.
This Gillard Labor government is committed to a smooth transition and will use all of the revenue to support households, to invest in clean energy future and climate change programs and to support jobs and competitiveness in energy intensive industries. For households there will be tax cuts, increases in family payments and higher pensions, benefits and other government allowances. Nine out of 10 households receive or will soon receive assistance through tax cuts and/or payment increases through the transfer system.

Treasury's price increase estimates, which formed the basis of the household assistance package, have recently been found to overestimate the price increases in five of six jurisdictions where information is available. In my home state of Tasmania, electricity prices were estimated to rise by nine per cent, but consultants for the Tasmanian electricity pricing regulator have claimed that the rise will only be 6.5 per cent. This is well below the forecast and therefore provides extra assistance to Tasmanian households.

This is a reform that requires the parliament to look at the longer term and not just the short-term politics. It is unfortunate, then, that those opposite are led by a politician who will only ever look to what he believes is a short-term political advantage. Most of those opposite publicly expressed a belief that we need to act on climate change and that supporting an emissions trading scheme is the way forward—until they thought the politics had shifted, until they sought a short-term advantage over the nation's long-term prosperity. It is not too late to put the nation's long-term interests forward and shelve your short-term political interests. It is not too late to realise that your policy and our policy are both to reduce emissions by five per cent by 2020. It is not too late to realise that climate change will not be solved in 2020 and we need a long-term plan to deal with the costs of pollution. It is not too late to do what is right for our grandchildren. (Time expired)

Senator EDWARDS (South Australia) (15:24): I rise to take note of answers from Senator Wong, but in addressing Senator Wong’s answers I must not let Senator Gallacher's comments go unaddressed. I remind Senator Gallacher, who has now left the chamber and is bunkered down in his office, that he might listen to his own leader. Prime Minister Julia Gillard said about the carbon tax:

There will be price impacts. The whole point of pricing carbon is to say that goods that have got a lot of carbon pollution in them get relatively more expensive, people innovate, they start to make things with less carbon pollution in them and those things are cheaper.

Forgive me, but where is the logic in it if that is what you are looking to achieve with this carbon tax? Why do you go out and turn the money wheel, the money churn, and start compensating all of these people with $9.90 a week if you want to change behaviour? I must also point out a further quote from the same leader, Julia Gillard, in one of her radio interviews:

Now I wasn't going to get involved in a semantic and ultimately sterile debate about what you call that fixed price period. That's why I was upfront and said it's effectively like a tax. And it will take us through to a cap and trade emissions trading scheme, a market mechanism to price carbon.

A tax is a tax is a tax.

That is why in South Australia, in my home state, the Olympic Dam project is in doubt. It is a project which offers great hope to South Australia, a state which is lagging well behind the national average in employment and growth. That project offers some 15,000 jobs directly in its construction phase and would add about $6 billion a year to the state's economy. It was revealed also
in yesterday's *Advertiser* that a record number of South Australians are struggling to cope with the skyrocketing power prices. I hear in everybody's retort from the other side that the pricing regulator says it only affects this cost by $5 a week, that one by $5 a week. How many more lots of $5 a week can the Australian people put up with? That $9.90 in compensation does not cover all the $5 here and the $5 there.

Back home in South Australia, the Tea Tree Gully council recently announced that it is being forced to factor in a cost of $500,000 this year for the carbon tax in their rate rises, while Mitcham council has been forced to allow for an increase in costs of $190,000 because of this government's carbon tax. It has also been revealed in the Adelaide *Advertiser* that the carbon tax will add another $4.6 million to the cost of the Southern Expressway duplication which is now being constructed. To boot, the cost of multi-trip bus tickets will rise to $33.14, and diesel costs for the metropolitan bus services in South Australia will increase by $1.3 million. How many lots of $9.90 per week in compensation to all these people is this going to cover? It is just not going to cut it. Taxpayers of South Australia are getting it everywhere, whether it be municipal rate rises, electricity price rises or the rise in the cost of groceries by virtue of transport and manufacturing.

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia announced last Friday that they would allow South Australia's electricity prices to rise by 18 per cent, 11.5 per cent of which is due to the Gillard government's carbon tax and the green schemes of their state Labor counterparts. What is Minister Wong's message to the households in South Australia, her home state? South Australian households will be paying average energy bills of $2,876 from next year. Shame, Senator Wong. Shame!

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk: Petitions have been lodged for presentation as follows:

**Pharmacy Services**

To the Honourable president and members of the Senate in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the undersigned shows:

Action Needed to Improve Local Pharmacy Service

That the PROSERPINE district is in need of additional pharmacy to service the needs of the community.

Your petitioners ask/request that the Senate:

Immediately call upon the Government to facilitate an additional licence to dispense medicine in Proserpine without further delay to improve competition, accessibility and choice for the members of the community.

by Senator Boswell (from 2,436 citizens).

**Telecommunications**

To the Honourable president and members of the Senate in Parliament assembled:

The petition of the undersigned shows:

That the residents of the central Southwest inland area of Western Australia, "Nannup shire and the surrounding districts" have been patient for too long waiting for good communications facilities in their shire. The safety of all the shire residents is at extremely high risk in the event of any fire or flood emergency due the lack of communication facilities across this hilly and forested countryside.

The petitioners ask that the Senate take immediate necessary action to rectify the fragmented and dysfunctional mobile telephone communications, ABC and local southwest radio reception for the safety and benefit of all the undersigned and their dependents.

by Senator Cash (from 490 citizens).

Petitions received.
NOTICES

Presentation

Senator Cameron to move:
That the Joint Standing Committee on the National Broadband Network be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Tuesday, 26 June 2012, from 6 pm to 8 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the review of the rollout of the NBN.

Senator Crossin to move:
That the Joint Select Committee on Gambling Reform be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Tuesday, 26 June 2012, from 4 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the prevention and treatment of problem gambling, followed by a private meeting otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1).

Senator Pratt to move:
That the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 27 June 2012, from 12.30 pm to 1.45 pm, to take evidence for the committee's inquiry into the review of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities annual report 2010-11.

Senator Smith to move:
That the Senate notes that:
(a) the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II occurred on 2 June 1953;
(b) the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II was celebrated between 2 June and 5 June 2012;
(c) during this period, Australians expressed their respect and affection for Her Majesty and their thanks for the longevity of her reign as Queen of Australia; and
(d) 3 February 2014 will mark the 60th anniversary of the first arrival of Queen Elizabeth II in Australia.

Senators Hanson-Young and Lundy to move:
That the Senate—
(a) notes that Wednesday, 20 June 2012 is World Refugee Day, recognising the importance of international commitment to worldwide protection of refugees under the 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees;
(b) notes that the 2012 theme of World Refugee Day is 'Refugees Have No Choice: You Do', which acknowledges the tragic conflicts and deadly persecution that lead people to seek protection in countries that are not their own, leaving behind their history, property and loved ones in search of a safe new life; and
(c) calls on the Government to reaffirm Australia's commitments under the 1951 Convention.

Withdrawal

Senator HANSON-YOUNG (South Australia) (15:30): I withdraw business of the Senate notice of motion No. 780 standing in my name for today.

Senator KROGER (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:30): At the request of Senator Colbeck, I withdraw business of the Senate notice of motion No. 1 standing in Senator Colbeck's name for the next day of sitting.

COMMITTEES

Selection of Bills Committee

Report

Senator McEWEN (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:31): I present the sixth report for 2012 of the Selection of Bills Committee.

Ordered that the report be adopted.

Senator McEWEN: I seek leave to have the report incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The report read as follows—
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
REPORT NO. 6 OF 2012

1. The committee met in private session on
Monday, 18 June 2012 at 8.19 pm.

2. The committee resolved to recommend—
That—

(a) the provisions of the Broadcasting Services
Amendment (Improved Access to Television
Services) Bill 2012 be referred immediately to the
Environment and Communications Legislation
Committee for inquiry and report by 25 June
2012;

(b) the Clean Energy Finance Corporation Bill
2012 be referred immediately to the Economics
Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 25 June
2012;

(c) the provisions of the Crimes Legislation
Amendment (Slavery, Slavery-like Conditions
and People Trafficking) Bill 2012 be referred
immediately to the Legal and Constitutional
Affairs Legislation Committee for inquiry and
report by 13 September 2012;

(d) the provisions of the Fair Work (Registered
Organisations) Amendment Bill 2012 be referred
immediately to the Education, Employment and
Workplace Relations Legislation Committee for
inquiry and report by 25 June 2012;

(e) the provisions of the Privacy Amendment
(Enhancing Privacy Protection) Bill 2012 be referred
immediately to the Legal and Constitutional
Affairs Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 14 August 2012;

(f) the provisions of the Social Security
Legislation Amendment (Fair Incentives to
Work) Bill 2012 be referred immediately to the
Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
Legislation Committee for inquiry and report by 22 August 2012; and

(g) the provisions of the Tax Laws
Amendment (Cross-Border Transfer Pricing) Bill
(No. 1) 2012 be referred immediately to the
Economics Legislation Committee for inquiry
and report by 14 August 2012.

3. The committee resolved to recommend—
That the following bills not be referred to
committees:

- Australian Citizenship Amendment (Defence Families) Bill 2012
- Australian Human Rights Commission Amendment (National Children's Commissioner) Bill 2012
- Broadcasting Services Amendment (Digital Television) Bill 2012
- Clean Energy Legislation Amendment Bill 2012
- Clean Energy (Customs Tariff Amendment) Bill 2012
- Clean Energy (Excise Tariff Legislation Amendment) Bill 2012
- Higher Education Support Amendment (Student Contribution Amounts and Other Measures) Bill 2012
- Legislative Instruments Amendment (Sunsetting Measures) Bill 2012
- Malabar Headland Protection Bill 2012
- Migration (Visa Evidence) Charge Bill 2012
- Migration (Visa Evidence) Charge (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2012
- National Health Amendment (Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme) Bill 2012
- Navigation Bill 2012
- Navigation (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2012
- Parliamentary Counsel and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012
- Passenger Movement Charge Amendment Bill 2012
- Social Security and Other Legislation Amendment (2012 Budget and Other Measures) Bill 2012
- Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Stronger Super) Bill 2012 Superannuation Supervisory Levy Imposition Amendment Bill 2012
- Tax Laws Amendment (2012 Measures No. 2) Bill 2012
The committee considered the Corporations Amendment (Proxy Voting) Bill 2012 and, noting that the bill had passed the Senate on 18 June 2012, resolved to recommend that the bill not be referred to a committee.

The committee recommends accordingly.

4. The committee deferred consideration of the following bills to its next meeting:
- Financial Framework Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2012
- Greenhouse and Energy Minimum Standards Bill 2012
- Greenhouse and Energy Minimum Standards (Registration Fees) Bill 2012
- Maritime Powers Bill 2012
- Maritime Powers (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2012
- Protecting Children from Junk Food Advertising (Broadcasting and Telecommunications Amendment) Bill 2011
- Special Broadcasting Service Amendment (Natural Program Breaks and Disruptive Advertising) Bill 2012.

(Apple McEwen)
Chair
19 June 2012

Appendix 1

SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee

Name of bill: Broadcasting Services Amendment (Improved Access to Television) Bill 2012

Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
The Bill amends the Broadcasting Services Act 1992 to introduce new legislative requirements, and increases some existing requirements for the provision of captioning services by commercial, national, and subscription television broadcasters.

The inquiry to examine:
The commercial and regulatory implications on broadcasters of making compliance with these captioning obligations a condition of a commercial television broadcasting license, a subscription television broadcasting licence, and a class licence.

Implications for free-to-air commercial networks in breach of the new licence condition if they are unable to provide a captioning service for reasons beyond their control, such as failure by a third party captioning provider to provide the service for reasons beyond the broadcasters control.

Implications for the long-term viability of services provided by subscription television, primarily international pass-through channels such as BBC World News, CNN, and Aljazeera.

Possible submissions or evidence from:
Free TV
ASTRA
Australian Broadcasting Corporation Special Broadcasting Service
Human Rights and Disability Groups

Committee to which bill is to be referred:
Senate Environment and Communications Committee

Possible hearing date(s):
To be determined by committee
Possible reporting date:
To be determined by committee
(Signed)
Senator Fifield
Selection of Bill Committee member

Appendix 2
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
Clean Energy Finance Corporation Bill 2012
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
To allow consideration of the legislation
Possible submissions or evidence from:
Economics Legislation Committee
Possible hearing date(s):
Possible reporting date:
25 June 2012
(Signed)
Anne McEwen
Whip

Appendix 3
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
Crimes Legislation Amendment (Slavery, Slavery-like Conditions and People Trafficking) Bill 2012
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
Whether the Bill adequately addresses the full range of circumstances and issues that it could
Whether victims are adequately supported
Possible submissions or evidence from:
Lawyers
Legal Aid Commissions
AHRC

Appendix 4
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
FAIR WORK (REGISTERED ORGANISATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL 2012
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
To ensure the Bill would achieve the objectives of the Bill and has no unintended consequences.
Possible submissions or evidence from:
Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations;
Relevant trade union organisations;
Relevant employer organisations;
Institute of Public Affairs;
Law Council of Australia; and
Any other relevant individuals with expertise in this area.
Committee to which bill is to be referred:
Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Committee
Possible hearing date(s):
To be determined by committee
Possible reporting date:
To be determined by committee
(Signed)
Migration Agents
Social Services
Relevant government departments
Committee to which bill is to be referred:
Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Possible hearing date(s):
Late July or August
Possible reporting date:
13 Sept
(Signed)
Senator Ludlam
Selection of Bill Committee member
Senator Fifield
Selection of Bill Committee member

Appendix 5
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
Privacy Amendment (Enhancing Privacy Protection) Bill 2012
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
Consideration of the adequacy of the proposed Australian Privacy Principles; Consideration of the efficacy of the proposed measures relating to credit reporting; Consideration of whether defences to contraventions should extend to inadvertent disclosures where systems incorporate appropriate protections; Consideration of whether provisions relating to use of depersonalised data are appropriate.
Possible submissions or evidence from:
Australian Retail Credit Association
Australian Consumers Association
Attorney-General's Department
Committee to which bill is to be referred:
Legal and Constitutional Affairs
Possible hearing date(s):
To be determined by committee
Possible reporting date:
22/8/12
(signed)
Senator Ludlam
Selection of Bill Committee member

Appendix 6
SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
Social Security Legislation Amendment (Fair Incentives to Work) Bill 2012
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
Consideration of lack of programme support within Employment Services for parents transitioning from Parenting Payment to Newstart Allowance, and the impact on families.
Possible submissions or evidence from:
Single parents lobby Job Services agencies
Committee to which bill is to be referred:
Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
Possible hearing date(s):
To be determined by committee
Possible reporting date:
To be determined by committee
(signed)
Senator Fifield
Selection of Bill Committee member
Appendix 8

SELECTION OF BILLS COMMITTEE
Proposal to refer a bill to a committee
Name of bill:
Tax Laws Amendment (Cross-Border Transfer Pricing) (No. 1)
Reasons for referral/principal issues for consideration:
- Retrospective tax change
- Rationale for retrospectivity
- Quantum of revenue at risk
- Consultation with treaty partners
- Consultation with affected taxpayers
Possible submissions or evidence from:
- Taxpayers (possibly impacted taxpayers: GE, Chevron, Power Corp, BHP Billiton, Rio Tinto, Ford, Holden)
- Treasury

Committee to which bill is to be referred:
- Senate Economics
Possible hearing date(s):
- To be determined by committee
Possible reporting date:
- To be determined by committee
(signed)
Senator Fifield
Selection of Bill Committee member

PARTY OFFICE HOLDERS
Australian Greens
Senator MILNE (Tasmania—Leader of the Australian Greens) (15:31): by leave—
On behalf of the Australian Greens, I wish to inform the chamber that in the absence of
Senator Siewert, Senator Ludlám will act as the Australian Greens Whip.

COMMITTEES

National Capital and External Territories Committee
Meeting
Senator McEWEN (South Australia—
Government Whip in the Senate) (15:32): by leave—At the request of the Joint Standing
Committee on the National Capital and External Territories, I move:
That the Joint Standing Committee on the National Capital and External Territories be
authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 20 June
2012, from 12.30 pm to 1.45 pm, to take evidence for the committee’s inquiry into the National
Capital Authority annual report 2010-11.
Question agreed to.

NOTICES
Postponement
The following items of business were postponed:
- Business of the Senate notice of motion No. 1 standing in the name of Senator Boswell for
today, proposing a reference to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Committee, postponed till 20 June 2012.
- Business of the Senate notice of motion No. 2 standing in the name of Senator Boswell for
today, proposing a reference to the Rural and Regional Affairs and Transport References
Committee, postponed till 20 June 2012.

COMMITTEES

Cyber-Safety Committee
Meeting
Senator McEWEN (South Australia—
Government Whip in the Senate) (15:33): At the request of Senator Bilyk, Chair of the
Joint Selection Committee on Cyber-Safety, I move:
That the Joint Select Committee on Cyber Safety be authorised to hold a public meeting
during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 27 June 2012, from 4.15 pm to 5.30 pm.
Question agreed to.

**Community Affairs References Committee**

**Reporting Date**

**Senator McEWEN** (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:33): At the request of Senator Moore, Deputy Chair of the Community Affairs References Committee, I move:

That the time for the presentation of the report of the Community Affairs References Committee on health services and medical professionals in rural areas be extended to 15 August 2012.

Question agreed to.

**Migration Committee**

**Meeting**

**Senator McEWEN** (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:33): At the request of Senator Singh, I move:

That the Joint Standing Committee on Migration be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Wednesday, 27 June 2012, from 10.30 am to 12.30 pm.

Question agreed to.

**Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee**

**Meeting**

**Senator McEWEN** (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:33): At the request of Senator Crossin, Chair of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, I move:

That the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee be authorised to hold a private meeting otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1) during the sitting of the Senate on Thursday, 21 June 2012, from 3.45 pm.

Question agreed to.

**Treaties Committee**

**Meeting**

**Senator KROGER** (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:34): At the request of Senator Birmingham, Deputy Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, I move:

That the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties be authorised to hold a private meeting otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1) during the sitting of the Senate on Tuesday, 19 June 2012, from 8.15 pm to 9.30 pm.

Question agreed to.

**Meeting**

**Senator KROGER** (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:34): At the request of Senator Birmingham, Deputy Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties, I move:

That the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties be authorised to hold a public meeting during the sitting of the Senate on Monday, 25 June 2012, from 10 am to noon.

Question agreed to.

**Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity Committee**

**Meeting**

**Senator KROGER** (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:34): At the request of Senator Cash, Deputy Chair of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity, I move:

That the Parliamentary Joint Committee on the Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity be authorised to hold a private meeting otherwise than in accordance with standing order 33(1) during the sitting of the Senate on Thursday, 21 June 2012, from 11 am.

Question agreed to.
COMMITTEES
Legal and Constitutional Affairs
References Committee

Reporting Date
Senator WRIGHT (South Australia) (15:34): I move:

That the time for the presentation of the report of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs References Committee on the detention of minors be extended to 19 September 2012.

Question agreed to.

DOCUMENTS

Murray-Darling Basin Draft Plan
Order for the Production of Documents
Senator HANSON-YOUNG (South Australia) (15:34): I move:

That there be laid on the table no later than 28 June 2012 by the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, the following:

(a) any draft or final legal advice regarding the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan obtained by the department;

(b) any legal advice regarding the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan obtained by another party and provided to the department;

(c) any draft or final legal advice that comments on whether the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan is consistent with the Water Act 2007;

(d) any draft or final legal advice that comments on the constitutionality of the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan; and

(e) any draft or final legal advice that comments on the prospects of a legal challenge of the Murray Darling Basin Draft Plan by an Australian state or territory.

Question agreed to.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Global Economy

DOCUMENTS

Tabling

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (15:35): On behalf of the President, I present a report on access to unpublished documents of the Senate Select Committee on Civil Rights of Migrant Australians, 1973-74. For the information of honourable senators, pursuant to standing order 37(3), I advise the Senate that on 18 June 2012 the President has authorised the National Archives of Australia to provide open access to certain records of the Senate Select Committee on Civil Rights of Migrant Australians, held at the National Archives of Australia. The committee undertook its work in 1973 and 1974 but due to a double dissolution election being held in May 1974 and the committee not being reappointed a final report was not presented to the Senate. Standing order 37(3)(a) enables the President to authorise persons to access and copy unpublished committee records which have been in the custody of the Senate for at least 10 years. The authorisation to open certain records of the committee to public access responds to a request from researcher Ms Kristina Kukolja. Ms Kukolja is preparing a radio feature for SBS radio which will examine the migration and settlement experiences, with a particular focus on Europeans and post-World War II Australia.

AUDITOR-GENERAL’S REPORTS

Report Nos 43 and 44 of 2011-12

The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (15:37): In accordance with the provisions of the Auditor-General Act 1997, I present the following reports of the Auditor-General:
Senator KOGER (Victoria—Chief Opposition Whip in the Senate) (15:37): by leave—I move:

That the Senate take note of report No. 44.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMMITTEES

Intelligence and Security Committee

Report

Senator FAULKNER (New South Wales) (15:38): On behalf of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security, I present the report of the committee, Review of administration and expenditure: No. 9: Australian intelligence agencies. I seek leave to move a motion in relation to the report.

Leave granted.

Senator FAULKNER: I move:

That the Senate take note of the report.

The oversight of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security of the Australian Intelligence Community is a very important responsibility of the committee, as senators would be aware, so I am very pleased to present this ninth review of the administration and expenditure of the AIC by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security.

The review examined a wide range of aspects of the administration and expenditure of the six intelligence and security agencies, including the financial statements for each agency and their human resource management, training, recruitment and accommodation. In addition, the review looked at issues of interoperability between members of the AIC.

Submissions were sought from each of the six intelligence and security agencies, from the Australian National Audit Office and from the Inspector General of Intelligence and Security. The submissions from ANAO and the six intelligence agencies were all classified confidential, restricted or secret and therefore have not made available to the public. As has been its practice for previous reviews, ASIO provided the committee with both a classified and an unclassified submission. The unclassified version is available on the committee's website.

Each of the Defence intelligence agencies provided the committee with a classified submission. The agencies marked each paragraph with its relevant national security classification. This has enabled the committee, for its 2009-10 review, to directly refer in this report to unclassified information provided in the Defence agencies submissions. The Committee also received five submissions from members of the public or public organisations, including the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre, the Brigidine Asylum Seekers Project, RISE and the Refugee Council of Australia. These submissions all dealt with ASIO’s security assessments of refugees.

On 25 March last year, the committee held a private hearing at which ASIO, ASIS, DSD, DIGO, ONA and DIO all appeared before the committee. On 16 June 2011, the committee held a public hearing—the first, in fact, since 2006—and heard from representatives of the Refugee Council of Australia, Refugees, Survivors and Ex-Detainees, the Asylum Seeker Resource Centre and ASIO in relation to visa security assessments. The committee thanks all
attendees, particularly those from organisations providing support to refugees, for the time and effort they took to put their views to our committee.

Given the public interest and importance of the issue of visa security assessments in the report I have tabled, I should say the committee certainly notes the request by some advocacy groups for ASIO to declare its non-statutory criteria for making visa security assessments. The committee believes that making non-statutory criteria publicly available could compromise national security because applications from potentially hostile individuals could be tailored to meet those criteria. Therefore, the committee has not supported that suggestion.

The committee notes that since its previous administration and expenditure inquiry ASIO's visa security assessment workload has increased significantly. Procedures and processes for undertaking visa security assessments have been placed under considerable strain and, I must say, in some cases assessments have taken longer than is desirable.

The committee takes very seriously the concerns put before it by various refugee and asylum-seeker advocacy groups, but it also recognises the difficulties that ASIO has in fulfilling its responsibilities in this area. Therefore, the committee welcomes the efforts, introduced by ASIO on 1 March 2011, to streamline the process of security assessments in an attempt to clear the backlog and to process future assessments in less time. The committee is satisfied that the current regime for visa security assessments is the correct one. The committee notes that the Inspector-General of Intelligence and Security has stated that ASIO is doing its job in a 'proper and legal manner'.

Overall, the committee is satisfied that the administration and expenditure of the six intelligence and security agencies is sound. However, I would note that concerns raised in relation to the efficiency dividend's impact on agencies during the committee's Review of administration and expenditure: Australian intelligence organisations, No. 8 were specifically raised in the evidence the committee took for the current review. This is extremely concerning to the committee. The committee will continue to monitor the impact of the efficiency dividend on the Australian intelligence community. The committee was pleased with the level of information given to it in relation to interoperability and it will continue to monitor this area to ensure that interoperability management and budgetary structures are in place across the Australian intelligence community. As always, the committee thanks the heads of the AIC agencies and all those who contributed to this review. I commend the report to the Senate.

Senator RHIANNON (New South Wales) (15:47): I listened with interest to Senator Faulkner's comments on this, because the impact of nearly a decade of counter-terrorism measures clearly is very relevant to Australia as it has had a considerable impact on the lives and liberties of Australians. The review of administration and expenditure undertaken by the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security is very relevant to any consideration.

It is also relevant to note that the budget, on page 32, covers various deliverables under the heading, 'Implementation of relevant recommendations of the 2011 Independent Review of the Intelligence Community'. However, the report from the independent review of intelligence matters was heavily redacted and no recommendations were made public. This is one of the problems that we have in getting a
full handle on the issues raised with respect to the report that has just been tabled, as it is still not fully clear to the public how all these agencies work together. With regard to the report from the independent review, for instance, it has sat on the Prime Minister's desk for six months. You would have to say it really is lacking in substance, as no recommendations were made public. Therefore when we come to this review of administration and expenditure, the obvious questions are: how do all these reviews fit together? How do they build on each other? Are they just going through the motions of apparently reporting, or is there a real attempt to make an assessment that can provide meaningful information to make an assessment of how we ensure our security is what Australia needs in 2012 and the years ahead? How do we learn the lessons of the last decade?

The threat status in Australia, from the information that is available, has remained about the same since the September 2001 attacks. Australians therefore have the right to know why there has been such a massive increase in funds for intelligence agencies and what these multimillion-dollar budgets are being spent on. But the reports coming out in this area certainly do not clarify that matter and that all-important question remains unanswered. The current report also fails on that score. The independent review of the intelligence community also failed to do this. Time and time again we see a failure to fulfil the objectives under which people expect these inquiries to operate.

It is also worth noting the comments of Mr Philip Flood, who headed the 2004 Flood inquiry. He said:

... Australians are entitled to expect that intelligence collection agencies are properly scrutinised and held to account.

That is where, when you look at these various reports, you would have to conclude that we continue to fail. The heads of agencies operate with minimal accountability, and there is the worrying possibility that they and their staff may at times operate outside the law. We have seen in various specific examples and, because these reviews are so scanty, it is very hard to make that assessment. It is also relevant to note one of the studies by Civil Liberties Australia. They estimate that about 25 per cent of ASIO data collected on Civil Liberties Australia members, and released under the 30-year rule, was in error. That helps give some indication of the problems that you would have to anticipate in reading these reports.

It is also worth noting some of the information the Australian Human Rights Commission have provided. They have previously raised their concerns about the conduct of ASIO security assessments for people in immigration detention who arrived in Australia without authorisation. So I do note the comments of the previous speaker, Senator Faulkner, where he talked about the increased load that some departments now have because of increasing numbers of people coming to Australia. However, there also continue to be problems about how many of those agencies carry out their work. I note that the Australian Human Rights Commission has found that there are significant delays in finalising ASIO security assessments for a large number of people in immigration detention. The level of resources allocated for the conduct of security assessments is something that has been questioned, and the working relationship between ASIO and the Department of Immigration and Citizenship is something that has also been raised as a concern.

While the Greens welcome the release of this report, as with other reports it shows up many questions about how these agencies are
working and to what degree intelligence and security are being managed in this country in a way that ensures that Australians are indeed secure, but secure in a way that protects human rights. We can most definitely get the balance right if attention is paid to that in a constructive way between these agencies and government.

Question agreed to.

Migration Committee
Report


Senator KROGER: by leave—I move: That the Senate take note of the report.

I seek leave to have a statement incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The statement read as follows—

It gives me pleasure today on behalf of the Joint Standing Committee on Migration to present the Committee’s advisory report on the Migration (Visa Evidence) Charge Bill 2012 and the Migration Visa Evidence Charge (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2012.

These bills, were referred to the Migration Committee by the House of Representatives Selection Committee on the 10th of May.

The bills will introduce a charge for the issuing of hardcopy evidence that a visa is held by a non-citizen visa holder.

Evidence in hardcopy form that such a person holds a visa is usually provided as a visa label or as an imprint placed in the visa holder’s passport. Currently Australia does not charge a fee for issuing these visa labels and the Department of Immigration and Citizenship provided over one million labels or imprints during 2011.

Despite the issue of these labels, the government actually relies on an electronic visa entitlement verification system, called VEVO, to validate a person’s visa status and entitlements online. VEVO is also accessible to registered organisations which may need to verify a person’s visa status as well as to visa holders themselves.

According to the department, two-thirds of its current visa caseload is processed electronically. Yet, 90 per cent of clients at migration counters still request hard copy evidence of their visa even though it is not necessary.

Currently, visa holders are entitled under the Migration Act to hard copy evidence of their visa status. These bills will amend the Migration Act to introduce a charge for the issue of hard copy evidence—on the basis that the electronic visa evidence accessible through VEVO makes the need for hard copy evidence redundant.

The charge is to discourage people requesting the hard copy evidence. The maximum charge limit will be $250, although the department has indicated that the actual amount charged will be much less. There will be different scales of charges, exemptions to the charges and nil fees for certain visa classes. The department estimates that the charge will recover some $90 million over the three years following implementation.

The Selection Committee and members of the Migration Committee questioned the scale of the charges, the projected revenue to be raised and whether the electronic VEVO system really does replace the need for hard copy evidence of visas.

The committee conducted its inquiry by issuing questions on notice to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship. The list of questions asked is contained in the appendix to the committee’s report.

The committee was satisfied overall with the department’s responses. The committee accepts that the main justification for introducing the fees is to encourage visa holders and registered organisations to accept electronic verification alone. This is part of a global transition towards visa label free travel and electronic confirmation of visas.

The committee has recommended that the legislation be passed. However, the committee
does believe that the associated explanatory memoranda should be more comprehensive. Accordingly, we have recommended that the explanatory memoranda be expanded and re-tabled.

The Chair, the Member for Calwell in the other place, thanks all on the committee for their work on this inquiry. I commend the report to the Senate.

Question agreed to.

DELEGATION REPORTS
Parliamentary Delegation to Vietnam, Thailand and Singapore
Senator McEWEN (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:54): by leave—I present the report of the Australian parliamentary delegation to Vietnam, Thailand and Singapore, which took place from 6 to 16 November 2011.

DOCUMENTS
Tabling
The Clerk: Documents are tabled pursuant to statute. Details will be recorded in the Journals of the Senate and on the Dynamic Red.

Details of the documents also appear at the end of today’s Hansard.

COMMITTEES
Membership
The DEPUTY PRESIDENT (15:54): Order! The President has received letters from a party leader requesting changes in the membership of various committees.

Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (15:55): by leave—I move:

That senators be discharged from and appointed to committees as follows:

The list read as follows—

Economics Legislation Committee—

Appointed—

Substitute member: Senator Milne to replace Senator Xenophon for the committee’s inquiry into the Clean Energy Finance Corporation Bill 2012

Participating member: Senator Xenophon

Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee—

Appointed—

Substitute member: Senator Hanson-Young to replace Senator Wright for the committee’s inquiry into the provisions of the Crimes Legislation Amendment (Slavery, Slavery-like Conditions and People Trafficking) Bill 2012

Participating member: Senator Wright

Procedure—Standing Committee—

Discharged—Senator Siewert

Appointed—Senator Ludlam.

Question agreed to.

BILLS
Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Amendment Bill 2012
First Reading
Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (15:55): I move:

That this bill may proceed without formalities and be now read a first time.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Second Reading
Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (15:56): I move:
That this bill be now read a second time.
I seek leave to have the second reading speech incorporated in Hansard.
Leave granted.

The speech read as follows—

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE AMENDMENT BILL 2012

This bill amends the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act 1999.

Gender inequality is a significant disincentive to women's workforce participation.

Improving women's workforce participation is central to improving productivity and addressing current and future skills shortages.

This package of reforms delivers on the government's 2010 election commitment to retain and improve the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency and the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act.

It is a significant reform to support and help drive improved gender equality outcomes in Australian workplaces.

It is an important component of the government's workforce participation and human rights agenda.

We said we would reform the act to support gender equality and improve workforce participation and workplace flexibility—and that is what we are doing.

This bill will improve gender equality outcomes as well as simplifying reporting for businesses.

It will assist in striking the right balance between the need to drive and encourage change within business, without increasing the regulatory burden.

This legislation follows a review of the act by the Office of Women in the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs.

The review found that since the act was last amended in 1999, there had been a number of economic, social and legislative changes, making it important for the act and the agency to provide a contemporary response to national challenges.

The review made it clear that gender equality is essential to maximising Australia's productive potential and to ensuring continued economic growth.

It has been estimated that closing the gap between men's and women's workforce participation could boost gross domestic product by 13 per cent.

The bill changes the name of the act to the Workplace Gender Equality Act 2012 to emphasise the focus of the act on gender equality in the workplace.

The name of the Agency is changed from the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency to the Workplace Gender Equality Agency.

The title of the director of the agency is also changed to the Director of Workplace Gender Equality.

The principal objects of the act are amended by the bill to reflect the focus on gender equality in the workplace. They are:

- to promote and improve gender equality (including equal remuneration between women and men) in employment and in the workplace;
- to support employers to remove barriers to the full and equal participation of women in the workforce, in recognition of the disadvantaged position of women in relation to employment matters;
- to promote, among employers, the elimination of discrimination on the basis of gender in relation to employment matters (including in relation to family and caring responsibilities);
- to foster workplace consultation between employers and employees on issues concerning gender equality in employment and in the workplace; and
- to improve the productivity and competitiveness of Australian business through the advancement of gender equality in employment and in the workplace.

The coverage of the act is expanded to include men, as well as women, particularly in relation to caring responsibilities.
The new legislation will mean that for the reporting period commencing 1 April 2013, a relevant employer must prepare and lodge a public report containing information relating to gender equality indicators.

Smaller organisations with fewer than 100 employees will not be required to report, but they will be able to access the agency's advice, education and incentive activities.

The proposed outcomes-based reporting will streamline and simplify reporting.

This will deliver certainty to organisations in what they are required to report on and provide an invaluable means of measuring progress over time.

Organisations will be able to measure their performance against other similar organisations.

This change will represent the first time the agency will be able to gather and analyse a rigorous and standardised data set.

We will know exactly what is happening, and where, in Australian workplaces regarding gender equality practices and outcomes.

Businesses will now be able to complete and submit reports online using a secure web-portal. Businesses have wanted this change and it will save them time and money.

The gender equality indicators are set out in the act and include reporting on equal remuneration for men and women.

Equal remuneration is explicitly referred to in the objects of the act. Organisations will be required to report on pay data. Salary data will be removed from the public reports.

More standardised data will provide insight as to where gender pay gaps are emerging or growing at the industry or sector level.

With the gender pay gap in Australia sitting at just under 18 per cent, this focus on equal remuneration is particularly important.

Over time, the legislation will enable the agency to develop benchmarks. This will allow employers to consider their performance compared to others in their industries.

The legislation will also enable the minister to set industry specific minimum standards, in consultation with industry and experts. These minimum standards will have to be determined before 1 April 2014.

Minimum standards will be used for the identification of those organisations that are struggling and the targeting of advice and assistance.

The new bill will also allow for more transparency in reporting.

It will be a requirement that public reports be signed by the chief executive officer of the relevant employer. This will help to ensure that management at the highest level engages in the issue of gender equality.

A relevant employer must inform employees and shareholders that the report has been lodged and employees and employee organisations will then be provided with the opportunity to comment on the report.

The bill also improves the transparency and fairness of the compliance framework and consequences for non-compliance.

Checks on the compliance of a relevant employer may be undertaken and may, by written notice, require a relevant employer to provide information that is relevant to the employer's compliance with the act.

Consequences for non-compliance, without reasonable excuse, include naming the employer in a report to the minister or naming the employer by other means.

There are also possible consequences in relation to Commonwealth procurement, grants and financial assistance.

This new legislation puts gender equality in the workplace firmly under the spotlight.

This is an important reform aimed at the genuine and sustained removal of barriers to women's full and equal participation in the workforce.

The government is determined to improve women's economic security—and this begins with fair and equitable treatment in the workplace.

This is a sophisticated and meaningful package of reforms—a significant step forward in enabling employers and government to measure and drive
better outcomes for women and men in Australian workplaces.

Debate adjourned.

**Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Stronger Super) Bill 2012**

**Superannuation Supervisory Levy Imposition Amendment Bill 2012**

First Reading

Bills received from the House of Representatives.

Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (15:56): I move:

That these bills may proceed without formalities, may be taken together and be now read a first time.

Question agreed to.

Bills read a first time.

Second Reading

Senator JACINTA COLLINS (Victoria—Manager of Government Business in the Senate and Parliamentary Secretary for School Education and Workplace Relations) (15:57): I move:

That these bills be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading speeches incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The speeches read as follows—

SUPERANNUATION LEGISLATION AMENDMENT (STRONGER SUPER) BILL 2012

This bill introduces a framework to support the implementation of superannuation data and payment standards that will apply to specified superannuation transactions undertaken by superannuation entities and employers.

These amendments are part of the SuperStream package of measures designed to enhance the ‘back office’ of superannuation. The Superannuation industry is currently dominated by paper based transactions that are inefficient in both processing costs and the time taken for transactions to occur and superannuation to be deposited into member accounts.

Both members and employers will benefit from the changes. For example, fund members will benefit from being able to easily manage their superannuation accounts, have low value inactive accounts consolidated automatically, and easily check if their superannuation contributions have been paid.

Employers will benefit from having standardised simplified administrative processes when dealing with superannuation funds. Conversely, superannuation funds will benefit from standardised simplified administrative processes when dealing with employers and other funds.

It is estimated that the SuperStream proposals could save the industry up to $1 billion per year. Much of the benefit of these savings should flow through to members in the form of lower fees and charges.

The standards will be mandated for superannuation entities (including Approved Deposit Funds), Retirement Savings Account providers and for employers.

A new penalty framework is also introduced to ensure trustees of superannuation entities, RSA providers and employers comply with the standards.

This bill also enables the Commonwealth to collect the costs associated with the implementation of the SuperStream measures and enables the minister to make a determination that specifies the proportion of levy money paid to Australian Prudential Regulation Authority (APRA) that is to be credited to the APRA Special Account.

The cost of implementing the SuperStream reforms is $467 million in total over seven years to be paid for by a temporary SuperStream levy on APRA-regulated funds. If you averaged the full levy increase of $121 million to apply in 2012-13 across the approximate 33 million
accounts existing today, the cost is roughly in the order of $4 per account.

Estimates undertaken by the superannuation industry have identified that SuperStream will save in the order of $1 billion each year in processing costs. Averaged over the approximate 33 million accounts existing today, this saving is in the order of $30 per account each year.

This is a significant saving for each and every member of a superannuation fund.

The coalition has acknowledged that the SuperStream measures have the potential to deliver real savings that will benefit superannuants and they support changes that make the superannuation system more efficient, transparent and competitive.

Full details of the measures in this bill are contained in the explanatory memorandum.

SUPERANNUATION SUPERVISORY LEVY IMPOSITION AMENDMENT BILL 2012

This bill provides the Treasurer with the ability to make a subsequent determination of the amount of the Superannuation Supervisory levy to be paid, for a financial year.

The Superannuation Supervisory levy will pay for implementation costs to improve the administration and management of super accounts making the processing of everyday transactions easier, cheaper and faster for both members and employers.

It is part of the 'SuperStream' package of measures designed to enhance the 'back office' processing of superannuation.

Key measures include the introduction of data and payment standards and consolidation of accounts.

Estimates undertaken by the superannuation industry have identified that SuperStream will save in the order of $1 billion each year in processing costs. Averaged over the approximate 33 million accounts existing today, this saving is in the order of $30 per account each year.

The cost of implementing the SuperStream reforms is $467 million in total over seven years to be paid for by a temporary SuperStream levy on APRA-regulated funds. If you averaged the full levy increase of $121 million to apply in 2012-13 across the approximate 33 million accounts existing today, the cost is roughly in the order of $4 per account.

This bill will provide the Treasurer increased flexibility in determining the maximum restricted and unrestricted levy amounts, the restricted and unrestricted levy percentages and the superannuation entity levy base to be used in finalising the levy amount.

Full details of the measure in this bill are contained in the explanatory memorandum.

Debate adjourned.

Migration Legislation Amendment (Student Visas) Bill 2012

Report of Legislation Committee

Senator McEWEN (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:58): On behalf of the Chair of the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee, Senator Crossin, I present the report of the committee on the provisions of the Migration Legislation Amendment (Student Visas) Bill 2012, together with the 

Hansard record of proceedings and documents presented to the committee.

Ordered that the report be printed.

Passenger Movement Charge Amendment Bill 2012

Report of Legislation Committee

Senator McEWEN (South Australia—Government Whip in the Senate) (15:58): I also present a report from the Legal and Constitutional Affairs Legislation Committee on time-critical legislation relating to the Passenger Movement Charge Amendment Bill 2012.

Ordered that the report be printed.
Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011
Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011
Second Reading
Debate resumed on the motion:
That these bills be now read a second time.

Senator DI NATALE (Victoria) (15:59):
I am pleased to be able to rise today to continue my remarks on the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. It is legislation that advances Australia down the road towards a much more modern, efficient and better connected health system.

We know in this day and age, with the use of technology, that most Australians are familiar with communication technology. Kids and grandparents are all thoroughly familiar with the world of instant connectivity. My young 3½-year-old knows his way around an iPhone. Not my grandmother, but many grandmothers are now using the internet as part of their daily lives. It has become a part of the world we live in.

I think that people would be shocked at how technologically naive and how technologically primitive our health system is when we compare the role that technologies play in our daily lives. It would be natural to assume when you move between a GP, a specialist, your hospital, allied health professionals and so on that the health information collected in each of those places follows you around electronically. But I have to say that nothing could be further from the truth. If the information does follow you, it often goes in the post. It might sit on a fax machine somewhere or it might gather dust in medical archives. If you do get your hands on it, it is often incomplete and occasionally it is completely illegible.

In a former life, I have spent time as a medical professional and spent countless hours with some of my colleagues and other professionals trying to decipher notes from other medical colleagues. I do not have the best handwriting in the world, but some of my colleagues’ handwriting more closely resembles Egyptian hieroglyphics than it does English. I have spent time contacting medical record departments and other doctors simply because I could not get access to up-to-date information, or the information was completely indecipherable. So it is important that we make change in this area.

There is also the situation where someone might present with a history of acute pain. I have been in that situation, where people present with acute pain and request analgesia, often opiate analgesia. One of the problems is that you cannot be sure whether the history is genuine or whether it is in fact somebody who is seeking opiates because they have a problem with dependence. It is a phenomenon known as ‘doctor shopping’. For decades we have been talking about resolving this issue and getting up-to-date PBS information so that healthcare professionals can make these sorts of decisions with confidence. The electronic health record has the potential to realise that huge area where we can make those clinical decisions with confidence.

In short, the system we have in this country of health technology communication results in two enormous problems. It results in major inefficiencies within the health system, which of course impose an enormous cost. More importantly, it results in serious medical errors, some of which are life threatening and occasionally fatal. Every single day, because of inadequate
information, people will get medication that they are allergic to and they will get drugs that interact negatively with other drugs that they are taking, causing major side effects. Tests will sometimes be ordered that are completely unnecessary because they have been done recently. With the full information at hand, the test would not have been ordered in the first place. Sometimes you will see a patient who has just had treatment from another healthcare professional or from hospital, and that information will make a huge difference in terms of the clinical decisions you make as a healthcare professional.

The savings estimated to be realised from the e-health implementation amount to about $11½ billion by 2025. That, I think, is a fairly conservative estimate. I have seen some people suggest that the figure may in fact be much, much higher, when you consider the duplication that occurs in medication, pathology and so on and savings in terms of primary care visits and a range of other potential benefits. As I said, cost is not the main reason that we need to take action in this area. The health system as it stands, because of the inadequate communication, results in damage to the health and wellbeing of Australian patients every day. Nearly 200,000 people are admitted to hospital every year because of medication errors. Many of those are avoidable and would have been avoided if we had access to up-to-date information. Lives are lost on a daily basis because of these sorts of errors, and it has to change. If you are wheeled into an emergency department, you want to know that the doctors treating you have access to all of the available information that will result in the best course of care for you. These issues are often a matter of life and death.

Times have changed. We have the technical know-how to fix this problem. We should see it in the same way as we see other health technologies. We accept that we would not deny cost-effective, life-saving medical technology in any other area of health care and we should not deny it in communication technologies either.

This legislation puts in place a crucial framework for e-health reform. In principle, the move towards e-health and the creation of the personally controlled electronic health record is not controversial. In fact, we heard recently that the coalition support the bill. I look forward to hearing from them about their comprehensive plan for e-health. It is very, very easy in this place to criticise; it is easy and it is cheap. What is more difficult is to be constructive and to provide solutions. So I am looking forward to hearing about the opposition's comprehensive plan for e-health.

The benefits that flow from the better use of communications technology in health care are obvious. As I said, they are potentially life saving. Everybody agrees that we need to make progress. While the government, doctors, consumer groups and even the opposition are in agreement on the principle of e-health, as with most reforms, the devil will be in the detail. The personally controlled electronic health record is the centrepiece of Australia's e-health agenda. Conceptually it is the central point of health information for every Australian. It brings together health information such as the medications that people take, the visits they have had to healthcare professionals—GPs and other allied health professionals—what was done at those visits, hospital information and important discharge information. All of this will be brought into the one place so that health professionals can monitor and update it. Once the system is operating, people will have confidence in it, knowing that their doctor, surgeon, allied health professional and so on are all coordinating their care and that they have the most up-to-date, most
relevant information available. They will know what tests have been done recently, what pills people are taking and whether people have filled their scripts, and that is important because often a doctor issues a script but does not know whether in fact the script has been filled. That may be because you cannot afford it or because you are having a side effect and have been reluctant to tell your GP. All of those things are potential advantages through e-health. We will be able to see X-rays and other scans that have been done and monitor them against each other over time. That is important because small changes can mark important pathologies. It is going to be a comprehensive change.

Most importantly, it is a personally controlled record. It is not mandatory; individuals have the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they wish to take part. I am very confident that, over time, as the benefits become clear, more and more people will take up an electronic record and we will have a better health system as a result. People will have control over who can see their record. We know that personal details are private and must remain so, and I am confident that the provisions are in place to ensure that that happens.

It is a transformative technology as well. It has the potential to empower individuals in a way that often modern medicine does not. One of the criticisms of modern medicine is that it is a disempowering process. You hand over almost total control, in some instances, to the healthcare professional who is monitoring and treating your condition, but in this case individuals have the information at hand. They can access that information as they need to and they can become more informed, and they have an opportunity to have an interaction with their healthcare professional, which does not exist at the moment.

The details of access are controlled, such as that the defaults are left to the system operator to determine, and that is important, because I assume that most people will use the default access controls. I am pleased that the government has acknowledged just how important this is, that consultation will be a critical part of this process and that they will suggest amendments to this effect. If all goes well, millions of Australians will be entrusting the system with their most personal details. It could not be more crucial that consumers have faith that their privacy will be respected.

We hope that individuals will make an informed choice and get together with their nominated provider, which in most cases will be a GP, but not always, and that they will go through the steps to create and populate their health record in a shared health summary. They will be told how to control the information and who can see it. Of course, the more information you share the better the clinical decisions are likely to be, but it is always balanced against the patient's right to privacy, so we have to give clear advice to people that they must decide the most appropriate way to implement these sorts of decisions.

Shortly, Australians will be able to sign up for the patient-controlled electronic health record directly online, through Medicare, their GP or their nominated provider. They will prepare a shared health summary so that other clinicians can see at a glance the information they need to know about an individual's health. It is important to know that individuals will have control over what goes on the record and that they will be able to decide who gets to see it. You will be able to access the record online and make your own notes. At all times, control of the electronic health record is in the hands of the individual. If you do not want to participate, the choice remains yours.
Of course, there are some issues. I know that it is going to be some time before the health information systems used within doctors' surgeries are integrated with the PCEHR. Following that, hopefully we will see hospitals, radiologists, pathologists, pharmacists and so on included so that we get a much more integrated system. I for one would have liked to have seen this happen a little earlier. Obviously, since 1 July is the deadline, it would have been nice if the whole shebang were ready to go. It is not. It will be, as we have heard, a 'soft launch'. In fact, it is becoming softer by the day, but that is not of great concern to us. Ultimately a system that starts small and improves with frequent iterations is probably more likely to be successful.

I do not know of too many IT projects that go smoothly. I think that IT projects are a bit like construction projects. There are often unforeseen hiccups, so I think it will be most likely that we will need to iron out some bugs through this process. While the profession, the industry and other stakeholders continue work on these, I think it gives an opportunity for consumers to become accustomed to the idea of the electronic health record.

We do have some concerns with this legislation. As I said, the privacy controls are not fully specified by the bill but are to be developed by the system operator. We wanted to ensure that consultation around the default access controls would be conducted, and we are pleased that this will now happen. The record will also serve as an enormous repository of medical data, so, if there were a way the data could be used for research purposes that protects privacy and anonymity but also provides the opportunity to improve our health system and get valuable information, then I think we should go for it. I am really pleased that this is happening at a time when the Association of Australian Medical Research Institutes is currently looking very keenly at the McKeon review. One of the purposes of that review is to look at how we can improve integration between medical research and the health system.

The key roles of medical research as outlined by the Association of Australian Medical Research Institutes is to reduce the burden of disease by improving our understanding of the drivers of health—risky behaviours and so on—to improve the quality of health services, to improve the efficiency of health service delivery and so on. Medical research in this country plays a huge role—in fact, we are world leaders in that area—and the patient-controlled electronic health record has an opportunity to allow that to continue to grow and develop. We have heard some other concerns about the electronic health record. Some in the industry have been critical of the NEHTA, the National E-Health Transition Authority. We have heard criticisms of its governance structure and criticism of its approach to consultation. We have heard from industry stakeholders who feel that the development of technical specifications was poorly handled. We are aware of that. We have also heard that there were concerns around the governance of the PCEHR. We agree that there is the potential for a conflict of interest when the functions of the system operator are invested in the secretary of the department. It is an issue of accountability and we are sympathetic to suggestions that the system operator should exist independently. We are pleased that there will be a review after two years. As we have said, the devil is in the detail, so we will be watching very closely over the next two years.

I am also aware of some of the reservations that my former profession has around the issue of the liability of doctors who use the electronic record. Will they need
to read the entire file of every patient at each consultation? If they do not, will they be held liable if there is a problem? There are some issues to resolve, but I am confident that the government, the medical establishment and other stakeholders will be able to work together to solve this dilemma.

The PCEHR also puts in place strict controls about who can see a record. It records who had access and when. We value the fact that consumers want their privacy to be respected, but that comes at a cost. The cost in this case is complexity. A small medical practice might have a single computer—one or two workstations—which makes this level of access control problematic. That is another issue that needs to be tackled.

There are bound to be delays, probably some mistakes, complaints and poor process encountered along the way. It is a big and expensive project with a lot of moving parts. It was not until we looked at this issue more closely that we began to get an appreciation of just how difficult and complex this issue is, but we do need to get it underway. We know that it is critical.

Modern medicine has made remarkable progress in a number of areas. We have had huge advances in medical technology. Life expectancy has increased, in part because of those advances. We have remarkable things, things that were previously the stuff of science fiction. Endoscopy, nuclear medicine, advances in genetics and so on are mainstream technologies today and they help us with the diagnosis and treatment of potentially fatal diseases. But there remains a glaring hole in the health system—that is, that in a 21st century health system we have what I consider to be in some instances 19th century communications practices. This bill provides the framework for improving that situation, for righting that wrong, and it is for those reasons that the Greens commend it to the Senate.

**Senator URQUHART** (Tasmania) (16:18): I rise to speak on the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011. E-health is an integral part of the Australian government's agenda for health reform, an agenda that aims to create a continuously improving healthcare system for the 21st century, a system that is accountable, affordable and sustainable, with safety and quality at its centre.

The personally controlled e-health system is the next step in using e-health to enhance the health care system. This key infrastructure reform is of vital importance to the way in which our health professionals will provide their services in Australia in the future. It creates the capacity for a patient's shared health record to be available securely over the internet where and when it is needed at the point of care. The first release will deliver the core functionality required to establish a system that can grow over time. It will benefit both patients and providers through a secure opt-in system. A patient or their nominated representative will be able to register for an e-health record and control access to that record. Individuals can choose whether or not to have the personally controlled e-health record. If they choose to participate, they will be able to set their own access controls or allow default access settings to apply. With the individual's permission, key pieces of health information may be reviewed by participating healthcare providers across different locations and healthcare settings. This will remove the paper trail between health professionals, removing the need for pharmacists to squint when trying to make out the doctors' handwriting, as Senator Di Natale mentioned, importantly ensuring that the correct information is transferred between health providers. It will limit the need for
patients to have to retell their story if they need to see a different specialist or GP, taking some of the burden out of seeing a new doctor. It will create synergies between a community mental health nurse who has assessed a patient at their home and the psychiatric unit of the local hospital.

It is a pleasure to be speaking to these bills only a few days after the Minister for Health, Tanya Plibersek, together with my federal Labor colleagues and I, announced a $325 million assistance package for the Tasmanian health system. A key aspect of this assistance package is to build on the tremendous work of the north-western health professionals and provide resources to speed up the rollout of e-health records to patients across the whole of Tasmania. A great example of how e-health can assist in isolated communities with limited health resources is evident in Smithton in the far north-west of Tasmania. Smithton is a small community of approximately 3,500 people that is serviced by a four-doctor general practice. The same GPs provide services at the local aged-care facility, Emmerton Park, and also at the local community hospital, which is located adjacent to Emmerton Park. As it is a small community, the majority of the residents of Emmerton Park and patients presenting to the community hospital are also patients of the local general practice.

Before the NBN connected the hospital, Emmerton Park and the general practice, doctors had not been able to access their existing patient notes when visiting Emmerton Park and the hospital because of variable and slow broadband, which meant that full patient histories, including test results, had not previously been available to them. This has provided the opportunity to implement technology using the NBN which will allow GPs to access their practice notes at both Emmerton Park and the community hospital, and print prescriptions on-site if required. The solution involves implementation of iPad 2 technology at Emmerton Park and the community hospital with virtual private network software to enable a quick remote connection to the practice system via the NBN. A wireless printer on-site will enable the printing of prescriptions, which the doctor can sign while in attendance. The iPad 2 technology will be duplicated at the practice so that doctors can use the camera features for consultation with their colleagues if required.

The Cradle Coast Electronic Health Information Exchange for north-west Tasmania has been a collaborative project of the UTAS Rural Clinical School, General Practice North West, the North West Area Health Service and the Cradle Coast Authority. The information exchange support team have had a very positive response from GPs, allied health professionals and specialists. Traditionally, the Tasmanian divisions of general practice have not worked with specialists and allied health professionals on collaborative IT initiatives. The north-west division engaged with the Cradle Coast Authority and with general practitioners, specialists and allied health professionals to install, train and support the uptake of a common, secure messaging platform, achieving the right balance between technology and the personal aspect of e-health initiatives for the support officers to increase the uptake of the new system.

The platform enables patient referral letters to be sent electronically, rather than using traditional paper based processes. Electronic referrals jumped from under 400 a month to 2½ thousand a month in just 12 months because of the hard work of the support officers, and the time they spent, with individual practitioners and their practices in adapting IT solutions to existing business processes. A specialist practice has reported time savings from eliminating
printing, folding and putting letters into envelopes and a reduction of its monthly postal costs by $300. E-health teams are encouraged to focus on the personal side of IT and go over and above installing software and providing instructions. It does take time and effort, but the initiative has been embraced by healthcare providers, and the pilot will be used across the nation as this bill is enacted and the national e-health rollout continues.

During a recent spell of hospitalisation, I had a facial X-ray scan at a medical imaging facility. I was very surprised that there was no requirement for me to wait around for the slides to be processed and printed—no careful carrying of those slides between the imaging facility and the specialist. The e-health link between the medical imaging facility and the specialist's surgery was so comprehensive that, by the time I arrived for the appointment the next day, the specialist had already had time to study the images. He conveyed to me his enthusiasm for the arrival of the NBN and how this would enable more comprehensive e-health records. It will make it easier for him to communicate with other specialists in the community sector, in private practice and in hospitals.

The assistance package announced by Minister Plibersek last week in Tasmania will see an additional $36.8 million over four years used to roll out personally controlled e-health records in Tasmania's hospitals and enable allied health, pathology and diagnostic imaging services to connect to e-health. In consultations with Minister Plibersek, front-line health professionals—surgeons, psychiatrists, paediatricians, social workers and emergency department nurses—all emphasised how enhanced e-health records would reduce errors and duplication, and improve the efficiency of their work.

Together with the funding for e-health records, the package will deliver $31.2 million for an elective surgery blitz, providing about 2,600 additional surgeries, targeted at areas where there are large numbers of patients whose surgery is overdue, such as orthopaedic and cataract surgery. There is around $22 million to establish walk-in clinics in Hobart and Launceston to provide care for minor illnesses and injuries over extended hours and at no charge to patients, alleviating the pressures on emergency departments. There is $48.7 million over four years for Tasmania Medicare Local, to support better care in the community to prevent and manage chronic disease. Individual GPs will continue to have central responsibility for the clinical care of their patients, with Tasmania Medicare Local supporting allied and preventative health services and the coordination of care. Additional support will include providing strength development and fitness programs for frail older Tasmanians, and addressing smoking, excessive alcohol consumption, physical inactivity and poor diet.

There is $74.5 million to provide better care for patients when they are discharged from hospital and to provide better palliative care in the community. Tasmania Medicare Local will help build and support better links between hospitals and GPs by ensuring that appropriate follow-up care and services, such as rehabilitation, are available post hospitalisation. This is expected to reduce avoidable readmissions to hospital. Expanding access to community-based palliative care services will enable people to remain at home, if they wish, at the end of their life, with support for health professionals to improve their palliative care skills and for electronic advanced care planning, building on a model pioneered by the Cradle Coast Authority and North West Area Health Service.
There is $53.9 million to train more medical specialists in Tasmania and provide more scholarships for nurses and allied health professionals, with up to 132 undergraduate clinical placement scholarships per annum, up to 48 postgraduate scholarships per annum and up to 70 continuing professional development scholarships per annum.

There is $15.4 million that will target service gaps in mental health services and population groups who currently have poor access to mental health services.

There is $42 million to support innovation in clinical services that would enable care to be delivered more effectively and efficiently. This will include $1 million in seed funding to establish a virtual health sciences precinct, bringing together Tasmanian hospitals, the University of Tasmania's Faculty of Health Science, the Menzies Research Institute, the Clifford Craig Medical Research Trust and appropriate primary care providers.

This funding will provide both a short-term boost to elective surgery and increase the rollout of e-health records, as well as a plan for how we can manage the long-term issues Tasmania faces with its older population, higher rates of chronic disease and system constraints. The funding addresses concerns raised in conversations across Tasmania with health professionals. For example, in the north-west, 18 health professionals joined Minister Plibersek in a small workshop room in the North West Regional Hospital's medical school. Joining the hospital's director of surgery and North West Area Health Service CEO were front-line nurses, doctors, allied health professionals, public servants, private practice operators and those who worked in both. There were people interested in research, those keen to just get things rolling again and some who wanted to revolutionise the system. They were all united in a desire to rebuild Tasmania's health system both for their community and for their colleagues. Gone were the squabbles between doctors and nurses. This meeting presented a united front to the minister and demonstrated just why Tasmanians and Australians should be very proud of our health professionals.

I was very impressed by the constructive attitude on display, not about a hand-out to patch up the issues but a focus on targeting the areas that would give the greatest return for the Commonwealth dollar, if it were to be forthcoming, and of course seeking the greatest return for the health of people in Tasmania, specifically in my area, the north-west coast. There was no desire to seek undue credit for anything but a real sense that this was our time to explain to the minister what we really do well in north-west Tasmania and what we need help with. We heard that there is no point throwing a lot of money at elective surgery when there are also significant bottlenecks in preparing someone for surgery and in rehabilitating them afterwards, as well as the important facet of our health system of trying to keep people well and out of surgery to begin with. That is exactly why systems research and e-health infrastructure definitely need to be expanded. North-west Tasmania is leading the nation in the rollout of e-health infrastructure and capacity. E-health makes getting treatment simpler for patients and delivers treatment more easily for health professionals. This is another positive reform being brought about by a Labor government committed to improving the health outcomes of Tasmanians both now and in the long term. I commend the bills to the Senate.

Senator EGGLESTON (Western Australia) (16:31): Earlier this month I had the opportunity to travel to London for a Commonwealth Economic Forum and, as is obviously the case when leaving the country
for foreign travel, the most important thing a person does is pass through immigration. I was very impressed by the fact that in our airports these days an electronic system looks at passports and confirms the identity of individuals. That is an example of IT being used in a very positive way. I think the introduction of electronic health records is a similar technological advance which will lead to greater efficiencies in the health industry, especially when a person away from their home base is struck by illness and their medical records can be available through the system of e-health records.

As has been said by other speakers, the coalition supports the concept of personally controlled electronic health records and the amendments to this bill. There is no doubt that the benefits of having an accessible electronic health record available around the country are great and have been referred to by many other speakers. This system is commonly referred to as e-health. It is certainly an exciting advancement, extending the scope of primary health care and protecting patients who are travelling. The efficiencies e-health can create are not new concepts to the coalition. Under the last coalition government, computerisation of general practice increased from 17 per cent in 1997 to about 94 per cent 10 years later. That meant that 94 per cent of general practices around the country had computers and patient records were kept much more systematically. The data within them was much more easily accessible to medical practitioners and to people doing research, for example, into the efficacy of drugs for the treatment of hypertension in which a general practice might have been participating. Accessing the records of the serial measurements of a patient's blood pressure is much easier with computers in general practice. Linking general practices to make up a huge pool of patients has been used widely in the United Kingdom to test new drugs, to record outcomes and to file those outcomes back to the university or wherever the trial was being facilitated, all linked by the internet.

The real value of this system is that when a patient who is away from their home becomes ill it is possible with an e-health record system that they can go to a hospital or perhaps to a medical practice anywhere in the country where their medical records will be accessible. This will mean that people can be treated much more quickly and effectively because the detail of their histories will be accessible. Very often people are not as aware of the details of their medical history as one might hope or imagine they would be. That is going to be one of the great benefits of electronic health records.

It has been forecast that by 2020 e-health capabilities could save up to $7.6 billion a year in health costs by reducing duplication and errors, by improving productivity and by providing better adherence to best practice principles. The government's own numbers suggest that the benefits of e-health records alone in Australia would be $11.5 billion saved by the year 2025. That is an incredibly large figure which in itself justifies completely the introduction of the system.

In addition, the same report suggests that a full e-health program can help avoid up to 5,000 deaths annually once the system is in full operation. That is a very important and practical consideration as well. It again shows how beneficial this program potentially will be to the Australian public.

The report further states that, annually, a fully implemented e-health system could avoid up to two million primary care and outpatients visits, 500,000 emergency department visits and 310,000 hospital admissions. They are amazing figures that testify to the efficiencies and cost savings
that this system will introduce to our health system.

Importantly, it will also mean that patients have their entire medical history available to them anywhere they travel. A patient with a patient-controlled electronic health record who becomes ill while travelling has their full medical history available to the doctor or emergency department they visit. These are very important benefits.

The downside of the electronic health record system is the protection of patient privacy. There are very legitimate concerns about patient privacy in relation to the introduction of electronic health records. We all know that it is very easy to hack into computer systems. Persons' health records are often very important to their capability of getting a job or insurance. People are quite rightly concerned that the privacy of their health records should be protected, not only for those reasons but just for the general issue of privacy and confidentiality of a person's health records and for the protection of the privacy of the doctor-patient relationship. For this reason the issue of privacy is the biggest concern that people have in association with the idea of the introduction of electronic health records. I think it is very important that the government and those who are responsible for setting up this system make sure that the question of privacy is uppermost in their minds and that the absolute confidentiality of health records is protected. It is a very important consideration.

The idea of electronic health records, and having wide accessibility to them, is one that is under consideration around the world. When I was at the United Nations in 2010, I met a British doctor who was interested in an e-health system in which medical records could be accessible anywhere in the world. In my view it is very bold thinking of his to contemplate a system whereby wherever you were in the world your health records could be accessed through the internet by responsible individuals in a hospital. It would be very hard to set up such a system, but not impossible in this day and age.

Unfortunately, the British experiment with e-health was not a great success. After expending a great deal of money, unfortunately the United Kingdom's system was scrapped, in late 2011. The British had spent some $12 billion on their e-health equivalent of this proposal. So we do have to make sure that the system is efficiently managed and that the concerns for patient privacy are respected. But overall I think the benefits that this system will bring to Australia and to the Australian public are great, and the coalition endorses this system, as I do as a former medical practitioner. I can see great benefits in having access at your fingertips to a patient's records and to the records of an individual from some other part of the country who might come in to see you. It is certainly going to be an interesting exercise to see how this system develops. But I am sure that, with goodwill and concern, once this system is up and running we will have a very useful tool to ensure that the health of Australians is protected wherever they travel in this country.

Senator POLLEY (Tasmania—Deputy Government Whip in the Senate) (16:42): I rise to fully endorse and support the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. This is another plank in building our health system in this country. Earlier in this debate a member of the opposition made reference to former minister for health Tony Abbott and the contribution he made. I just thought we should correct the record. I would not be proud of having been part of a government
where the minister for health ripped $1 billion out of the health system.

Before talking about this legislation I want to refer to the very positive developments that took place last week in Tasmania, when the Minister for Health, the Hon. Tanya Plibersek, announced a much needed injection of funds into the Tasmanian health system. I would like to commend not only the current minister, the Hon. Tanya Plibersek, but also the former Minister for Health and Ageing, the Hon. Nicola Roxon, because they have listened to the Tasmanian people over a long period of time and have now invested in health where the Tasmanian community best needs that money spent at this point in time. Some $31.2 million over four years will be provided for an elective surgery blitz, providing about 2,600 additional surgeries targeted at areas of need; about $22 million to establish walk-in clinics in Hobart and Launceston that will provide care for minor illnesses and injuries, for extended hours and at no cost to patients, thus removing pressure on our departments of emergency medicine; and $48.7 million over four years to support Better Care in the Community to prevent and manage chronic disease through the Tasmanian Medicare Local. Individual GPs will continue to have central responsibility for the clinical care of their patients, with the Tasmanian Medicare Local supporting allied and preventive health services and the coordination of care. Given the disease profile of health in Tasmania, this is an very important consideration.

Further, there will be $74.5 million over four years to provide better care for patients when they are discharged from hospital and, most importantly—and something I have been lobbying for for a long period of time—better palliative care in the community; and $53.9 million over four years to train more medical specialists in Tasmania and provide more scholarships for nurses and allied health professionals. The very limited training of allied health professionals has had a significant effect on service provision in my state of Tasmania. There will be $15.4 million over four years to address gaps in mental health services; $36.8 million over four years to roll out the personally controlled electronic health record in Tasmania's hospitals and enable allied health, pathology and diagnostic imaging services to connect to e-health; and $42.0 million over four years to support innovation in clinical services that will enable care to be delivered more effectively and efficiently. This will include $1 million in seed funding to establish a virtual health sciences precinct, bringing together Tasmanian hospitals, the University of Tasmania Faculty of Health Science, the Menzies Research Institute, the Clifford Craig Medical Research Trust and appropriate primary care providers.

The reasons I raise this are manifold. Firstly, this came as a consequence of the efforts of Tasmanian politicians, both in this chamber and in the other place, over quite a considerable period of time. This is not a spur-of-the-moment decision but a considered response to the unique situation in Tasmania. Community and, particularly, clinician consultation with Minister Plibersek contributed to the development of this package. This was gathering information at the grassroots level. As the minister has said on many occasions, her Labor colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Senate have camped out in her office. If I recall correctly, last Friday she said she was possibly looking at an extension to her ministerial office to accommodate her Tasmanian colleagues!

This reflects the concern of this government to act in the best interests of the Australian community. This is in stark contrast to the Howard government's overt operations to downgrade a public health
system, upon which much of our community relies, and drive people into a private system, which was often beyond their resources. We only have to look at the US to see the effect of reliance on private health care: 15 per cent of population have no access to health care—some 47 million people. I could outline a number of things that have been brought to my attention in relation to the lack of access for Americans to their health system, because it is quite frankly unaffordable and not available to most Americans.

But to get back to the health forums that were held in Launceston, at the one held at Launceston General Hospital all the health professionals were represented, and it was a very vigorous and engaging exchange of views and ideas. And it was suggested very strongly, at all the forums around Tasmania, that there was a desire—a need, in fact—for electronic health records, and that the e-health in this legislation was a step in the right direction.

Clearly, this is a major indicator of the $36.8 million over four years to roll out the personally controlled electronic health records. The Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011, the PCEHR Bill, will establish the national personally controlled electronic health record, PCEHR, system. The PCEHR system and its regulatory framework will include an entity that will be responsible for the operation of the PCEHR system.

These bills will also implement a privacy regime specific to the PCEHR system which will generally operate concurrently with Commonwealth, state and territory privacy laws. The national e-health strategy, endorsed by health ministers in 2008, recognised that a 21st century healthcare system requires 21st century health information infrastructure in order to achieve its vision, which is to enable a safer, higher quality, more equitable and sustainable health system for all Australians by transforming the way information is used to plan, manage and deliver healthcare services. And that is obviously underpinned by the rollout of the National Broadband Network.

Underpinning this vision is a recognition that significant improvements in the way that health information is accessed and shared is required if Australia is to maintain a world-class health system in the face of rapidly increasing demand and costs. The purpose of the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011 is to ensure that the PCEHR Bill, once enacted, operates appropriately and effectively. This will be achieved by making a number of amendments to the Healthcare Identifiers Act 2010 and other legislation to allow participants in the PCEHR system to take up and use healthcare identifiers to support the secure and accurate sharing of records within the PCEHR system.

The Healthcare Identifiers Service, the HI Service, was created by the HI Act as a foundation element for electronic transmission of health records. By assigning a unique identifier to each consumer, individual healthcare provider and healthcare provider organisations, the HI Service provides a solid basis for ensuring that a health record is attached to the PCEHR of the right consumer, restricting the ability to author a clinical record for the PCEHR system to qualified healthcare providers and making sure that connection to the PCEHR system is only available to those healthcare provider organisations that meet technical and security requirements. As a result, a health record entering the PCEHR system will typically contain all three kinds of healthcare identifiers. The healthcare provider organisation's identifier will be used to identify the provider organisation to the system, the individual healthcare provider's
identifier will be used to identify the author of a record uploaded to the system, and the consumer's identifier will be used to identify the PCEHR to which the record should be attached.

The consequential bill amends the HI Act to allow healthcare identifiers to play a central role in the integrity, security and safety of the PCEHR system. The consequential bill will also make amendments to the Health Insurance Act 1973 and the National Health Act 1953 to allow a range of health records created by Medicare to be included in an consumer's PCEHR where a consumer wants that information to be included.

The Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee clearly reported the following:

Submitters to the inquiry have been in favour of the benefits that will result from the implementation of the PCEHR system, many recognising that it is time that such a system were implemented. The AMA commented as follows:

... most members are enthusiastic about using a shared electronic health record. They know that with the right system they can improve the patient's healthcare experience. The right sort of shared record system will help doctors deliver better care. They will have important information about their patients to help them to make good clinical decisions.

The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners stated that they continue to strongly support the PCEHR and the foundations of electronic communications.

Support for the bills came not only from medical organisations. The Aboriginal Health Council of Western Australia was similarly supportive of the system and also identified that its introduction will see benefits delivered to patients, particularly those in remote and rural Australia. They said:

We also very much see that the proposed legislation has great potential to enhance better patient outcomes in Aboriginal communities. Our sector also sees that this has a role to play in terms of Closing the Gap. It is also very clear from what the government is saying they are trying to do that this particular legislation and the proposal would support people who are in remote and regional centres.

Submissions to the Senate committee raised some concerns about the system operator. These were addressed by the Department of Health and Ageing, who stated that they believed the compromise between a private organisation and an interdisciplinary statutory authority was a sensible middle position. They said that the membership of the advisory committee should be as diverse as possible. The committee felt that both of these issues should be reviewed in two years but should not delay the development of this important improvement to health care.

Debate about the opt-in or opt-out issue raised arguments on both sides. This issue should be revisited in the two-year review. But it must be remembered that this is the beginning of a system and, as long as we accept that review and even change can occur, we need to get on with this, as with many of the other health reforms that are being implemented. Safety is critical to the operation of the system. We need clear definitions, privacy and access. The time line for introduction has also been raised. But no good reason has been raised to not proceed with the introduction of personally controlled electronic health records.

The Greens have raised recommendations about additional privacy controls, community consultation and data aggregation. The coalition, who as usual see everything in a negative light, wish to delay it for another year. But, as I said earlier, we need to implement what is necessary. The commentary at the health forum in
Launceston last week confirmed to me that moving ahead with these two pieces of legislation is what is needed. We should stop procrastinating and do what needs to be done. From what I can see, these pieces of legislation and the investment that the federal government has made in Tasmanian healthcare services relating to them are steps in the right direction and will provide a good foundation for us to build on as we continue making and dealing with revolutionary changes not only in our economy and in health but in the way that we provide services to the members of our communities.

**Senator MASON** (Queensland) (16:57): The coalition opposition supports the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. A personally controlled electronic health record system is, let us face it, a very good idea. Any improvement to mankind's armoury against the empire of disease is a very good thing. Senators in this debate this afternoon have spoken about the advantages of such a system, and indeed it does have advantages. I accept that this system will assist in effective, efficient and timely patient care. I accept that this system will save time and allow medical practitioners to rely on information noted by other doctors rather than forcing patients to relay their medical history. I accept that the system could dramatically reduce the number of hospital visits each year. I accept that the system could also help prevent thousands of deaths annually when the system is fully operational, another significant advantage provided by e-health.

We also should not forget about the dollars. It is very important in these times of fiscal stringency to save taxpayer dollars. This system may well save billions of dollars over the next 10 to 15 years, by reducing duplication and errors, improving productivity and encouraging stricter adherence to world's best practice. These are all good things. I know that coalition senators and members such as Senator Fierravanti-Wells, Dr Southcott in the other place and Senator Sue Boyce have done a lot of work on this particular issue, and I want to congratulate all of them.

But the opposition does have some reservations. Once again we encounter the standard problem with this government. They come up with some very good ideas now and then, but that is often marred by lack of attention to detail and poor implementation. You will recall that it was the coalition that initiated the focus on shared electronic health records. But again this is a program that the Labor government has not fully developed. I listened before to Senator Di Natale and I loved his use of the words 'soft launch'. We now know that even though the system is being launched on 1 July this year, it is being 'soft launched', which I think means it will be quite some time before the system is ubiquitous. I think that is probably right. But I liked the language—slightly Orwellian, but it never gets by the opposition. We are not quite sure about the costs. The government has not been too forthcoming about the long-term costs of this technology. We know it is expensive, but that does not mean it is not worth it. Already it has been raised in debate that the United Kingdom spent about $12 billion on e-health records and that money has now largely been scrapped. It would not be a good thing for this government to go the same way. I am hoping the Australian Labor Party is not like the British Labour Party in this context—I am in a generous mood and so I will not assume it is.

**An opposition senator:** You always are.
Senator MASON: Yes, I always am! Some of my colleagues have raised the issue of stakeholder use and how some will see it as a make-work scheme for medical practitioners with little incentive to create the shared health summaries. That is a potential problem and of course there is a reliance on general practitioners to drive the uptake. Some have already asked this afternoon why would they bother doing that. It will take time, and they will see little or no reward for their efforts. Over time, perhaps, that will change, but, initially, I think it is fair to say, it will be an issue. My colleagues have raised—Senator Fierravanti-Wells raised it well and eloquently—the lack of stakeholder consultation. Reports from a number of key stakeholders indicate there was not thorough consultation and they had difficulty communicating with the National E-Health Transition Authority.

They are all important points, and I know that the Senate has discussed them well this afternoon. I congratulate all my colleagues for their contributions in this debate. But I want to concentrate on one particular issue, if I might. As Senator Polley just recognised—and I agree with her—health records are among the most sensitive records citizens give to a doctor, but governments potentially have access too. They hold potentially the most personal, sensitive information. So, of course, there are significant privacy concerns about these e-health records—about access, about their security, about their veracity, about the control over contents, the use and the potential use of these e-health records. All those issues are legitimate and they are all live in this debate.

This is one of those absolutely classic Senate debates because this debate reflects that most fundamental tension in regulating a liberal democracy—that is, the quest for individual autonomy and individual privacy on the part of every citizen versus the impulse of a community and social responsibility. That tension between the two—it is not a dichotomy; it is a tension—is being played out in this debate. While the government does have a moral responsibility to look after their citizens—and e-health is a very good example of that—citizens do not want the state to intrude excessively upon their autonomy in extracting that information. Somewhere in that tension lies the answer and lies the balance. Exactly where those boundaries should be drawn will always be widely contested and hence the privacy concerns raised by citizens about these bills.

The government is quite right to suggest, as they have this afternoon, that the government's decision to have an opt-in scheme—I remember discussing an opt-in or opt-out scheme a long time ago, Acting Deputy President Boyce, with you and others. But the government having chosen that—that is, people have to choose to register to have a personally-controlled electronic health record—it does raise the question of privacy protections. Privacy remains a concern, but with an opt-in scheme they are strengthened, and I acknowledge that. In my view the government should be congratulated for that.

Last week I happened to watch the 7.30 on the ABC—even though I am in the opposition, I do watch the ABC—with Professor Chris Puplick, the former New South Wales Privacy Commissioner, and he was asked about this legislation.

Senator Feeney: And former Liberal Party senator.

Senator MASON: Yes, and former Liberal Party senator and former President of the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Board as well—appointed by a state Labor government. What he said was very
interesting. He said that just like the internet, once the information is out there it will always be available to someone somewhere, regardless of restrictions and limitations. That, of course, is the problem. There is an oft-quoted saying among IT people that goes along these lines: information wants to be set free, but that does not mean that people necessarily want information to be free. Sometimes that is for good reasons—like patients wanting to protect their data—or sometimes for the wrong reasons, like authoritarian governments wanting to maintain their grip on power. It simply expresses the significant reality that once a genie is out of the bottle it is impossible to put it back in. When information is out, when it is set free, you cannot put it back in, because—guess what?—it is everywhere, particularly today with the promiscuous exchange of information, garnered by the internet, social media and other media enterprises. The fact is that these days information when leaked or when out is out forever. The information to be contained within this system is of an intensely personal and private nature, much of which may never leave the inner sanctum of a doctor's surgery. Given that the personal electronic health records system will, by its nature, exponentially increase the number of people with access to these details, it is not unreasonable for patients to fear that the risk of information being obtained by someone other than their doctor will also increase—and that is the concern. People are entitled to be concerned that their medical history could fall into hands in which it does not necessarily belong. Let us face it: in the profession many of us work in, the profession of politics, health records could devastate or potentially even destroy a political career. As examples take evidence of mental illness or evidence that someone is suffering from cancer or evidence that perhaps a woman at one stage even had an abortion or evidence that someone has contracted a sexually transmitted disease at some stage. All of these could be very embarrassing and would certainly be compromising and potentially they could destroy a political or a corporate or a legal or other career. That is why these records are so important and why their protection is absolutely and utterly vital. If they are released, even if they are released inadvertently, people would become subject to prejudice or subject potentially to blackmail. It could have detrimental impacts on their relationships, their work or their insurance and so on. There must be no unauthorised access.

It was not long ago, as you would recall, Madam Acting Deputy President, that we had the example of the stolen laptop in the United Kingdom, and this is not the only story of its kind. In about the middle of last year a laptop containing health information on over 8½ million patients and 18 million hospital visits, operations and procedures was stolen from a National Health Service building in London. The data did not contain names but it did include postcode, gender and age details. There were concerns at the time that the information could be used against the subjects by, for example, blackmail over sensitive medical issues and so forth. That is the sort of problem that is possible, hence the enormous concern as to privacy.

I note Senator Polley, when speaking before, mentioned the United States health system. The United States electronic health record system has been described as 'Wikileaks on steroids'. But while Australia's privacy laws generally do offer greater protection than do those in the United States, it is an interesting and concerning analogy for this kind of system. It is certainly a concerning analogy at least. Even with
access to information by authorised users, so by those authorised to look at the information, there are still privacy concerns. Who owns the information? Can I change information that I deem to be wrong or inaccurate? Can I do that unilaterally? Can I restrict access by others to certain types of information? For example, I might not want my GP to know about my mental illness—

Senator Scullion: Or your drug addiction.

Senator MASON: Indeed, my drug addiction or some disease that I have contracted or whatever else. It could be embarrassing. Again, where do we draw the line? How does the regime in this bill interact with, in particular, the provisions of the Privacy Act, which, of course, is the ultimate protector of privacy in this country? All these issues are on the table. I accept what the government has said, that there will be at least a review of these issues in two years time, and again I say I think that is a very good thing because within that time of the next two years the true utility of this law can be addressed. I simply conclude by saying that for the good health of our nation I hope the government—for that matter any government of whatever political complexion—will address these privacy issues with very great discretion. Not to do so could lead to compromising of privacy and a shocking infringement of individual rights.

Senator CAROL BROWN (Tasmania—Deputy Government Whip in the Senate) (17:12): I also rise to make a brief contribution to debate on the legislation before us, the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. Currently we have the health records of patients scattered across a range of locations and attached to different clinics and hospitals, so we need to have a system that allows for a patient's whole health record to be easily accessible, no matter what medical facility they may present at. It is inefficient and potentially dangerous to a patient's health if they have to retell their medical history each time they visit a different healthcare provider. So that is why the Gillard Labor government has announced a $466 million investment over two years for the establishment of an electronic health records system. This funding is to establish the personally controlled electronic health records system national infrastructure. This will prove to be a vital piece of health technology as we continue to find more efficient and effective ways to treat patients.

The outdated approached of paper records or records that do not travel with a patient when they present at a new health facility can cause unnecessary delays and medical errors. In fact, medication errors cause about 190,000 hospital admissions each year, with eight per cent of those being because of inadequate consumer information. So that is why from 1 July 2012 we will begin to roll out the personally controlled electronic health records system. This is the next step in using e-health to enhance our healthcare system. It will create an individual electronic patient record that has the capability to be shared securely over the internet and it will be available to help treat a patient when and where it is needed. From 1 July 2012 individuals will have the option to register for a personally controlled electronic health record. The first stage of the e-health rollout will deliver the core functionality required to establish a system which can grow over time. Individuals can choose not to have a personally controlled the record and, if they choose to participate, they will be able to set their own access controls or enable default
access settings. Once the individual has selected the permission level, key pieces of their health information may be viewed at participating healthcare providers across different locations and healthcare settings. Already, the federal government is making a significant investment in the nation's health system, and the personally controlled electronic health records are the next cog in this investment.

As part of our investment in health care, the federal government has signed with states and territories in a historic health reform agreement which will deliver a better deal for patients. This historic national health agreement ensures we can deliver the funding our public hospitals need, with unprecedented levels of transparency and accountability, less waste and significantly less waiting for patients. This new deal provides a much-needed funding boost to hospitals and ensures, through the provision of tough national standards, that the money goes straight to hospitals and, in turn, straight to patients. Together, the Commonwealth, the states and the territories will share in funding growth in an equal partnership. There will be a single national funding pool, activity based funding and national standards, including guarantees on emergency waiting times and elective surgery waiting lists, and it will improve front-line care through the afterhours GP helpline, Medicare Locals and GP superclinics. In effect, this funding deal ensures that our hospitals are able to invest in the infrastructure they need to provide the very best health care for all Australians.

As a Senator for Tasmania, I am particularly concerned about the Tasmanian health system and ensuring that the healthcare needs of Tasmanians are looked after. I am pleased to say that Tasmanians will benefit from the introduction of personally controlled e-health records. In fact, the whole Tasmanian health system is already benefitting from significant investment from the federal Labor government. The Tasmanian health system received a significant boost only last week when the Minister for Health, Tanya Plibersek, announced a $325 million package over four years for an emergency rescue of the Tasmanian health system. We know that the Tasmanian health system is facing significant pressures and has some unique challenges. For instance, we know that Tasmania has an older population and that the proportion of our older people is growing more quickly than in any other state or territory. Tasmania has a small and geographically dispersed population which suffers from a higher prevalence of chronic disease and has higher health risk factors. That is why I was pleased to see the Minister for Health come to Tasmania, after strong lobbying from the Tasmanian parliamentary Labor team, to conduct consultations with front-line health professionals, unions, Tasmanian Medicare Locals, Tasmanian Health Organisations, members of parliament and the Tasmanian state government.

The package announced by the Minister for Health, Tanya Plibersek, will include $31 million for an elective surgery blitz that will provide about 2,600 additional surgeries in areas where large numbers of patients are overdue for surgery, including cataract surgery, knee replacements, hip replacements, hernias and gall bladder surgery, and $22 million to establish walk-in clinics in Hobart and Launceston that will provide care for minor ailments and injuries, for extended hours and at no charge to patients. These centres will link to local general practices and Tasmanian Medicare Locals, to ensure continuity of care for patients. We will also deliver $48 million to better support care in the community to
prevent and manage chronic disease through the Tasmanian Medicare Locals. GPs will still continue to have central responsibility for the clinical care of their patients, with Tasmanian Medicare Locals supporting allied and preventative health services and the coordination of care. There is $74 million to provide better care for patients when they are discharged from hospital and better palliative care in the community. There is $53 million to train more medical specialists and provide more scholarships for nurses and allied health professionals, which will deliver up to 34 additional specialist training places, up to 17 new clinical supervisor positions and up to 11 new training coordinators as well as funding for more scholarships for nursing and allied health professionals. There is $15 million to help address gaps in mental health services; $42 million to support innovation in clinical services which will enable care to be delivered more effectively and efficiently; and $36 million to roll personally controlled electronic health records into Tasmanian hospitals and enable allied health, pathology and diagnostic imaging services to connect to e-health.

This investment from the federal Labor government will ensure that the Tasmanian health system is put back on track and will allow us to deliver the very best health care to Tasmanian patients. We need to make structural changes that ensure that the Tasmanian health system is delivered as efficiently as possible to secure the long-term future of the Tasmanian health system. A key component of this is the rollout of the personally controlled electronic health records in Tasmania, which will support public hospitals, allied health, pathology and diagnostic imaging. As part of Minister Plibersek's consultations in Tasmania, it was repeatedly highlighted that e-health would help reduce errors and duplication and help improve the efficiency of care. The issue of e-health was raised at each roundtable that was held by Minister Plibersek in Launceston, Hobart and Burnie. Whilst this investment in Tasmanian health will have significant benefits, the e-health records rollout is very exciting. It stands to deliver significant assistance to help Tasmanian health professionals provide the very best care.

The rest of Australia also stands to benefit considerably from the rollout of the personally controlled electronic health records. E-health represents an important part of the future of health care in Australia for both consumers and healthcare providers. It will enhance the way health care is delivered and result in more efficient and effective health care. The federal Labor government has e-health as an integral part of its health reform agenda, an agenda that aims to continuously improve Australia's healthcare system to ensure that it is accountable, affordable and sustainable, whilst providing the very best of care. Personally controlled electronic health records represent the next exciting stage of our health reform agenda, and I commend the bills to the chamber.

Senator BOYCE (Queensland) (17:22): It is interesting that Senator Brown used the word 'rollout' in her contribution to this debate on the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011. In fact, there is no rollout. There is simply a system in which you can lodge your interest to be involved in what is happening on 1 July. It reminds us of this government's 'ability' to roll out the NBN in Tasmania. It leads us to the same sort of mismanagement, waste and inability to implement which we saw during that rollout and which is now happening with this rollout. I certainly share
Senator Brown's hope that e-health will be useful to the people of Tasmania, but I do not have any certainty around that. I also hope that it will be useful to the people of Queensland, but again I do not have any certainty around that. I hope it will be useful to the people of Australia, but there cannot be any certainty around that either.

As numerous speakers have pointed out this afternoon, e-health is a noble aim. It is certainly something that we should do. Because of the work of successive governments in Australia—our current statistical collection and our work to date on definitions and standardisation of all manner of things within the health area—we are possibly in a better position to do it. We are in a better position than almost any other country in the world to do this well.

But today we are talking about the introduction of the personally controlled e-health records aspect of an e-health system. Once again, we are looking at fantastic rhetoric and zilch delivery, zilch implementation. The personally controlled e-health record system is supposed to start on 1 July. As Senator Di Natale said earlier, it will be a 'soft launch'. It will be a very soft launch. It will be an almost ghostly launch—a Mary Celeste launch—because there is nothing in this ship to launch. It is simply a shell waiting to be populated. Fine. But this government should not go on with nonsense about what is going to happen.

Minister Roxon, the former health minister, talked about the e-health revolution that would be coming. It was in January 2011 when she started talking about the e-health revolution. She said:

After the outstanding success of the e-health conference in Melbourne earlier this month, there is strong momentum behind delivering the Government’s $466.7 million PCEHR system by July 2012.

It is fine for Senator Brown to try to suggest that this system is part of the national health and hospital reforms of this government, but it is in fact as meaningful as almost anything else they have done—which is almost nothing. There has been no real progress. Of course they now have to talk about a soft launch. Having gone from the big bang of 'Wow, we're going to have an e-health system that will be the envy of the world,' they are now saying, 'Well, people can just choose to let us know that they would like to be involved from 1 July.' There is at least some vague hope on that basis that the PCEHR legislation will achieve long term some of what it has set out to achieve.

But it is a complete nonsense for this government to try to claim that this legislation is some sort of a move, a reform, a revolution. They need to fess up to the fact that they could not work out how to do it. They could not work how to get it right and now they are going to take the easy option which was suggested to them all along. But of course this government loves to talk the rhetoric, fail to implement, waste money and mismanage as it goes.

As has been noted by other speakers, the coalition will not be opposing this legislation, because we think the idea of having personally controlled e-health records and a proper e-health system is an excellent idea. We are, however, like many stakeholders outside this place, concerned about this government's ability to implement a sensible system that will work. Despite all the promises made by NEHTA, the transitional authority for this program, and DOHA, the personally controlled e-health record system is simply nowhere near ready to launch. It is an idea still. This government needs to confess that it is still just an idea; it is just a ghost of an e-health system.
Key components of the PCEHR are not finished and are nowhere near being finished. Key issues identified during a number of inquiries—and I note one of them was by the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee, of which both you and I are members, Madam Acting Deputy President Moore—such as safety, liability and privacy have not been successfully resolved. The coalition, in its minority report to the PCEHR committee last year, suggested that it would be wise for the government to delay the launch until they knew that they had it right and that some of the systems they were intending to use had been trialled in real-life situations. We were concerned this would be a completely dysfunctional system that would cause more harm than good.

One of the key aspects for a functioning e-health system is the public's confidence in it. If it has serious errors or serious problems in its early days, it will take years to regain the trust of the public. I am told that the National E-Health Transition Authority was called to Minister Plibersek's office in recent weeks and was basically told: 'Stop the spin. It's not ready. It won't be ready. Let's wind back the rhetoric and the expectations. Let's start talking about soft launches and people choosing to get involved in registering, but let's stop the nonsense about the e-health revolution.' So we have a complete backtrack by this government.

One thing that has not been wound back is the spending. I am somewhat amused by Senator Carol Brown's view that more than $300 million for the hospital system in Tasmania would be sufficient to overcome the unique challenges of the Tasmanian health system. We have some unique challenges in my home state of Queensland in the health and hospitals system too, where over $1 million a day is being forced to be spent to pay the interest rate on the wages bill of the debacle of a health pay system that the former Bligh government implemented. I think perhaps the unique challenge faced by so many of these hospital systems is their Labor state governments which cannot, as this government cannot, properly implement and effectively discipline their own spending.

Let us look, for example, at the liability and risk issues associated with this legislation. Key medical indemnity insurers are warning GPs not to participate as they could be exposed to a new wave of litigation. Insurers are telling doctors not to use the e-health system and the PCEHRs until the issues are settled. The President of Medical Defence Australia, Julian Rait, said his organisation had serious concerns about the legal liabilities doctors would face if they used the PCEHRs and would 'advise members not to participate until these problems are properly addressed'.

As for safety, the fundamental issue of any medical system, one of the comments that came out of the estimates process was that NEHTA had just one document that it could show to the Senate committee demonstrating its interest and concern in the safety of the PCEHRs. It was called the Clinical safety case report. Thirty-three pages of that 34-page document detailed a huge number of safety risks that the PCEHR system was subject to. On page 32, the document says that 'the feedback to date on the clinical safety recommendations has not described to what degree they have been accepted into the design and if they will be included in future specifications'. So, in fact, none of these safety risks have been properly assessed for their level of danger and what needs to happen to get them properly out of the system. Clearly the question of who is going to be liable if things go wrong has been completely avoided. There is no answer to the question: 'Is the system safe?' There is
no system, as I said before, so how are they going to know if it is safe? Yet $1.1 billion has been spent on this.

Just last Friday, we had the extraordinary situation of the CEO of NEHTA, Mr Paul Fleming, announcing that the NASH—the National Authentication Service for Health—was not going to be ready for 1 July. They gave the contract to IBM well over 18 months ago—again, to the distress of the local industry. Medical software providers in Australia were shocked when IBM got the job of providing the NASH. One of them even commented to me: 'They have just gone for the safe option. No-one ever got sacked for hiring IBM.' Apparently someone should get sacked for hiring IBM, because the NASH was due on 30 June and it will not be finished.

In the past, Paul Fleming has described the National Authentication Service for Health as:

... a key foundational component for eHealth in Australia. It is essential that the identity of people and organisations involved in each eHealth transaction can be assured, and this requires high quality digital credentials. The NASH, Australia’s first nationwide secure and authenticated service for healthcare delivery organisations and personnel to exchange sensitive eHealth information, will provide this.

That is the description of the NASH.

In March 2011, NEHTA gave the contract to IBM to design this key foundational component. Guess what? On 15 June, Mr Fleming quite happily said that the fact that the delivery of the NASH has been delayed to a date that no-one can tell us:

... will have no impact on the launch of the personally controlled eHealth records system in July, or the ability for consumers to register for an eHealth record.

Let us note that term 'register'. He went on to say:

Australians will be able to register for an eHealth record in July as intended.

That actually was not what was intended. They were supposed to be able to register and use the e-health system from 1 July. They will not be doing that. That is not what will be happening. And, when queried, Mr Fleming said they did not know when IBM were going to fix the problem and when we would have a NASH to go along with the system. Yet the most serious problems raised were around safety, security and privacy. That is what the NASH is designed to protect.

In the Australian last Friday Karen Dearne said:

THE Gillard government's $1.1 billion e-health records program will launch without the key user verification system in place, with the National E-Health Transition Authority (NEHTA) conceding it has failed to deliver the project on time.

I just find it bizarre that this is what happened. But why should we find it bizarre that providing this and implementing it properly is way beyond the skills of this government or its appointees? As I said earlier, we support this legislation because we believe an e-health system is a national imperative. If it functions properly, it will save the public purse millions. But it has to be done properly, it has to be done intelligently and, far more to the point, it has to be done honestly and transparently. That has not happened to date with the way NEHTA has suggested that not having a key component of e-health ready in time for the so-called launch on 1 July is not a problem. I would love to know when someone is going to take responsibility for NEHTA and for the fact that this has gone from being an e-health revolution in early 2011 through to a 'soft launch' where people can put their names forward to say they would like to be involved if they want to, when and if it finally gets delivered.
I am pleased that the government are now slowing down the implementation of e-health, but I am completely displeased that they cannot simply be honest or transparent about the problems that they have encountered along the way. We are all aware of the problems that have come out of the UK, where over £6 billion was invested and wasted by the former Labour government. To everyone's shock and horror, it could not be reclaimed. It was simply wasted and closed down.

We are in a great position in Australia. We currently have 3.6 million people who are registered to receive primary care with their doctors. We are one of the few countries in the world that can actually tell you we have 3.6 million people registered for primary care by their doctors. So why wouldn't we look at using those people as the starting point—the people who have the chronic healthcare programs with their GPs? Why wouldn't we start with that group? These people would benefit from the fact that they will not have to cart X-rays around with them. They will not have to have test after test. They will not have to tell their story over and over. Why wouldn't we start there instead of creating some sort of money-eating machine that we have no hope of implementing successfully and nationally for so long?

There are so many issues that I think we need to work on with regard to these bills. We will be checking to make sure that the legislation does work as intended over time, that people do have sufficient confidence in the security and safety of the system to actually use it and that clinicians find the system functional for them.

I am disappointed at the approach that has been taken almost consistently by NEHTA, the lack of transparency, the lack of consultation with stakeholders until after the event and the lack of honesty here in suggesting, 'We don't need NASH, really.' Yes, they will get a system cobbled together to get them through, but to say that is as good as the one we have just paid $48 million to IBM for is just bizarre. So let us hope this is a good outcome for Australians.

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:42): I thank senators for their consideration of the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Bill 2011 and the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records (Consequential Amendments) Bill 2011 and their contributions to the debate on these bills and the amendments. At present, consumer health records are scattered across a range of locations and clinics rather than being attached to the health consumer and easily available at the point of care. That means consumers need to retell their story each time they visit a different healthcare provider. This outdated approach can result in things like unnecessary retesting, delays and, unfortunately, medical errors. For example, we know that medication errors cause around 190,000 admissions to hospital each year, with eight per cent of those errors due to inadequate consumer information. The legislation in front of the chamber this afternoon will help to put an end to that.

The bills before the chamber today establish the essential IT and governance infrastructure that will allow consumers to set up their own personal electronic health records—computer based records that can be accessed anywhere where there is an internet connection. That means records can travel with a health consumer from clinic to clinic and doctor to doctor at the click of a button. Once this essential infrastructure is in place later this year, consumers will be able to opt in and begin registering for personal
electronic health records and access a range of basic information on their own health care.

Just as you build a house, these bills help to lay the foundations for e-health today—strong foundations that will underpin the development of the sector as it expands into the future. This is about developing the foundations of the system carefully and systematically. We know this is a complex area of health reform. It is complex, and that is known by those sitting opposite. It is known that this desire for an electronic health record had part of its origin back in 2003, when the coalition embarked on implementing e-health reform and e-health records. The truth is that very little, if anything, was achieved in the period of government between 2003 and 2007. That is no reflection on the officers of the Department of Health and Ageing as seems to have been the case in some of the contributions we have heard today. The harsh language that we have heard from those opposite should, or could, be directed to the health minister of the former Howard government. It is a complex area of health reform.

A national e-health record system will continue to build over time as consumers and healthcare providers join the system. Since 2010 we have been working closely with consumers and healthcare providers to get this right, and will keep doing so. Establishing a national e-health record system is part of our government's e-health agenda, an agenda that builds on the work of GPs, hospitals and other health providers and that is integrating modern technology into health care. Already, 97 per cent of GPs have access to computers and 96 per cent have access to the internet in their consulting rooms. I congratulate GPs for supporting this technology to become part of their practice, with all the benefits of improved efficiency and accuracy that it provides.

Throughout the development of this infrastructure there has been extensive consultation with clinicians, consumers and the health IT industry. We are looking to the health sector and technology experts to innovate and implement. Individuals can choose whether or not to have an e-health record. If they choose to participate they will be able to set up their own privacy and access controls. As the records evolve they will have the capacity to contain health information such as conditions, medications, allergies and records of medical events created by healthcare providers. The records will also be able to include discharge summaries from hospitals, information from Medicare systems and some information entered by consumers. We know that consumers and healthcare providers need to have confidence in the e-health record system and the information it contains, so it is critical to implement a legislative framework that provides robust and transparent governance and appropriate protections for participation in and use of the system. The bills and the amendments that are being debated here today will do just that.

Key elements of the bills will establish the system operator and its advisory bodies, a registration regime for consumers, a privacy and security framework and associated penalty mechanisms and the circumstances in which information in the national e-health record system can be collected, used or disclosed by particular parties. The bill also provides for the legislation to be reviewed after it has been operating for two years.

This is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to deliver these important reforms. These bills are part of the government's bold health reform agenda, reforms that will make it
easier for consumers to receive the right care when and where they need it. I commend the bills to the Senate.

Question agreed to.

Bills read a second time.

In Committee

PERSONALLY CONTROLLED ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS BILL 2011

Bill—by leave—taken as a whole.

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:49): I table a supplementary explanatory memorandum relating to the government amendments to be moved to these bills. The memorandum was circulated in the chamber on 8 May 2012. I seek leave to move government amendments (1) to (32) on sheet CN235 together.

Leave granted.

I move government amendments (1) to (32) on sheet CN235:

(1) Clause 5, page 8 (line 15), omit "amended.", substitute "amended; or".

(2) Clause 5, page 8 (after line 15), at the end of the definition of Ministerial Council, add:

(c) if that Agreement is not in force—the COAG council (however described) responsible for health matters.

(3) Clause 5, page 11 (line 1), before "System", insert "performance of functions under this Act by the".

(4) Clause 9, page 17 (line 26) to page 18 (line 3), omit subclause (3), substitute:

(3) Each of the following is identifying information of an individual, other than an individual in the capacity of a healthcare provider:

(a) if applicable, the Medicare number of the individual;

(b) if applicable, the Veterans' Affairs Department file number of the individual;

(c) the name of the individual;

(d) the address of the individual;

(e) the date of birth, and the date of birth accuracy indicator, of the individual;

(f) the sex of the individual;

(g) if the individual was part of a multiple birth—the order in which the individual was born;

Example: The second of twins.

(h) if applicable, the date of death, and the date of death accuracy indicator, of the individual.

(5) Page 18 (after line 25), at the end of Part 1, add:

13A System Operator may arrange for use of computer programs to make decisions

(1) The System Operator may arrange for the use, under the System Operator's control, of computer programs for any purposes for which the System Operator may make decisions under this Act.

(2) A decision made by the operation of a computer program under an arrangement made under subsection (1) is taken to be a decision made by the System Operator.

(3) The health information referred to in subsection (2) in relation to a consumer may include the name of one or more healthcare providers that have provided healthcare to the consumer.

(4) Clause 44, page 35 (line 30), after "provider", insert "organisation".

(5) Clause 51, page 40 (lines 9 to 12), omit subclause (2), substitute:

Cancellation or suspension if consumer no longer eligible, etc.

(2) The System Operator may, in writing, decide to cancel or suspend the registration of a consumer if:  

---
(a) the System Operator is no longer satisfied that the consumer is eligible to be registered; or

(b) the System Operator is no longer satisfied, having regard to the matters (if any) specified in the PCEHR Rules, that the identity of the consumer has been appropriately verified; or

(c) the System Operator is satisfied that, unless the registration of the consumer is cancelled, the security or integrity of the PCEHR system may be compromised, having regard to the matters (if any) prescribed by the PCEHR Rules; or

(d) the System Operator is satisfied that the consent referred to in subsection 41(3) in relation to the consumer has been withdrawn; or

(e) the System Operator is satisfied that the consent referred to in subsection 41(3) in relation to the consumer was given by an authorised representative or nominated representative of the consumer, and:

(i) the authorised representative or nominated representative who gave the consent ceases to be an authorised representative or nominated representative of the consumer; and

(ii) the System Operator requests the consumer to give consent of the kind referred to in subsection 41(3); and

(iii) the consumer does not, within a reasonable period, give the consent.

(10) Heading to subclause 51(4), page 40 (line 26), omit "whether consumer eligible", substitute "action in relation to consumer's registration".

(11) Clause 51, page 40 (line 29), omit "whether a consumer is eligible to registered", substitute "whether to take action under subsection (3) in relation to the entity's registration".

(12) Heading to subclause 51(5), page 41 (line 1), omit "whether other entity eligible, etc", substitute "action in relation to entity's registration".

(13) Clause 51, page 41 (lines 3 to 8), omit all the words from and including "consumer" to and including "registration", substitute "consumer while the System Operator investigates whether to take action under subsection (3) in relation to the entity's registration".

(14) Clause 58, page 46 (line 9), omit "has applied", substitute "is applying, or has applied,".

(15) Clause 58, page 46 (lines 29 and 30), omit "has applied", substitute "is applying, or has applied, ".

(16) Clause 73, page 57 (lines 6 to 15), omit the clause, substitute:

73 Contravention of this Act is an interference with privacy

(1) An act or practice that contravenes this Act in connection with health information included in a consumer's PCEHR or a provision of Part 4 or 5, or would contravene this Act but for a requirement relating to the state of mind of a person, is taken to be:

(a) for the purposes of the Privacy Act 1988, an interference with the privacy of a consumer, and

(b) covered by section 13 or 13A of that Act.

(2) The respondent to a complaint under the Privacy Act 1988 about an act or practice, other than an act or practice of an agency or organisation, is the individual who engaged in the act or practice.

(3) In addition to the Information Commissioner's functions under the Privacy Act 1988, the Information Commissioner has the following functions in relation to the PCEHR system:

(a) to investigate an act or practice that may be an interference with the privacy of a consumer under subsection (1) and, if the Information Commissioner considers it appropriate to do so, to attempt by conciliation to effect a settlement of the matters that gave rise to the investigation;

(b) to do anything incidental or conducive to the performance of those functions.

(4) The Information Commissioner has power to do all things that are necessary or convenient to be done for or in connection with the performance of his or her functions under subsection (3).
(17)Page 57 (after line 16), at the end of Division 4, add:

73A  Information Commissioner may disclose details of investigations to System Operator

The Information Commissioner is authorised to disclose to the System Operator any information or documents that relate to an investigation the Information Commissioner conducts because of the operation of section 73, if the Information Commissioner is satisfied that to do so will enable the System Operator to monitor or improve the operation or security of the PCEHR system.

(18)Page 57, after proposed clause 73A, insert:

73B  Obligations of System Operator in relation to correction, etc.

(1) The System Operator may, in order to meet its obligations under the Privacy Act 1988 in relation to the correction and alteration of records:

(a) request a participant in the PCEHR system to correct personal information contained in a record included in the PCEHR system and, if the participant does so, to upload the corrected record to the PCEHR system; and

(b) if the participant refuses to do so—direct the participant to attach to the record a note prepared by the consumer in relation to personal information included in the record, and to upload the record and note to the PCEHR system.

(2) A participant in the PCEHR system who is given a direction under paragraph (1)(b) must comply with the direction.

(19)Clause 74, page 58 (line 9), after "provider", insert "organisation".

(20)Clause 76, page 60 (line 10), after "provider", insert "organisation".

(21)Clause 77, page 60 (line 16), before "The", insert "(1)".

(22)Clause 77, page 60 (after line 29), at the end of the clause, add:

(2) Despite subsection (1), the System Operator is authorised, for the purposes of the operation or administration of the PCEHR system:

(a) to hold and take such records outside Australia, provided that the records do not include:

(i) personal information in relation to a consumer or a participant in the PCEHR system; or

(ii) identifying information of an individual or entity; and

(b) to process and handle such information outside Australia, provided that the information is neither of the following:

(i) personal information in relation to a consumer or a participant in the PCEHR system;

(ii) identifying information of an individual or entity.

(3) This section does not limit the operation of section 99.

(23)Clause 97, page 73 (line 28), after "must", insert "take such steps as are reasonably necessary in the circumstances to".

(24)Clause 99, page 76 (line 17), after "provider", insert "organisation".

(25)Clause 105, page 80 (line 9), omit "operator", substitute "organisation".

(26)Clause 105, page 80 (line 12), omit "provider operator", substitute "provider organisation".

(27)Clause 108, page 84 (after line 2), after subclause (4), insert:

(4A) Without limiting the matters to be covered by the review, the review must consider the following matters:

(a) the identity of the System Operator;

(b) alternative governance structures for the PCEHR system;

(c) the opt-in nature of the PCEHR system, including the feasibility and appropriateness of a transition to an opt-out system.

(28)Heading to subclause 109(2), page 85 (line 7), omit "jurisdictional advisory committee", substitute "committee and council".
Clause 109, page 85 (line 9), after "committee", insert "and the independent advisory council".

Clause 109, page 85 (line 10), after "committee", insert "or the independent advisory council".

Clause 109, page 85 (after line 30), after subclause (4), insert:

PCEHR Rules may relate to agreements

(4A) The PCEHR Rules may specify that a person must enter into a specified kind of agreement in order to be, and remain, a registered healthcare provider organisation, registered repository operator, registered portal operator or registered contracted service provider.

Clause 109, page 86 (after line 27), after subclause (7), insert:

PCEHR Rules may relate to research

(7A) The PCEHR Rules may specify requirements with which the System Operator and other entities must comply in relation to the preparation and provision of de-identified data for research or public health purposes.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (17:49): Madam Acting Deputy President, I would like, if I could, to ask some questions that pertain to both bills.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Moore): That is fine. Go ahead.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS: During the debate, Minister, concerns were raised, particularly in relation to privacy, by Senator Boyce and me. Is the government assured that the provisions contained in the amendments go fully to addressing privacy concerns that have been raised not just here but as part of the inquiry by the Senate Community Affairs Legislation Committee. They are of concern and have been of concern throughout this whole process. I really just want to hear, Minister, your assurance that that is the case, particularly in relation to the concerns that were raised in relation to the powers of the Australian Information Commissioner.

Senator McLucas (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:50): The e-health record system will have bank-strength security features, including extremely strong encryption and firewalls. These protections are in line with the very high standards required by both the Department of Defence and the Attorney-General's Department. Paper based records, as we know, can be copied, stolen or modified without anyone knowing. With the e-health record system patients will be able to view a log that shows them every occasion on which their record has been accessed or changed and by whom. Consumers will need a secure password to access the system, which they can invent themselves. The password will then be encrypted, as with internet banking. For even more security, when you log on you will have to enter a personal question to confirm your identity. On top of this, the system will automatically log you off if your session is inactive. As for the question about privacy and security, they are fundamental to the effectiveness of an e-health record system. Unlike the former government's proposal, as I recall, this one is personally controlled, and I think that gives enormous power to the health consumer to manage their personally controlled electronic health record—something that will give the community confidence in the system, which I am sure we are all looking for.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (17:52): I understand that, under these amendments, the role of the system operator in providing de-identified data for research and public health purposes will be clarified, with the objective that the aggregate data be used to improve understanding of population health issues. Again in relation to privacy, when the system is accessed for the purposes of de-
identifying data, will that also be covered by the legislation in terms of logging in and logging off? One accepts the logging-in and logging-off where it is a medical practitioner accessing the information. But, with this broader scope, do those provisions ensure that those privacy concerns are met even where the data is used in that manner?

Senator McLucas (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:53): The amendments specify that it is a function of the system operator to prepare and disclose de-identified data for research or public health purposes. The amendments also provide that the minister can make rules to specify requirements with which the system operator must comply when preparing and providing de-identified data. The system operator will be authorised to delegate this function to a Public Service employee of the Department of Health and Ageing, the Chief Executive of Medicare or any other person with the consent of the minister. Despite any delegation functions, the system operator will ultimately be responsible for this function.

It is intended that the rules will provide detailed requirements regarding the manner in which the system operator de-identifies data and discloses it to requesting parties. For example, it will be critical to set rules in respect of de-identifying the information of small populations to ensure persons are not directly or indirectly identifiable. It is likely that the requirements will draw on existing requirements developed by the National Health and Medical Research Council ethics committee or the Aboriginal Health and Medical Research Council. The rules may also provide criteria that the system operator must consider in determining whether or not to disclose the requested de-identified data.

Senator Fierravanti-Wells (New South Wales) (17:55): Can you outline some of the provisions in relation to strengthening the consent arrangements in the legislation? Could you provide just a little bit more information on that, thank you, and on the circumstances in which those provisions in the amendments will strengthen those consent arrangements?

Senator McLucas (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:56): Could I ask you to be a little more specific, Senator, so I know exactly what issue it is I am trying to address. There are general provisions in the legislation around consent, as you understand. I am trying to accurately answer your question, so I would not mind knowing what you are really asking.

Senator Fierravanti-Wells (New South Wales) (17:56): I do not have it in front of me, but in the Senate committee inquiry there were concerns raised about the consent arrangements. If the officials have other information and want a bit more time to get it, I have some other questions, if that would help, Parliamentary Secretary. The officials could have a look and maybe come back.

Senator McLucas: That is fine.

Senator Fierravanti-Wells: That would probably give them a little bit more time. I wanted to address some of the issues about the launch that were raised in the article in today's Australian. The article refers to the launch being 'on hold'. Do we know when that launch at St Vincent's Hospital will take place?

Senator McLucas (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (17:57): The federal government have been building the
infrastructure for a national e-health record system that will allow consumers to set their own computer-based electronic health records. The infrastructure has been built and it is going through the final stages of rigorous testing at the moment. This is about developing the foundations of the system carefully and systematically. We are determined to get it right and to ensure that the system is rolled out properly, phased in over time. The minister has always said that that is what the government would do—and, in the debate on the legislation both here and in the other place, many of those opposite endorsed that approach.

We know this is a complex area of reform and that a national e-health record system will continue to build over time as consumers and healthcare providers join the system. We have been working closely with consumers, healthcare providers and others to get that right, and we will continue to do so.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (17:59): Do I take it that the launch that was planned at St Vincent's Hospital in Sydney for Monday, 2 July, which was to be the first working day of the new system, (1) has been cancelled and (2) has no replacement date?

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (18:00): I can confirm that health consumers will be able to register on 1 July.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (18:00): Yes, Minister, but they are not going to be able to register online; they will still have to go back to the manual system. Is that not the case?

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (18:01): I am advised they can register on 1 July.

Senator FIERRAVANTI-WELLS (New South Wales) (18:01): But they are not going to be able to register online; they will still have to go back to the manual system. Is that not the case?

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (18:01): I am advised that from 1 July people will be able to register on the phone and in person at a Medicare office. Question agreed to.
In Committee
PERSONALLY CONTROLLED
ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS
(CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS)
BILL 2011

Bill—by leave—taken as a whole.

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (18:02): by leave—I move government amendments (1) to (4) and (6) to (17) on sheet ZA290:

(1) Schedule 1, item 16, page 5 (lines 14 and 15), omit "to disclose a healthcare identifier to the PCEHR System Operator", substitute "to use, and to disclose to the PCEHR System Operator, a healthcare identifier".

(2) Schedule 1, item 16, page 5 (line 21), omit ", of a healthcare recipient".

(3) Schedule 1, item 16, page 5 (line 24), omit ", of a healthcare recipient".

(4) Schedule 1, item 17, page 6 (lines 9 and 10), omit the item, substitute:

17 Subsection 20(1)

Omit "is authorised to disclose an identified healthcare provider's healthcare identifier to an entity", substitute "or a registration authority is authorised to use, and disclose to an entity, an identified healthcare provider's healthcare identifier and identifying information".

(6) Schedule 1, item 21, page 6 (line 28), omit "has applied", substitute "is applying, or has applied."

(7) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (after line 10), at the end of section 22A, add:

(3) If the healthcare recipient has an authorised representative or a nominated representative, the PCEHR System Operator is authorised:

(a) to collect identifying information of the authorised representative or nominated representative from the service operator; and

(b) to collect the healthcare identifier of the authorised representative or nominated representative; and

(c) to use and disclose the identifying information and healthcare identifier,

for the purpose of verifying the identity of the authorised representative or nominated representative and for other purposes of the PCEHR system, subject to the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Act 2011.

(8) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (lines 11 and 12), omit "and registered repository operator", substitute ", registered repository operator or registered portal operator".

(9) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (line 13), omit "The", substitute "(1) The PCEHR".

(10) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (line 14), omit "registration authority", substitute "registered portal operator".

(11) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (after line 17), at the end of section 22B, add:

(2) The PCEHR System Operator, a registered repository operator or a registered portal operator is authorised to adopt the healthcare identifier of an authorised representative or a nominated representative of a healthcare recipient as its own identifier of the authorised representative or nominated representative, so far as is reasonably necessary for the purposes of the PCEHR system.

(12) Schedule 1, item 21, page 7 (line 23), after "provider", insert ", or an authorised representative or nominated representative of a healthcare recipient".

(13) Schedule 1, item 21, page 8 (after line 30), at the end of section 22D, add:

(4) Despite paragraphs (2)(b) and (3)(b), the consent of the healthcare recipient is not required for the uploading of information by the Chief Executive Medicare in accordance with paragraph 38(2)(a) of the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Act 2011.

(14) Schedule 1, item 21, page 8 (line 34), after "recipient", insert ", a healthcare provider, an authorised representative of a healthcare recipient or a nominated representative of a healthcare recipient".

(15) Schedule 1, item 21, page 9 (line 1), after "recipient", insert ", a healthcare provider, an authorised representative of a healthcare recipient
or a nominated representative of a healthcare recipient”.

(16) Schedule 1, page 10 (after line 28), after item 29, insert:

29A At the end of section 46E

Add:

(4) Despite paragraphs (1)(ba) and (bb), the consent of the consumer is not required for the uploading of information by the Chief Executive Medicare in accordance with paragraph 38(2)(a) of the Personally Controlled Electronic Health Records Act 2011.

(17) Schedule 1, item 32, page 11 (line 8), omit "Guidelines", substitute "guidelines".

Question agreed to.

The TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Senator Moore) (18:02): The question now is that schedule 1, item 18 stand as printed.

Question negatived.

Bills, as amended, agreed to.

Bills reported with amendments; report adopted.

Third Reading

Senator McLUCAS (Queensland—Parliamentary Secretary for Disabilities and Carers and Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister) (18:04): I move:

That these bills be now read a third time.

Question agreed to.

Bills read a third time.

Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012

Second Reading

Debate resumed on the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Senator BERNARDI (South Australia) (18:05): From 1 July 2012 the Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012 will create the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency—which I will refer to as ‘the agency’—which will replace Skills Australia. The bill gives the agency additional responsibilities other than those which Skills Australia had: providing advice to the minister on improving the productivity of the Australian workforce, providing advice to the minister on the allocation of Commonwealth funding including the National Workforce Development Fund and assessing research relating to improving the productivity of the Australian workforce. The bill also adds three additional board members to the existing arrangements and adds a new category to board membership.

Australia does indeed face skills shortages in a number of important industries. Businesses continue to have problems procuring the right people for the right job. Recently even the ACTU has been critical of the government’s approach to addressing the skills shortage with a proposed offshore recruitment drive to fill vacancies in the mining and construction industries. It goes without saying that it is vital for our training systems to work efficiently in order to provide real job prospects to Australians. The Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency is responsible for the $558 million Workforce Development Fund, a fund made available to pay up to half the costs of training for the upskilling of existing workers. The government’s contribution equates to $4,292 per training place, based on predictions of training 130,000 workers.

We on the coalition side, like all Australians, need to be convinced that the agenda being pursued by the government is producing value for money. There are some concerns that this policy and indeed this bill appear to have been cobbled together in the ad hoc way that we have seen many times before from this Labor government.
It is worth remembering that the agency established in this bill will replace Skills Australia, which was set up by the Labor government in 2008, just four years ago. Labor has decided to bring forward the work of the agency and have appointed an interim board. So it would now appear that this government has declared Skills Australia to have passed its use-by date. I ask: is Labor saying that Skills Australia did not achieve what it was meant to? Very few other conclusions can be drawn. As my colleague Ms Ley said in the other place:

The failure does not really lie with Skills Australia; it rests with the government … Skills Australia provided advice and offered ways to improve skills and boost employment. It provided that advice, and the methods, to government, but ultimately it is up to government to act. It seems to me that the government is more interested in trying to spin another story, if you will, for the media's benefit or to convince some people that the government is actually doing something rather than digging deeper past the veneer and actually dealing with the development of skills and our economy. It begs the question: is the government really interested in fundamentally changing Australia's workforce for the better, or is it content to continue to make grandstanding statements and announcements that ultimately make little if any difference to those on the ground?

It would be remiss of me not to comment on the fact that this bill includes what is effectively a $20 million slush fund for the unions, because in addition to the $558 million in the National Workforce Development Fund, the government can allocate $20 million to unions and employer groups. There are, according to my research, no criteria for the allocation of these funds and there is no defined purpose. This leads me to conclude, quite reasonably, that this looks to be just another Labor slush fund for their union mates. It goes almost without saying that with a Labor government there always seem to be some perks for the union movement.

Moving on from the unions, the coalition is concerned that this bill panders to what I would describe as Labor's love of bureaucracy. Here we have this new agency replacing an old agency—it is not old, since it began just four years ago—but it is still doing the same thing, albeit with a few additional responsibilities. The government is spending $25 million over three years to set up this new agency, whereas the old agency only cost $5 million a year to run. It strikes me that this balance is wrong.

A vigilant eye must be kept on these processes to avoid taxpayers' precious money falling through the cracks and to avoid the creation of more red tape that stifles economic opportunity. As every Australian knows, Labor likes to spend. This is evidenced by the last four years of this government. Unfortunately, Labor likes to spend but is not that concerned with what it has to show for it at the end of the day.

During the Senate Education, Employment and Workplaces Relations Legislation Committee's inquiry into this bill, some stakeholders raised concerns about the overlapping of responsibilities between the agency and other bodies. For example, the education departments of both Queensland and New South Wales raised the issue of the agency potentially undertaking duties of the Productivity Commission and/or state and territory bodies. Also, with this government we have seen a major redirection of funding from various training initiatives and programs into what they call new initiatives. For example, the $200 million from the Critical Skills Investment Fund was redirected into the National...
Workforce Development Fund. Senator Evans, in his capacity as the minister, announced the merging of the funds, in 2011. Far be it for me to simply conclude that this is more money shuffling. But it is apparent that this can confuse stakeholders, who query which fund they now have to apply to in order to gain the appropriate benefits.

For those who do not want to look deeper it gives the appearance of increased funding from the government. These changes made by the government—like moving money around and rebranding agencies—can not only be confusing for industry but can lead to what the Queensland department called 'fragmenting skills investment', where there is a misdirection or waste in how funds are spent. So, it is important that the agency use its resources to support the work already being done by other agencies, rather than adding another level of bureaucracy.

The bill also proposes an initial three board members, and it adds an additional category for membership, that being the representation of employees. I should note here that some stakeholders have proposed that, if employees have their own membership category, employers should too. I will acknowledge that an industry category already exists, but it is not clearly defined. In fact, unions could describe themselves as industry representatives. I hope that in future the government will partake in some common sense and ensure that employers are adequately represented on the agency board.

Another point of concern is the fact that there seems to be no person from the training sector represented on the board. I believe that training should be afforded the same significance as unions and industry. After all, that is a core part of this whole issue: the training of workers. The Australian Council for Private Education and Training has said: … it is appropriate that the training sector also be represented as part of the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency membership … such an appointment would add valuable expertise to the AWPA as it develops advice for government.

In the next five years there is expected to be a shortfall of about 250,000 skilled workers in this country. This poses a challenge for all those involved in upskilling our workforce. Training needs to produce the skills that industry requires and is prepared to pay for. This will not happen if the agency's agenda is warped by the government trying to keep its most valued stakeholders happy—and by that, I mean the union movement. Excluding this important level of expertise can only hinder the work of the agency going forward. That is something the coalition does not want to see happen.

There are also a few inconsistencies between this bill and the budget papers that the government should take note of. The first is the task given to the agency regarding funding. The bill states that the agency will provide 'advice' on matters relating to the allocation of Commonwealth funding, including the Workforce Development Fund—and yet the budget papers state that the agency will 'administer' the Workforce Development Fund. Also, the bill says that the agency will assess research relating to improving workforce productivity; whereas the budget papers state that the agency would 'undertake' research. Further clarification to clear up these inconsistencies would be welcome.

The coalition will pay close attention to this new agency, in the hope that this is not just another quick fix or a temporary solution to a problem that the government has. We want it to be an enduring fix for the skills shortages that are apparent in Australia. We want there to be an effective collaboration between industry and government so that the
skills requirements of industry can be met and sustained for decades to come. We do not want this agency to become another level of bureaucracy that splashes out, or indulges or provides for its preferred stakeholders, to the long-term detriment of improving Australia's workforce.

In conclusion, the coalition will not be opposing the passage of this bill. We are simply seeking to highlight our concerns. We would like the government to consider them, not only in the initiation of this agency but also in its ongoing operations, whilst it holds the Treasury bench.

Senator THISTLETHWAITE (New South Wales) (18:17): I am pleased to speak in support of the enactment of the Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012. For developed nations to grow their economies, and at the same time have real growth in incomes, there must be productivity growth over the long term. Unfortunately, in Australia at the moment, there is a misguided and often ignorant debate occurring regarding means to stimulate productivity growth in our economy. I am not going to go into the details of that debate at the moment.

Before my time in this place I did have the great honour of representing workers in a number of industries throughout the country. From agricultural to aeronautical industries, from horseracing to the health industry, I had the great privilege of representing workers and their interests and negotiating on their behalf. One of the lessons I learnt from my 14 years as an advocate for workers was that a happy workforce is a productive workforce, and the system of workplace relations—and, importantly, education—must encourage cooperative workplace relations. To encourage cooperative workplace relations, employees must have developed and definite career paths—and an important part of the development of a career path is skills development, ensuring that people are able to attain the education and the skills they require to better themselves and to ultimately increase their earning capacity and their living standards.

Since becoming a senator I have sought to expand my work in visiting workplaces throughout New South Wales. I have also been fortunate to visit many trade training centres throughout the state. Earlier this month I visited Taree, on the mid-north coast of New South Wales, to celebrate the official opening of the Manning Valley Trade Training Centre, a $2.9 million investment by the federal government in an opportunity for students, beginning in years 9 and 10, to commence their trades in hospitality and building trades, at that particular high school. It is a wonderful opportunity for those who are interested in skilling themselves up to begin a trade in the Australian workforce. I have also been fortunate to open trade training centres in Bellingen, in Port Macquarie, in Maclean and in Lithgow—and, in all of these areas and circumstances, the school communities were overwhelmed by the fact that the government is investing in skills development in their local area. We are bringing the community together—bringing employers, educators, parents and students together to increase the skills base of a particular community and ultimately provide more employment prospects for children in those schools. It is initiatives such as this that are ensuring that the workforce of tomorrow is properly skilled and ready to continue driving our economy and making it stronger.

This bill goes further to augmenting the Gillard government's efforts to ensuring the continued success of the Australian economy through skills development. The goal of the this bill is to amend the Skills Australia Act 2008 to establish the Australian Workforce
and Productivity Agency in place of Skills Australia. Skills Australia was established by the Skills Australia Act 2008 and commenced operation in April of that year. A Labor government initiative, Skills Australia was designed to address skills shortages by supplying independent research, analysis and advice to government on Australia's skill needs. As it stands, Skills Australia's current role is a wide one. It encompasses various research and development goals associated with improving skills attainment and development in Australia. Its current roles are to analyse and provide policy advice on skills needs, to commission and assess research on workforce development needs, to disseminate information about workforce development and skills, to provide advice to the government and publicly on training reform and to facilitate alignment of resources by maintaining relationships with the states and territories and other stakeholders with an interest in workforce development and skills.

With the passing of this bill, the government is seeking to build on work already undertaken by Skills Australia through the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency. It is appropriate for productivity to be in the name of this organisation, because ultimately what we are talking about when we talk about skills development in our country is improving productivity growth over the long term, which will be the impetus for long-term economic growth. The agency will assume the functions of Skills Australia but with additional membership and responsibilities. The agency will provide advice to the minister on Australia's current, emerging and future workforce development and workforce skills needs. These are vital issues of importance that, if we are to continue to build on this country's economic success, require our utmost attention.

The agency was announced in the 2011-12 budget, which indicated that the new agency would develop sectoral workforce development plans, undertake research, consult industry and disseminate information on workforce planning issues. The agency will build on and expand the work of Skills Australia. It will give industry a central role in the National Training System, improve long-term workforce planning and development to address skills and labour shortages and contribute to improvements in industry and workplace productivity. One of the factors that is key to ensuring long-term productivity growth, particularly in the current economic climate in Australia, is ensuring that there are not any bottlenecks in our economy. Bottlenecks that have developed over recent years are skills shortages in particular pockets of the economy. We have all seen the stories associated with mining companies in remote areas, in particular, being unable to access skilled workers in particular trades. This body will work with employers, and particularly in remote and regional areas, to ensure that there are plans in place to meet the demand for skills in vital trades. That will foster long-term productivity growth in our economy. It will give industry a stronger voice and ensure that the government's investment in training delivers the skills that industry and the economy need, in the right place at the right time.

Importantly, the agency will have the ability to make recommendations to the government to direct funding to areas of critical industry need and will be an authority on workforce development policy. It will have a central role in advising on expenditure priorities for the National Workforce Development Fund and will be able to provide advice to the government on
a range of other skills funding initiatives. It will build on the strengths of Skills Australia and collaborate with industry associations, industry skills councils, unions and employers to ensure a shared and practical approach which meets sectoral, regional and small business industry needs. Fostering cooperation in workplace relations will be a key initiative of this body.

Specifically, the agency will advise the government on expenditure priorities for the National Workforce Development Fund; drive engagement between industry, training providers and government on workforce development, apprenticeships and vocational education and training reform; develop and monitor sectoral skills and workforce development plans in conjunction with industry skills councils; provide independent advice on sectoral and regional skills needs to support workforce planning and productivity, including in small business; promote workforce productivity by leading initiatives for the improvement of productivity, management innovation and skills utilisation within Australian workplaces; and conduct skills and workforce research, including into the future of work and working life in Australia.

One of the fundamental goals of this newly established agency is to improve productivity. One of the primary ways in which it will do this is through skills matching. When an industry is experiencing a boom, it is crucial for that industry to be able to harness that boom by maximising productivity through access to a skilled workforce. The agency will ensure the availability of skilled workers in those circumstances, while also ensuring training is offered to workers affected by structural change. The agency will also advise on the allocation of Commonwealth funding, including through the National Workforce Development Fund. The aim of the agency is to improve long-term workforce planning and development to address skills and labour shortage and to contribute to improvements in industry and workplace productivity.

Our economy is going from strength to strength. Economists across the globe look to our great southern land in awe of our handling of the global financial crisis. Despite all our success and the government's deft stewardship of our great nation's economy we need to continually invest in productivity. This government will not rest on our laurels, and it is through legislation such as this that we will continue to ensure that productivity growth is a priority, and skills development is an important part of such productivity growth. I commend the bill to the Senate.

Sitting suspended from 18:30 to 19:30

Senator McKENZIE (Victoria) (19:30): It gives me great pleasure to speak to the Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012. I am a member of the Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Legislation Committee, which examined this bill. Throughout the inquiry process we heard consistently about the Labor government's record in training measures and how the government has some form over time in constructing an array of policy responses to address our skills needs, including their history of poor policy implementation and constant reallocation of budget funds in helping the Australian workforce develop the skills our economy needs for its future. Actually, more accurately, we heard that the poor policy implementation and constant reallocation of budget funds is a theme that has run right throughout the term of this government. I need look no further than the carbon tax, which we were promised we would not have, the Treasurer overseeing four of the largest
deficits in history, and a Prime Minister who is happy to be overseas this week lecturing others on economic responsibility.

Skills Australia, which this legislation deals with, was set up under the Rudd government, the previous iteration of the current Labor government, only in 2008 but is already being superseded by another agency. That begs the question: what was not working? Why did we set something up in 2008 only to be setting up four short years later, with all the inherent costs that come with it, a new agency to address the problem that does not seem to have been addressed over the previous four years? In each budget we see a major redirection of funding from various training initiatives to new initiatives. We hop from one policy solution to another without getting to the nub of the issue: providing real Australians with real job opportunities right across the regions. Anybody who is vaguely interested in real jobs for real people, and in education and training, knows that it takes time to train people in the knowledge and the array of skills that are going to assist our economy and help them make their way through the pipeline of various pathways and training opportunities that we have available in our country. When we keep flip-flopping and changing the process that people must undertake to access work and to obtain the skills they need to access work, we do not assist in getting to the end point where we can in any real way assist the need for skills on the ground. We have a lot of people talking to a lot of organisations in different spaces across the nation, but we do not have too many people actually getting into real jobs on the ground. In fact, the government's training bureaucracy is growing at an extraordinary rate, so somebody is getting the jobs—the bureaucracy within the training sector itself, rather than people on the ground.

Skills Australia, together with the Industry Skills Councils, was tasked with addressing Australia’s current and future skills needs. I remember asking a question at estimates about this particular set-up. When we think about future skills needs and my own interest in regional Australia it begs the question. We had had the first iteration of the Murray-Darling Basin draft plan and learnt about its consequent impact on the economic future of the two million people who live in the Murray-Darling Basin and the various industries that the basin supports. In conjunction with what was at the time the newly announced carbon tax, I asked these bodies during an estimates hearing, 'Have you actually factored these new policy initiatives of the Labor government into our future skills needs, particularly in areas across regional Australia?' and the answer was: 'Not really.' For somebody who is passionate about getting economic development happening in the regions, getting local economies diversified and getting young people, particularly young people in regional Australia, into jobs, it was extremely disappointing. But I digress.

How is it that skills shortages across the nation are worsening at a time when economic growth is falling? The same committee that examined this bill, the Senate Education, Employment and Workplace Relations Legislation Committee, is currently conducting an inquiry into agricultural skills needs in regional Australia. Whilst I will not pre-empt any findings of the report, which will be handed down later this week, it has been an interesting process to read through the submissions—which are all available online—from various players in regional Australia around the skills gap, particularly around agricultural education and agribusiness. For instance, last year we heard that in north-west Victoria there were 30
vacancies for agronomists. For those in the chamber who do not know what an agronomist is, it is somebody who goes out and assesses your farm and looks at what you can grow, what your soil is like and what the rainfall is. They do an analysis of what is happening at that geographic location and can advise you of the best way to build your farm business and make it a profitable enterprise.

So there were 30 vacancies for agronomists across the region in north-west Victoria—Hamilton, Horsham, right up to Mildura, down along the Murray and back to places like Swan Hill, and everywhere in between, such as Manangatang. There were 30 vacancies across the region, without one single applicant—not one—to help farmers on the ground to develop up their business case, innovate and diversify their business and maximise the productivity of their particular enterprise. That is the sort of skills shortage we are dealing with in north-west Victoria. So I hope that under Skills Australia this will become one of the priority areas. I was listening to Senator Thistlethwaite earlier when he spoke about what the priority areas would be and how they would be set across the regions, and how this amendment and the organisation that will be set up as a consequence of it will be tasked with addressing those areas. I am hoping that we actually have some people who can help north-west Victoria find an agronomist and address the skills gap that I have in my particular patch.

Similarly, we heard about the research from the Australian Council of Deans of Agriculture which shows that there have been fewer than 700 graduates annually in agricultural and related courses in recent years but that 4,000 positions a year need to be filled in the sector. If there has ever been a skills gap, it sounds like there is one right there, identified by the Australian Council of Deans of Agriculture. I am hoping that this particular body will set as its first priority addressing the skills need of regional Australia and the skills gap we have right across the sector, from highly skilled agricultural scientists and researchers right through to farm labourers, milkers and the like.

These are the sorts of issues that require focus and a real commitment to finding a solution. Tonight some great claims have been made of collaboration between the industry bodies, the training providers themselves and skills councils—which I find quite incredible, given that in consulting around this particular amendment the body that will be set up will have no representation from the training sector. Given that the training sector itself is the conduit, if you like, between industry, the Skills Council and the job on the ground, the training provider's input is particularly important, not only for identifying these skilled job seekers but in terms of how we are actually going to deliver them out in the regions. I think it is particularly important within the regional Australian context, because we do not have a great choice of training providers. If we do not have somebody on that board who actually understands how training is best provided in the regions, where there might only be one or two options available to job seekers, that is problematic in itself.

So we need focus and real commitment to finding solutions to retraining and to supporting those across our community who have been struggling after widespread job cuts and a lack of opportunity in the area. Again, I bring my contribution to this debate back to regional Australia. I think about the job losses in my home state of Victoria, from food processors to the giant Murray Goulburn Co-operative—a huge employer, particularly in the north-central and south of...
the state. They are significant job losses—300 jobs. And there are also the job losses in manufacturing, which has been a large contributor to our local economies in regional Victoria.

We might ask ourselves why the food processors are shedding jobs and why the manufacturers are shedding jobs. I think we can slate it at the feet of the current government, for a whole array of issues that they refuse to address. This rejigging, I guess you could call it, of Skills Australia is another example of their continually tweaking but not quite delivering the policy on the ground. The government is good at paying lip-service to these types of solutions without any real actions or outcomes.

The bill before us tonight expands the Skills Australia board from seven members to 10. That is always interesting when you are trying to get decisions. If you are trying to get a decision and you want to be flexible and nimble, expanding the size of something might not be the way to do it. But the board has been expanded from seven members to 10 in an effort to increase union and industry representation and supposedly provide a more inclusive approach. However, there is actually no representation on the board from the training industry—and surely the training industry is a stakeholder in this proposal. Keeping the training sector away from the AWPA whilst increasing union presence seems like a warped decision-making process to me. I still do not have my head around why, if we are increasing the number of board members from seven to 10, we could not increase it from seven to 11. But I will move on.

In addition to the $558 million for the National Workforce Development Fund, there is a $20 million pool of funds that the AWPA can allocate to unions and employer groups, with no defined purpose for this pool of funds and no criteria for its allocation. I think we have wasted enough money thus far. We need to be ensuring that when we are providing organisations, programs, projects and bodies with the likes of $558 million worth of taxpayers' money that we have some structure and framework around how that money will be spent and the sorts of things we want to target it towards.
It seems there is evidence that purchasing of training by both states and the Commonwealth is fragmenting skills investment and duplicating effort. As an avowed proponent of states' rights, I think we had it pretty well defined. If we go playing in these spaces, we waste a lot of taxpayers' money. Whether we are wasting Victorian taxpayers' money because we are spending it twice in Victoria or Queensland taxpayers' money, as was the evidence the committee received from Queensland taxpayers, I think it is an issue. We all, particularly in the Senate, have to take responsibility for not only looking after the Commonwealth purse but looking after the purse of all those constituents in our respective states.

I just want to read one of the concerns from the Queensland government that was raised during the inquiry on this particular bill. They said:

...[A] unique strength of our national training system is that co-funded training delivery is administered primarily by states and territories. This arrangement supports a cohesive national system and targets the available funding efficiently to complementary local, state and national objectives...A far more effective system would be for the funds to be allocated to the States, with clear performance benchmarks on how the funds were to be invested to support an industry led system.

That sounds like a good idea to me. Unfortunately, it was not one taken up by the government.

As a coalition senator, I support working cooperatively with the states to get the best outcomes through an efficient cross-jurisdictional allocation of resources and an approach to training that ensures industry can get the skills it needs. We are seeing at the moment that the mining industry is conducting quite a comprehensive advertising campaign right throughout the nation to get the types of skills that it needs on the ground. It would be great if this body could work with industry, as it hopes to, but also reconsider and think about adding working very cooperatively with the training providers. I also think that the waste of taxpayers' money needs to be addressed. Setting up some criteria around how it is going to be spent would be beneficial.

I will just read from the coalition senators' additional comments to this inquiry. They said:

Skills Australia was tasked, together with the Industry Skills Councils, with addressing Australia’s current—and future—skills needs.

I am just hoping that we in regional Australia get the skilled graduates we need to get the job done for our national economy.

Senator PRATT (Western Australia) (19:50): I am delighted to speak on this Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012 today because, as we know, this country has been built on the back of good skills and good education. Good economic management is only part of what makes our nation successful; we know that what is really at the heart of that are the skills and talents of Australian people. But we need the right architecture in this country in management, governance, commitment and consultation to get those things right. Part of that is the establishment of the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency, because our economic productivity goes hand in hand with the skills that Australians have. This bill replaces Skills Australia and broadens its role, putting the needs of Australian industry at its very heart. It is a demonstration of our government's commitment to workforce development and the continued growth of our economy.

I am going to talk tonight about one of the important challenges facing our economy
and our society into the 21st century. For our nation to remain at the competitive front that it currently is it means staying ahead in skills and education, and in the development of good skills and education in this country. It means we need industry led workforce strategies. As the Treasurer told the other place only this week, the Australian economy is seen right around the world as a beacon of strength, stability and resilience in the face of deeply troubling economic volatility worldwide. While we know good economic management is a core part of that story, the skills base of this nation is really at the very heart of it. Our economic vital signs are indeed strong. We know that in the last 12 months our GDP has grown by a solid 4.3 per cent. This growth outstrips that of any other major advanced economy. Some 800,000 new jobs have been created in this nation since Labor came to office. In fact, there are now more Australians in paid work than ever before in our nation's history. But we do not want it to be any old paid work; these should be highly skilled and therefore well-paid positions. Interest rates are almost half of what they were when Labor came to office.

So our economy is strong and our fundamentals are right because of our good economic management credentials. But part of what we need to do in working hard to keep it that way, particularly in the face of the economic turmoil that the globe is currently facing, is workforce development and skills development. We need to make sure that all Australians can make the most of the opportunities presented by our economy. We need to make sure that as many Australians as possible can benefit from all the positive things that having access to good quality work brings. We need to make sure that we have a workforce that is educated and skilled and ready to take on the challenges of our changing economy. We want to make sure that our economy remains strong and robust as well as being responsive to what are pretty significant changes both globally and internally in the Australian economy at this time.

We do this in part by looking to the development of our workforce and making sure that it is able to make the transitions that currently confront us. At the heart of this, and at the heart of this bill, is listening to industry and also listening to those people who represent workers—in most instances, unions. The development of skills and education has been a long-held focus of our government, as are those relationships, because we know the challenges that confront us now and will confront us into the future are basically about building the capacity and capability of our workforce to be more productive in the face of a global economic environment in which higher skill levels will be absolutely critical.

In my home state of Western Australia we know this challenge all too well. We know that WA has the lowest unemployment rate around the country. We have an increasing demand for skilled workers, and that demand for skilled workers is continuing to rise in some sectors. A good example of this is the fact that, according to our Minister for Tertiary Education, Skills, Science and Research, Senator Evans, by 2015 the Western Australian skilled construction labour market alone will need some 76,000 workers. But these workers will need skills and qualifications relevant to the industry they work in. Workers will need to have qualifications ranging from certificate I right through to postgraduate qualifications.

One part of our response to this shortage has been to co-fund the Civil Contractors Federation Skill Centre in Jandakot—or the CCF Skill Centre, as it is currently known. As Senator Evans pointed out, CCF is a very
clear demonstration of what can be done and what opportunities arise when industry and government do the right thing and work together in partnership. This is where we see real outcomes targeted at industries that are growing and developing. You do this in consultation with the industries that need skills. Most importantly, there are real outcomes for workers so they can get the training, skills and qualifications they need to get the jobs they want. So our government has a commitment to industry and to workers, to providing and facilitating opportunities to develop skills for Australians. But, as we know, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The government believes the very best way to make sure that employers' workplace training needs are met is to work in partnership with them to deliver that training.

I think the Gillard government's $558 million investment in the National Workforce Development Fund further shows our government's commitment to skilling Australians to meet the demands of the future. The National Workforce Development Fund is going to be administered by the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency. The agency will allocate industry skills and workforce development funding, and this is important because industry will have a direct advisory role in deciding what is done with the funding. Again, this comes back to making sure that skills development and workforce development meets the needs of industry. We do this by directly involving industry in the decision making. It makes real sense to have industry working in partnership with government on skills development, because we know that a key way of increasing productivity is ensuring that we have a skilled and qualified workforce.

Changes to our economy make it even more important that we work together. Our economy is indeed changing. The mining industry is changing rapidly and we need a workforce to respond. We know that the Australian economy is changing very rapidly and it is not just about the mining boom. For example, we know that retail has been affected by the change in people's spending habits online. We also know that people are spending more money on services and that services are a growing part of the economy. So again our economy is changing, and our government needs to make sure that the jobs and growth happen in all sectors of the economy. Therefore, we need to work together with industry and unions in order to do this.

A new feature of the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency will be the assessment or provision of research and analysis. That will enable us to know not only that our skills development is in touch with the needs of industry but that there is a proper, forward-looking vision and analysis and that there is not only consultation with individual businesses and industry groups but collaborative decision making and vision about where the economy is likely to move into the future. This is so that government, industry and unions in partnership can better understand and project what skills are going to be needed. Currently, in WA, we are facing a pretty big skills shortage, but we know also that in some regions of Australia there are still unacceptably high levels of unemployment. That includes my home state of Western Australia. We need to be able to better project what skills are needed and where they are needed and to assist people to develop those skills.

We need a country that gives all people a chance to participate in the benefits that economic growth provides. With stronger research and analysis we can work towards avoiding skills shortages and giving people access to opportunities. Skills shortages not
only deny those people looking for work opportunities; they also present a risk to the cost base and viability of the development of new construction and mining projects and, indeed, many other industries in Australia. A pretty big example of this is Western Australia's gas pipeline industry, which employs highly skilled welders and boilermakers. Often a pipeline company may have trained staff who then move industries because they are offered twice the pay to work somewhere else. If we are better able to assess, research and analyse skills needs by industry, then we can ensure that the booms and the subsequent gaps in industries are catered for. We need to make sure that all Australians have the opportunity to access good jobs by having the right skill mixes. Research and analysis can really make a difference in this.

The Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency, with its expanded role and board membership, will provide significant benefits for our national economy, for its many industries and for workers, because the core of this is making sure we keep our economy strong not only at a national level but household by household.

Senator ABETZ (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition in the Senate) (20:02): There is no doubt that the upskilling of the Australian workforce is an honourable and proper pursuit of government. The upskilling of the Australian workforce today will determine the productivity of our nation tomorrow. The productivity of our nation tomorrow will determine the wealth and wellbeing of our nation into the future. Can we fund a proper health system? Can we protect our borders? It is to fund those sorts of functions of government that we need a healthy economy. Indeed, can we pay off Greens-Labor's massive debt, now well in excess of $130 billion? It is the biggest debt incurred in the shortest time in Australian history. Make no mistake, the issues that are part and parcel of this bill are of vital importance to Australia's tomorrows and beyond.

What is the government seeking to do with the Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012? The bill will subsume Skills Australia, a bureaucracy established only some three or four years ago during the halcyon days of then newly elected Prime Minister Rudd. Remember when he had to change everything? Of course, he had to meddle in this area as well. Now, three or four years later, the government has come to the realisation that Mr Rudd's good idea at the time is no longer such a good idea. As a result, they have to amend that which they introduced only a few short years ago; and at a cost of about $25 million for a new bureaucracy to undertake the exercise.

The new Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency was announced in the 2011-12 budget. It will be a new agency. The agency will have responsibility for the administration of the $558 million Workforce Development Fund. This fund is available to pay up to half the costs of training for the upskilling of existing workers. The government's contribution equates to about $4,292 per training place, based on their predictions of training 130,000 workers.

Let us stop there for a moment. When you ask about Labor's employment figures and projections, you know they get it wrong, and substantially wrong. It was only two budgets ago that they promised the Australian people that 500,000 new jobs would be created over a two-year period. In the last budget that was reduced to 300,000—a 40 per cent reduction.

Senator Humphries: What a surprise.

Senator ABETZ: And yet, Senator Humphries, we are to believe that the
predictions here are going to be honoured—just as we are to believe Labor's promise and prediction to the Australian people that there will be a $1.5 billion surplus or their claim that they have control of our borders. I think the Australian people are learning fast through bitter experience that the predictions and prognoses of this Greens-Labor government are not to be believed. Indeed, it does not matter into what area one looks, one can see the failure not only of the policy settings but then of the follow-up administration by the Greens-Labor government. But, they tell us, they will be seeking to upskill 130,000 workers.

Now, what else are they doing? There is going to be a round of funding of $50 million for three priority areas. There is $15 million for the priority of supporting the resources sector, as well as those sectors where the effects of the resources boom are particularly acute. I think it is a very good initiative to try to assist those sectors so that we need to import fewer workers for our booming resources sector. It is a great initiative, something that the coalition support. But interestingly enough, out of the $50 million, less than one-third is going to be directed to this jobs rich area for which we now have enterprise migration agreements. Don't get me wrong; the coalition support enterprise migration agreements, but only because they are a necessity. We do not support them because we see them as ideal; we support them because we see them as essential to getting Australia's resources projects up and running. But why on earth would you spend less than one-third of the available funding on the most jobs rich area, where there is the greatest likelihood of job opportunities for individuals in the event of their being upskilled? Indeed, the largest amount, $20 million, is going to be spent on support for upskilling and skill-deepening across all sectors of the economy. I dare say that is for those areas that they have no idea about.

Let us have a look at what this bill does. It expands the board of the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency, compared to that which currently exists, and it adds a new category of board membership. Labor government, a new category of board membership—let me guess: could it be employers? No. Could it be trainers? No. How about trade union bosses? You got it. Sensible.

**Senator Humphries:** That is a surprise!

**Senator ABETZ:** You got it. How surprising! No matter which way this government turns, it will manufacture an excuse to put some union boss or ex union boss onto a board. There are three new board members to be appointed under this new category of employee representative. And, just in case you thought this was going to be a very careful selection process, guess who one of those three new board members is going to be? It is none other than—you see him here, you see him there, you see him everywhere—the National Secretary of the Australian Workers Union. The person who installed Ms Gillard as Prime Minister has, as part of his reward, been given a position on this board. Remember the man who was there on _Lateline_ telling the Australian people that they were going to get new Prime Minister the next day, courtesy of the numbers that he controlled in the Labor Party caucus? He is going to be a beneficiary of this amendment bill through a position on the board.

If you thought, 'One out of three isn't too bad,' guess who else has been appointed? It is none other than Dr John Edwards, the fellow who wrote an academic treatise on Australia's greatest Prime Minister.

**Senator Humphries:** Bob Menzies?

**Senator ABETZ:** People listening might be forgiven, Senator Humphries, for thinking
that that would be Australia's longest serving Prime Minister, Sir Robert Gordon Menzies, or—

Senator Humphries: John Howard.

Senator ABETZ: Australia's second longest serving Prime Minister, both of them prime ministers who took Australia through a golden era of prosperity and stability. But no. All those people who thought it was Menzies or Howard got it wrong. According to this great academic, Dr John Edwards, a Labor Prime Minister gets that title. With all that expertise in academia that he will bring to the Skills Australia Board, we will undoubtedly have a whole lot of people being gainfully employed!

It is interesting that on this board there is no specific category allocated to providers of training. 'But employees need a special category so we can get Paul Howes on the board.' Employers do not get a look-in. Who gets a look-in? Academics like Dr John Edwards. As for education or training, training does not have to be a part of it, just possible. There is economic and industry representation, and now we have representation of employees. What is the government's argument? They say, 'Oh, "industry" must mean employers.' And of course 'industry' does not mean employers. If that is what the government are actually arguing, let them amend the bill to change 'industry' to 'employers' so there is some equity and fairness. At the end of the day, may I remind Senator Collins, the Labor Party and the Greens, this will be a body that seeks to assist people by upskilling them to gain employment—to gain employment with whom? With employers! They are the people that will ultimately be providing the jobs, yet they are to be discounted. They count for nothing in this class warfare that the Australian Greens and the Australian Labor Party are waging as we speak. Employers are to be absolutely and utterly discounted, but union bosses—you betcha!—have to be there.

Having severely and seriously embarrassed Mr Shorten and the Labor government over their refusal to consider productivity as an important issue in the Fair Work Act review, we now have this new agency, to be called the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency. I say to the Greens and Labor: this is too little, too late. If you were genuinely concerned about productivity, you would have put it in the terms of reference for the review of the Fair Work Act. Something we know, courtesy of freedom of information requests, is that both the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations and the Department of Finance and Deregulation were deliberately ignored by the government because they did not want to utter the word 'productivity', let alone assess the Fair Work Act against that vital ingredient. I know it is not popular to talk about productivity because the trade union movement will immediately say that productivity means more work for less pay. That is the Labor Party view of the world.

The coalition view of the world is that productivity actually means greater job opportunities, greater wages and greater wealth for the community. We look at expanding the pie by increasing the opportunities and welcoming innovation into our economy, but Mr Shorten could not bring himself to accept the advice of his own department or the Department of Finance and Deregulation to consider productivity. What they have done now is put into the title of the organisation the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency. The Parliamentary Library provided us with an interesting note in relation to this bill which says, 'It is not clear in either the bill or the explanatory memorandum how this will be achieved.'
Here we have a government yet again realising that they have been snookered. They have to talk about productivity. They have been humiliated on the front pages of newspapers around the country. They have been identified as having ignored departmental advice courtesy of freedom of information. So what do they do? They say, 'We'll put "productivity" into this title,' but they do it in such a rush. Why? Because all they are concerned about is tomorrow's headline. There is no follow-through with the administration. There is no plan as to how this will affect, impact and support productivity, something which I think most Australians now recognise is a vital issue which this country needs to face, to ensure when there are wage increases above and beyond the CPI that there are productivity offsets. Unless we get productivity offsets, we will go down the road of Greece and Spain and some of the other European countries. We can keep promising people increased wages unrelated to productivity but one day we will hit the brick wall, as they have in Greece. I would never want that sort of humiliation to befall this great country Australia. That is why we have to deal with productivity now, while it is still easy to be dealt with, rather than wait another decade when we may find ourselves with some of the diabolical problems that our European friends now find themselves in.

We welcome the fact that Labor have finally been willing to utter the word 'productivity', but as the Parliamentary Library told us it is not exactly clear how productivity will be dealt with in this legislation. I am sure Mr Howes will be able to tell people on this training and productivity board how to get 30 per cent wage rises in the resources sector without any productivity trade-off and then brag about it, as his fellow union bosses do. When that happens, it reverberates throughout the whole economy and the consequences are there for all see.

As is so often the want when you do not have the numbers in a place such as this, the coalition know that we are snookered, that the government will not consider sensible amendments. We will not oppose this bill but I say to the Australian people that there is a better way to deal with issues of Australian workforce and productivity than to expand a board from seven to 10 and whack a union boss onto it. I would have thought the government might have more imagination than that, if they were genuine about developing the Australian workforce and the productivity agenda, which clearly needs to be addressed if we are to secure the future of our country and in particular if we are going to be able to pay off the massive debt legacy which the Green-Labor alliance will be leaving us whenever they are thrown from office.

Also interesting in this bill is a fund of $20 million to be shared equally between the trade union movement and employer organisations. We know the Labor Party love doing this. They will say, 'We've got clean hands; we have equally funded the trade union movement as we have the employer organisations.' Of course there is one big difference: everyone now knows that the Australian Labor Party and the Australian Greens are the beneficiaries of huge amounts of money from trade union organisations for their campaigns but employer organisations such as AiG and ACCI are notoriously known for not making any political donations. The Labor Party pretend that they come to this debate with clean hands, that they will be dealing equally with employer and employee organisations—each gets the same amount—but they know they will be getting a dividend out of that in return whereas the coalition or any other
organisation will not be getting any such dividend from employer organisations.

No matter what the government put up, it seems it has to have a union boss on it and the reason for that is clear. In this case, it could not be clearer because the person who will be the beneficiary is the man who put Ms Gillard in the Lodge. The coalition has concerns and reservations about this bill, so ably expressed by Senators Back and McKenzie in their report on this bill. The coalition not be opposing it.

Senator BACK (Western Australia—Deputy Opposition Whip in the Senate) (20:22): Thank you Acting Deputy President Edwards, and I congratulate you on your recent elevation as acting chair. I join with my leader in expressing the sentiment that the only way in which Australia in the future is going to be able to retire the massive debt that is now around our necks is to have as fully employed and as highly skilled a workforce as we possibly can. Regrettably, the legislation before us this evening falls far short in its objective to achieve this. As Senator Abetz has said, the coalition will not oppose this legislation, but I assure you that it needs radical improvement before it is actually to achieve anywhere near the sort of objective that is necessary for this country.

The seeds of failure were sown not in the life of the Gillard government, or even the Rudd government. The seeds of failure were sown way back in the time of the Hon. Kim Beazley Sr. And if that sowing was not sufficiently poor for the Australian workplace and for skills development at that time, it was perpetuated in the time of the Hon. John Dawkins. It is no pleasure for me that both parliamentarians were from Western Australian. There is a simple reason behind this. There was a time when it was recognised in our country that there were those who should aspire to professional qualifications and studies in the universities, and there were those who should aspire to the technical and trades areas because of their levels of interest and perhaps their capacity at the time at which those decisions were made. I am talking now, back in the 1970s and beyond, of young boys, particularly at the age of 15 or 16 years, for whom a year 11-12 education at that time in their lives was not what they were aspiring to. But, unfortunately, where they should have been directed into the technical colleges and into technical and other trades training where they would have been well suited and would have achieved tremendous success and gone on to very successful careers, whether as employers, as business people or as tradesman employees, we had a circumstance, commenced by then Beazley Sr, and perpetuated by Dawkins, in which that was put to one side. We then perform moved to a scenario in which these students were initially influenced to and then forced to remain on to years 11 and 12 at school and then to aspire to university style education.

What we see in 2012 is the end result of that poor policy decision making. Perversely, what we see is that many of the jobs that should have been occupied by those young people who should have been directed into technical colleges and trades training areas, and would today be undertaking those trades skills and contributing that to our Australian economy, are now in the main being occupied by 457 visa holders, who we have had to bring in from overseas as a result of this vacuum. That is where the fundamental error has taken place.

So what has happened? We have seen burgeoning numbers of students going into the universities and perform, and of necessity, we have seen a decline in the standards of entry at many of our universities. This has assisted nobody, but particularly those who should never have
been pushed or encouraged into, almost forced into, university-level training for degrees for which there is little employment, particularly in the terms of financial and career progression reward, which they may have aspired to had they gone through the alternative path. That is where we need to reverse the trend we see today.

Just in the last seven months we have participated in inquiries in the agriculture and agribusiness higher education and skills training areas. I look forward to presenting to the Senate this week the final report of that inquiry. At the same time the Education, Employment and Workplace Relations References Committee has undertaken an inquiry into the equivalent, if you like: the engineering professional, technical and trades skills areas. I wish to comment on the latter. It was incredibly disturbing to the committee to learn from Engineers Australia that their best guess is a cost to the Australian taxpayer each year at the moment of some $7 billion on infrastructure projects that were poorly described, the tender processes were inadequately undertaken—or successful tenderers selected—the projects were poorly implemented, or they had to go back and rework failed projects. That is a $7 billion a year cost to the Australian taxpayer, since most infrastructure projects are in fact publicly funded.

When I say that we are looking at a wide gap, I refer back to my earlier comments, because the seed for the failure that has reflected itself in that $7 billion was found at a time when people should have been directed into technical training and into skills training but were in fact directed into university-level training. That is the best example I can give, and the most current example I can give you, of the failure of the legislation we see attempting to be addressed in this bill here this evening.

The Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012 is too little, too late, and it fails to address the fundamentals. It fails to address the cause of why we are where we are today. Why is it that a country as wealthy as Australia, a country with the education system that we have, has failed its participants? It has failed its students, it is failing its teachers, it is failing its academics, it is failing industry and it is failing the Australian community and the Australian taxpayer. For the life of me, I cannot see why this should be so.

As a person who has worked in Asia, the Middle East and India over the last 15 to 20 years, I have seen where their deficiencies lie. Their deficiencies are not those of our country. If you drive on a road in India, you can see where their infrastructure failures are. Ours is a country that surely should be a model—it should be right up the top. And yet we unfortunately see, starting with education, with failures of policy, the end result—where we are today.

Only last Wednesday, a week ago tomorrow, I was 600 metres underground at the Tindal gold mine in Coolgardie. There would probably be those who might wonder whether it would be wiser, Senator Farrell—through you, Mr Acting Deputy President—that I never came out of the mine!

Senator Farrell: I would never say that!

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Edwards): Order!

Senator BACK: The point I want to make to you, Mr Acting Deputy President, is this—well, two points. First of all, I only went underground because my grandfather had been a miner underground on the Golden Mile in Boulder in the 1920s. I have to say to you I had no desire to go underground, Senator Farrell; nevertheless, I did. Secondly, it was interesting talking to the
young mine manager—and I had a keen interest in his sense of occupational health, safety and wellbeing; it was principally my wellbeing that I was most interested in! We were talking about this very issue of skills development in the mining industry. And we would say with pride—of course, from Western Australia—that we are at this time enjoying an opportunity to support the wealth of our nation. I asked this young man, 'How are you going for trained staff?' He said, 'We can't get any.' I asked, 'Why is it that you can't get them—with Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, the school of mines?' He said, 'We can't get people out of the city; and, if we can get them out of the city, they've got no skills that are employable in this mine.' I said, 'If you actually had these people, could you employ them?' He said, 'We could employ them tomorrow.' I said, 'Where does the fault lie?' He said, 'It lies in skills and trade training.' This is a young fellow with no axe to grind—I don't know what his politics are; I don't care what they are—but he simply said to me that that was the case. I said to him, 'What's the overwhelming nationality of employees on this mine?' He said: 'New Zealanders. We have people from all countries of the world.' I said, 'How many Australians?' He said, 'Not many; principally New Zealanders.' I said, 'How do they get a job?' He described to me the situation of people who are actually outside the mine site, seeking work day after day, but because they do not have the necessary, basic skills to be employable, they are not getting this work.

I heard Senator Pratt, a Western Australian senator, also speaking of the need to get these people skilled up.

Senator Polley interjecting—

Senator BACK: But why is it, Senator Polley—through you, Mr Acting Deputy President—that we do not have a circumstance where our young people can be skilled up so that they can be employed? In fact, Senator Polley—through you, Mr Acting Deputy President—they spoke to me of a one-armed truck driver, who was very keen to work on the mine. He felt discriminated against because, as a one-armed truck driver, they could not employ him underground. It was not for his inability to drive a large truck underground; it was the fact that, when they took him underground, and they showed him the shaft—about 1½ metres wide, going up in 25-metre levels some 600 metres—and they said to him, 'Could you ascend those steps in the event of an emergency?' and he himself said, 'No, I could not.' So they employed him above ground, and some five to six years later that same person is still employed.

The point I want to make is that we have failed—we have failed the skilled sector, we have failed the technical sector and we are continuing to fail; and this piece of legislation is not going to address that one little bit. Last week I was in Karratha, in the Pilbara, right beside Dampier, right in the middle of our offshore oil and gas, and our burgeoning iron-ore industry, asking the same question: how are we addressing these wide gaps between skills that are needed and skills that are available? And here, sitting in Canberra tonight, we are not putting policies into place that will actually make these people employable. Is it a disappointment to me that young eastern Australians do not want to leave the east coast to come and take up these jobs? Of course it is. Are the policies right that allow young people who are fit and able and single to travel from where they live to places where they could be employed? No, and it is wrong that those policies are not in place. If a person is married with a family, I can understand that they cannot shift. I had to move, as a kid of 17, to Western Australia
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from Queensland to go to veterinary school, because I had that engagement, I had the
opportunity and I had that ambition. I had to
go to Tasmania, Senator Polley—through you, Mr Acting Deputy President—and I left
a wife and three children in Western
Australia, because I could see the
opportunity for work. And if we do not
inculcate into our young people the need to
work, the desire to work, the pleasure of the
ambition of work, of building up skills, then
we simply are disinheriting a population of
young people into the future. That is why I
feel so passionate, that the sorts of issues we
are addressing are not going be those that are
going to solve these problems.

I was also in the town of Geraldton last
week, on our mid-west coast. It is just north
of Geraldton that the Oakajee port will be
constructed, and it will open up the mid-west
of Western Australia to a new type of iron
ore, being magnetite, whereas it is hematite
that has been the driving force of the iron-ore
industry in the Pilbara region. As soon as
Oakajee is opened up—as soon as that port is
built—we are going to see a wonderful
expansion of that whole mid west region.
But once again we are going to come back to
the sorts of arguments that have torn the
Labor Party apart in the last few weeks,
arguments based in the tension between
employing Australians and having to bring in
overseas workers simply because we are not
putting the right fundamentals into place to
ensure that our young people can gain these
skills.

I wish to make another point in relation to
this. I made the observation at the beginning
that 15-year-old and 16-year-old boys
particularly do not often see the benefit of
higher education. They are not as mature as
girls at the same age. But my own experience
in agribusiness and agricultural education
from the 1970s through to the 1990s tells me
that if you can put in the face of these young
people the interest in and the desire for
higher education as they develop their own
skills they will redevelop the love of learning
that was lost in primary school and
secondary school and become the most
wonderful assets. People who start out at the
VET level—the technical skills area—can
very quickly, if they have that level of
interest, progress through to higher technical
and professional level education. Look at the
wealth of experience that they will gain from
working on the shopfloor right through as
they gain those skills.

That is what came out in the engineering
skills inquiry that was run by my associate
Senator Marshall as the deputy chair and my
other colleagues on the Senate Education,
Employment and Workplace Relations
Committee. That is what we need to be
developing in this country. That is the vision
that we need for young people in this
country. We do not want them sitting around
in places where there is no employment. We
do not want them sitting around feeling sorry
for themselves. We do not want them sitting
around because earlier generations of their
own family did not work. We have to set the
vision for them in a country where there is
every opportunity. We have to say to these
people, 'This is your future, and you have to
be part of the future rather than being part of
the problem.'

I do not want to dwell, as others have
done and as we all could do all night, on the
challenges that we face in this country to get
rid of the debt, to pay down the deficit and to
start benefitting from the boom. That boom
will not be there long into the future. Any of
us who get out there and talk with industry
and who engage with companies that are
working in Australia and other countries of
the world—working in Africa, working in
South America and other places—have been
told that they are positioning themselves
very well. Unfortunately, if we do not
increase our productivity and our competitiveness, we will be left behind and be a laughingstock; we will be the Europe of the middle of this century; it will be said of us that we let an opportunity slip through our fingers. The Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency Bill) 2012 is just a grain of sand on the beach. That beach ought to be the coastline for the future of this country. Regrettably, this bill is not going to turn us into the learning and productive nation that we need to be.

Senator IAN MACDONALD (Queensland) (20:40): It is always a pleasure to follow two speakers who clearly know their subject and who are passionate about training. I congratulate Senator Abetz and Senator Back on their understanding of and their commitment to skills in Australia. I participate in this debate tonight because, coming from North Queensland and Northern Australia, I see the impact upon Australia, Australians and our economy of the lack of skills and the atrocious system for training our young people currently in place under the Gillard government and before that the Rudd government.

I want to share some of the facts that come to me through my office. I am conscious, though, of time and there are a number of other senators who would like to contribute to the debate on the Skills Australia Amendment (Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency) Bill 2012. But because of an unholy alliance between the Greens and the Australian Labor Party, debate on this bill has been curtailed. Right through this year the Greens and the Labor Party, debate on this bill has been curtailed. Right through this year the Greens and the Labor Party have got together and taken from this parliament its ability—its duty—to properly scrutinise legislation that is brought before it. While, as previous speakers from the coalition have indicated, we will not be opposing this bill, there are a number of issues relevant to skills training in Australia which need to be debated and which we would like to engage the Greens and the Australian Labor Party in debate on to challenge some of the ideas that come forward. But, because of this guillotining of debate in this parliament that the Australian Labor Party and the Greens have embarked upon, my time in this debate will be severely curtailed and I am conscious that a number of my colleagues who want to speak will not get the opportunity to do so.

The Howard government recognised the need to get appropriate skills training in Australia. That is why we set up Australian technical colleges. I have to tell you that, while this area of policy is not something with which I am totally familiar, the Australian technical college that was set up in Townsville—where my office is located—was very well supported. The work that it was doing in training people in the skills needed in Australia was first class. It was run by a board of skilled people who had an interest in industry and training and the employment that is needed in the industries that are prevalent in Northern Australia. When the Labor Party came to government in 2007 they annihilated that great model of training, the Australian technical colleges, and that is really one of the causes of the significant problems that we have in finding the right people for the right jobs in Australia at the present time. It is very difficult in Townsville or in Ayr, where I live, to even get your car serviced these days. Why? Because motor mechanics, who used to fix cars of ordinary citizens like myself, have now been lured into the mines with big pay offers. Why are they doing that? Because there are no properly skilled people available to fill all the jobs that are currently available in Australia. Other industries in Northern Australia, such as the sugar industry, are finding it difficult to get skilled people
because of this shortage and, regrettably, the
current government has done absolutely
nothing about it.

This bill is not one that would have been
introduced in this form, had the coalition
been in government. It does make some
amendments to the Skills Australia
arrangement, set up by the Rudd Labor
government a few short years ago, but it
seems already that even the Labor Party
understands that Mr Rudd's proposal was
basically without merit. So, it is bringing in
this new Australian Workforce and
Productivity Agency, which is to replace
Skills Australia. One of the new roles given
to this organisation, over and above what
Skills Australia had, is to provide advice to
the minister on improving productivity in the
Australian workforce. From looking at this,
it seems that the thing that this is going to do
for employment in Australia is to give Paul
Howes—the great backer, the 'clackeur', of
the Labor Party, the one who was
instrumental in changing the prime
ministership from Mr Rudd to Ms Gillard—a
job on the board. Perhaps the minister in
summing up could tell me just how many
jobs Mr Howes does have from this
government and what he gets paid for those
jobs that he takes on.

We know about the Labor Party's unholy
alliance with the union movement in
Australia, and we know what the union
movement is like when it comes to
productivity. You only have to see what has
happened in the Health Services Union.
Have a look at the productivity gains there.
The productivity gains for their officials,
including the current member for Dobell in
his past role as an official, are there for
everyone to see. Certainly, one would
wonder what the member for Dobell's
productivity was in his role in the Health
Services Union. Fair Work Australia—the
organisation set up by the Labor government,
which seems to be made up by people whose
former lives were as trade union officials—
has suggested that Mr Thomson used
whatever funds of that union he could get his
hands on for what could only be described as
nefarious ends.

One wonders if what happened in the
HSU is unique to that union. My experience
is that many unions operate in a way similar
to the HSU. Coming from Queensland, I
know the inordinate influence the Australian
Workers Union has had in that state. We
only need to look at the influence of big Bill
Ludwig in my state of Queensland and his
role in the AWU. One of the results of big
Bill Ludwig's influence in Queensland we
see in the chamber here every day with his
son, Senator Joe Ludwig, who is a minister
in this government. Some would wonder
whether he would attain the rank of minister
were it not for the influence of his father in
the AWU. We see that the AWU's tentacles
get further and further entwined within the
Australian Labor Party government with the
appointment under this bill of Mr Paul
Howes, the Australian secretary, as I
understand it, of the Australian Workers
Union. One would wonder what Mr Howes
could contribute to the productivity of the
workforce, and it is something that the
coalition will be keeping a very close eye
upon.

There are quite a number of other issues
that I did want to raise in relation to this bill.
I notice that the budget papers said that the
new organisation, the Australian Workforce
and Productivity Agency, was to undertake
research. But this bill says that the agency
would be assessing research, not undertaking
research. One wonders where the
compatibility lies between those two
descriptions of what the agency might do. I
have known in the past, and far be it from me
to suggest it now, that previous Labor
governments have given big grants of money
to unions to look into things that are being
talked about in this bill—productivity issues.
Big grants go to unions to participate almost
as contractors in this sort of research and
then, lo and behold, the same union makes a
donation back to the ALP for its election
campaigns. One cannot help but be
suspicious and wonder whether there is not a
bit of a round-robin here, but the shame of
that, of course, is that it is taxpayers' money
that first goes to the union in the way of
grants and then somehow ends up in a
roundabout way back in the pockets of the
ALP for election campaigning. I just wonder,
and perhaps I am a little bit suspicious, why
the budget papers talk about undertaking
research whereas the bill says that they will
not be doing any undertaking of research and
they will just be assessing research that I
assume would be produced by others.

There are a lot of other things that I would
like to say about this bill but I am conscious
that my colleagues also want to make a
contribution, so I will leave my contribution
at that point while letting the Labor Party
know that we will be very closely assessing
the way that this bill works out in practice.
We will certainly be closely watching the
work of the increased board of Skills
Australia, now called the Australian
Workforce and Productivity Agency, and we
will be wanting to see how that board—and
the agency—operates in the way that it is
required to as in this bill before the
parliament. I conclude my remarks there
because of the guillotine and because I am
aware that my colleagues are very keen to
also make a contribution on this bill.

Senator HUMPHRIES (Australian
Capital Territory) (20:53): I want to
contribute on the Skills Australia
Amendment (Australian Workforce and
Productivity Agency) Bill 2012 although
there is not much opportunity to do so
because, as Senator Macdonald has pointed
out, this important issue has to be put to an
early bed because the government believes it
is more important to get through its business
in a certain time frame than to allow the
parliament to do its job. However, I want to
make a contribution to this debate that
reflects on the importance of ensuring that as
a nation we have a better focus on
productivity than has been the case in recent
days.

I recall sitting in this chamber in the last
few years of the Howard government when
we had a very strong economy and very
strong growth. We had a budget that was in
surplus, we had virtually no debt—debt was
being eliminated or had been eliminated—
we saw low interest rates, we saw low
unemployment and a lot was going very well
for the Australian community, particularly
for the Australian worker. We were coming
to the point where real wages had risen
during the life of the Howard government by
something like 20 per cent. Labor, the
opposition as it then was on this side of the
chamber, wanted to criticise the performance
of the Howard government and it latched on
to the question of productivity because it was
able to discover, amidst all that good news,
that there was a little bit of a dark lining on
the very white cloud, which was that
productivity was not improving as much as
the rest of the Australian economy. They
latched onto that and made a big issue of that
before the 2007 election.

So one might expect that in the 4½ years
or so in which the Labor Party has held the
Treasury benches there would have been
some very significant progress on the
question of the productivity of the Australian
economy, because there has not been much
progress on things like unemployment,
bringing debt down or having surplus
budgets. So you might expect that in this
area, which had been such an issue, there
might have been some progress. Yet have we
discovered, not long ago, that under this government Australian productivity has fallen. It has fallen, not gone up. It has not even been sustained at the same level; it has actually fallen. Despite a bevy of reports from the Productivity Commission on ways in which the Australian economy might be made more productive, that advice has in large part been ignored by this government, with the result that productivity is indeed falling. It takes a special level of ineptitude to have an economy which is at least in part so strong as this one is, with so many opportunities existing to do things better, and to find that the productivity of the Australian economy has fallen.

And it is not surprising when we see the way in which this government has handled the issues surrounding productivity. It has wound back flexibility in the workplace. Those opposite should not jump up with a little scare campaign about Work Choices—I am not arguing for a return to Work Choices—but you backed away from the idea of flexibility in the workplace, and that is very much at the heart of how you get more productivity. You have wiped that off the slate: ‘We’re not interested in that.’ You backed away from promises to increase training at school level. What happened to the 2,650 trade training centres in Australian secondary schools you promised at the 2007 election? What happened to them? They went the same way as the 37 GP superclinics and the 260 Australian childcare centres—all washed away in the tide of history and all promises broken by the Labor Party. But those promises about the trade training centres were about in part skills and productivity and, of course, they have gone; they have disappeared.

I think that is why I feel so suspicious about the creation of the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency. We were told very much in the lifetime of many people in this chamber that we were going to have a wonderful new world with respect to skills by virtue of Skills Australia being set up. That is now being swept aside. That is a promise that you can afford to have broken, because you have got another promise to make: you are now going to have an Australian workforce and productivity agency which is supposedly going to fix this problem and there are going to be many millions of dollars poured into that and that is going to solve the problem that has not been solved to date. Well, you can forgive me for being a little bit suspicious and cynical about the approach that this government is taking. There is a hollowness about so much that this government says in these areas that one has to be very suspicious.

We have a new body set up which mentions the word ‘productivity’. Why? Because the government is failing on that front, it needs to do something on that front and it needs to appear to be acting on the question of productivity. It has got a lot of money being poured into it. That is the classic Labor response to this issue: pile the money in—of course, mostly borrowed money. And it has got a board which is well salted with trade union friends more noted for their factional loyalty to the Labor Party than for their skills in things like productivity and we have a promise that this is going to fix the question of skills take-up and productivity in the Australian workforce. I am sorry, but I do not believe it. I see more of the rubbish that we have had from this government in these areas, and the structure of this legislation only lends itself to that kind of cynicism. As Senator Macdonald pointed out, the budget papers promise that this new Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency would undertake research, that it will have the capacity to undertake research. What research is it going
to do? Apparently now none, according to the bill. It is going to only be assessing research.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Parry): Order! The time allocated for the consideration of this bill has now expired. The question is that this bill be now read a second time.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Parry) (21:00): The question now is that the remaining stages of the bill be agreed to and this bill be now passed.

Question agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Corporations Amendment (Future of Financial Advice) Bill 2012
Corporations Amendment (Further Future of Financial Advice Measures) Bill 2012

Second Reading

Debate resumed on the motion:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Senator CORMANN (Western Australia) (21:00): The coalition cannot support the Corporations Amendment (Future of Financial Advice) Bill 2012 and the Corporations Amendment (Further Future of Financial Advice Measures) Bill 2012 in their current form. This government has run a highly conflicted and highly ideological anti small business agenda in the financial services space. If this legislation were to be put to a vote in the Senate in its current form, we on the coalition side of this chamber would not be able to support it, because we stand up both for business and consumers and for sensible, well-balanced, good public policy. When this government is presented with an opportunity to impose more red tape, more complexity and more costs on both business and consumers they will always go that way, in particular if they can help to promote the vested interests agenda of their friends in the union-dominated industry super funds movement, which of course is right behind all the contentious aspects of this legislation.

If passed in their current form, these FoFA bills would unnecessarily increase red tape and the cost of advice for consumers, and they would also reduce consumer choice and competition. In our view the legislation before us today is unnecessarily complex and in large parts unclear. It is expected to cause job losses in the financial services industry. Even according to the government’s own explanatory memorandum to this legislation, about 6,800 jobs in the financial services industry will go as a direct result of this legislation. Industry estimates are more in the range of 25,000 to 35,000. According to conservative industry estimates, it is also likely to cost about $700 million to implement and a further $350 million per annum to comply with the legislation. Mr Acting Deputy President Fawcett, you would think that a piece of legislation that will have this impact on an important industry like the financial services industry would go as a direct result of this legislation. Industry estimates are more in the range of 25,000 to 35,000. According to conservative industry estimates, it is also likely to cost about $700 million to implement and a further $350 million per annum to comply with the legislation. Mr Acting Deputy President Fawcett, you would think that a piece of legislation that will have this impact on an important industry like the financial services industry would have gone through a proper and rigorous policy development process, that the government would comply with their own internal process requirements in assessing the impact that that regulation will have on both the industry and consumers and that the government would properly assess the cost-
benefit equation. But of course the government has not done that. The government has failed to assess. The government has failed to go through its own proper processes in assessing the merits or otherwise and in assessing the cost-benefit equation in this legislation.

I repeat: this is legislation which the government itself told us in the explanatory memorandum to this bill will cost about 6,800 jobs in the financial services industry and it is a piece of legislation which conservative industry estimates indicate will cost about $700 million to implement and a further $350 million to $375 million a year to comply with after. If you do not run a proper regulatory impact assessment on a piece of legislation like this, what legislation do you run a regulatory impact assessment on? If you throw your processes out the window for a piece of legislation like this, that process is quite frankly not worth the paper that it is written on.

In pursuing regulatory change, the parliament must focus on making things better, not just more complex and more costly for everyone. The parliament must avoid regulatory overreach where more red tape increases costs for both business and consumers for little or no additional consumer protection benefit. Parliament also needs to be mindful that the bills before us today have already caused an increased concentration of advice providers, driving an entirely undesirable reduction in competition and choice for consumers. The coalition supports sensible reforms which increase trust and confidence in Australia's financial advice and financial services industry by increasing transparency, choice and competition; however, any reforms in this area do need to strike the right balance between appropriate levels of consumer protection and the need to ensure the ongoing availability, accessibility and affordability of high-quality financial advice.

This deeply conflicted and highly ideological anti small business government has failed to achieve the right balance with by FoFA, because it failed to comply with its own most basic internal process requirements around best practice regulation. And of course it was none other than the government's own Office of Best Practice Regulation that made the very damning assessment that these bills do not comply with the government's own best practice regulation requirements. This is highly unsatisfactory, given the complexity and costs associated with, in particular, the contentious parts of the proposed FoFA changes. The coalition recommends that the parliament insist on a proper regulatory impact statement that complies with the government's own best practice regulation requirements. This is why, on behalf of the coalition, I will be moving a second reading amendment that requires the government comply with its own processes in relation to best practice regulation assessments and regulatory impact statements before the Senate considers these bills any further.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Fawcett): Senator Cormann, do you wish to move that amendment now?

Senator CORMANN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Acting Deputy President. I move:

At the end of the motion, add "but, that further consideration of these bills be an order of the day for the first sitting day after the Government has tabled for these bills a regulatory impact statement which has been assessed by the Office of Best Practice Regulation as compliant with its requirements."

For example, there is no precedent in the world for introducing the sort of additional red tape that would result from the introduction of the government's opt-in
Minister Shorten clearly is intent, at the behest of the Industry Super Network, on making Australia the world champions in red tape. I know we are very keen to be the world champions in many things, but the world champions in red tape is not a goal that we should aspire to as a nation. Every time you increase the levels of red tape, every time you increase complexity and impose unnecessary additional compliance burdens, you actually reduce our productivity and impose significant additional costs on the economy, which of course hold us back from reaching the full potential we should always be striving for.

The coalition have very constructively engaged in this debate. We have made a series of very sensible and constructive recommendations on how this flawed legislation currently before the Senate can be improved. In fact, the coalition have presented a 16-point plan as part of our dissenting report attached to the report of the parliamentary joint committee inquiry into this particular legislation, which sets out in some detail how we think this legislation can be improved. We urge this Labor government and we urge the Greens, even at this late stage, to carefully reflect on the recommendations we have made.

This is a process that has been going for some time. Ever since Minister Shorten took responsibility for this portfolio there has been a lot of chopping and changing. He has backed down on a number of his very ill-considered early forays in this space. In April 2011 he announced that the government would ban all commissions and like payments on all individual and group risk, which was always a dumb idea; it was always going to be bad policy, it was clearly ill-thought out and it was something he was pushed into by a vested interest agenda in part of one segment of the financial services market that he is particularly close to. Of course he had no choice other than to completely back down from what was always a bad idea and that was always driven by a deeply conflicted approach to policy development in this area. We think he should have done likewise in relation to some of the other contentious bids.

Where did all this start? All this started with the so-called Ripoll inquiry. Perhaps I can take a step back here. Financial advisers provide a very important service to the community. They help people with their financial health and wellbeing. They help people manage financial risks and maximise financial opportunities. They deal with other people's money, which is why it is important to have an appropriately robust regulatory framework in place. However, whenever we consider making changes to that regulatory framework we do, as I said earlier, have to work on getting the balance right. After the global financial crisis, clearly it was appropriate for us to consider whether the regulatory framework was still appropriate in the wake of collapses like Storm Financial, Westpoint, Trio and others. But let me just make the point that, overall, the financial services industry in Australia performed very, very well in the context of the global financial crisis. The incidents were isolated incidents, and the proposal to force clients to resign contracts with their advisers on a regular basis would have done nothing to prevent the collapse of Storm, Trio or Westpoint, for example.

Of course, the reason I can say that is that when the Ripoll inquiry—the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services—ran a thorough inquiry in relation to all this in 2009, they received well in excess of 400 submissions. Out of all those submission, how many do you think recommended that we have enshrined in legislation a requirement that people should be forced to resign contracts with their
financial advisers on a regular basis—the so-called opt-in proposal? Out of more than 400 submissions, one of those submissions recommended that we have a requirement enshrined in legislation that clients should be forced to resign contracts with their advisor on a regular basis, taking away the freedom of individuals to make their own choices and their own decisions on how long they want to engage into a contractual relationship with a particular service provider for. One single submission recommended that particular change. Two guesses as to who that one submission came from. It was the Industry Super Network, a gentleman called David Whitely. He came to see me, week in week out, and said, 'Can't I negotiate a deal with you?' He came to see me in my office as if he were talking on behalf of the government, trying to negotiate a deal.

There is only one reason Minister Shorten has put this particular aspect into this legislation, and that is that the Industry Super Network and David Whitely insisted on it. It is not about good policy. I am very happy for Bernie Ripoll; he has since been promoted to Parliamentary Secretary to the Treasurer, and good luck to him. He was a very good chair of that inquiry, and the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services, under his leadership, did a very good job. It delivered a unanimous bipartisan report with a series of 11 or 12 recommendations that were very sensible recommendations, widely supported across the industry and with bipartisan support across the parliament. And what did Mr Shorten do? Instead of implementing those recommendations he jumped on the one recommendation that was put forward by the Industry Super Network—one out of more than 400 submissions—and said, 'No, I'm going to attach that to it.' That means it was 2½ years after the Ripoll inquiry reported before we actually got the opportunity to deal with this legislation to improve the financial services regulatory framework. This minister has allowed the reform agenda to be completely hijacked by one particular vested-interest perspective in the financial services market, which clearly is pursuing a particular commercial interest. If this was about good policy, we could have implemented the 11 recommendations made by the Ripoll inquiry back in November-December 2009. That was years ago. We could have had the better and improved financial services regulatory framework in place years ago. But because this government and this minister were so intent on pursuing a conflicted, vested-interest agenda here we are years later.

This is legislation that is supposed to come into effect on 1 July 2012. That is 11 days away. So here we have a piece of legislation which is very complex and which has significant system change requirements at the end of it and we are debating it in the Senate today. I can well understand why this completely dysfunctional, incompetent and divided government want to guillotine debate on this bill tomorrow. If they do not guillotine debate on this tomorrow, we might well still be debating it after it is supposed to have come into effect. Then magnanimously at some point the minister said: 'We are going to have a soft start. We are going to leave it optional as to whether people comply with it from 1 July 2012. The hard start is going to be as of 1 July 2013.' When this legislation went through the House of Representatives the government was not even ready to move amendments to that effect, even though the government had made those commitments way earlier. The way the government and Minister Shorten have handled this debate has been incompetent, chaotic and disrespectful to an important industry across Australia. It has had serious implications already on the
structure of the industry and not for the better for consumers. It has already resulted, as I said earlier, in reduced choice, reduced competition and increased costs for consumers for little or no additional consumer protection benefit.

There are a series of very specific issues that we are concerned about in relation to these bills—for example, the chopping and changing. The minister had given commitments for sometime, all throughout the consultation period, that the changes in terms of the additional annual fee disclosure requirements and the opt-in requirements would be prospective only—that they would not apply to existing clients; they would only apply to new clients. When the draft of the legislation was released in the second half of last year, out of nowhere, all of a sudden, they were to apply to everyone. I do not expect people in Treasury to necessarily know how a business is run. I do not expect people in the Labor government to know how business is run. But they should make it their business to find out what the cost implications and system implications of some of the changes they are pursuing are ultimately for consumers before they impose all this additional red tape and complexity.

We have long supported the introduction of a best interest duty. We have long supported that. If we had had a sensible discussion on how that should be enshrined into the Corporations Act we could have passed it long ago. The best interest duty really should be an important and central part of the FoFA changes. However, the way it is currently drafted in this legislation is not clear enough. It still leaves the opportunity for confusion, and we should avoid confusion and minimise the risk of future disputes by tightening up the definition of the best interest duty. The current version of the proposed best interest duty included in the current FoFA bill is certainly an improvement on the version included in the exposure draft; however, the coalition remain concerned that the catch-all provision contained in proposed section 961B(2)(g) would create uncertainty for both clients and their advisers. We recommend that this clause be removed from the best interest duty.

We also think it is important to provide certainty around the provision of scaled advice. One way of ensuring that clients are able to access affordable and appropriate financial advice would be to allow advisers and their clients to limit the scope of the advice to a series of discrete areas identified by the clients rather than to mandate a full financial plan in every case. We also think that the government still has a bit of work to do on fixing the status of risk insurance inside superannuation.

In short, if the coalition is elected to government at the next election, we will fix Labor’s FoFA mess because this legislation, which has already been passed by the House of Representatives, never went through a proper regulatory impact assessment, because Labor’s FoFA bills will increase red tape and costs for both business and consumers by reducing choice, competition and diversity across the financial services industry, because it is unnecessarily complex and in large part still unclear and because, according to Minister Shorten himself, it will cause job losses in the financial services industry. We, the coalition, if we are successful at the next election, will pursue the complete removal of opt in, pursue the simplification and streamlining of the additional annual fee disclosure requirements, improve the best interest duty, provide certainty around the provision and availability of scaled advice and refine the ban of commissions on risk insurance inside superannuation further to go beyond the backdown that the minister has pursued since
his April 2011 announcement. The government's handling of this legislation has been completely inept and the Senate should not be supporting these currently deeply flawed bills. (*Time expired*)

Senator THISTLETHWAITE (New South Wales) (21:20): I am pleased to rise in support of the Corporations Amendment (Future of Financial Advice) Bill 2012 and the Corporations Amendment (Further Future of Financial Advice Measures) Bill 2012. I was pleased to be a member of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services that conducted an extensive inquiry into the proposed operations of these bills. The bills have come about as a result of an inquiry that was conducted by the parliamentary joint committee into financial products and services in Australia. This inquiry came about as a result of the shocking circumstances that occurred in the case of Opes Prime and Storm Financial, where there were financial collapses and thousands of particularly small-time mum and dad investors lost millions of dollars in retirement income and savings.

The government acted to ensure that appropriate regulation was put in place to prevent these circumstances in the future. These reforms deliver on that commitment to strengthen the regulatory framework around the provision of financial services in this country and to improve the quality of financial advice that is being provided by product suppliers and advisers to investors. This new system will build trust and confidence in the financial planning industry through enhanced standards, through the alignment of the interests of consumers and advisers and through a reduction in conflicts.

The first tranche of the legislation is the Corporations Act to require financial advisers to provide a fee disclosure statement to a client when charging advice fees for longer than 12 months and to require financial advisers to provide a renewal notice to a client when charging advice fees for longer than 24 months. The bill also extends the Australian Securities and Investments Commission's licensing and planning powers used to supervise the financial services industry. These reforms will apply to advisers and fee recipients in situations where they provide personal advice.

The first aspect of this bill sets in place arrangements which require financial advisers to obtain their retail clients' agreement in order to charge ongoing fees for financial advice. This is known as the opt-in requirement. This comes about as a result of unengaged investors being unaware of commissions and fees that they may be charged in certain circumstances relating to advice and products that they use in respect of financial services. Currently there are some clients of financial advisers who pay ongoing fees for financial advice who receive little or no service. Some clients are unaware of the amount of fees that they pay, and this is occurring despite the fact that most ongoing advice contracts allow a client to opt out at any time.

The initial disclosure of ongoing advice fees does not assist, as the disclosure is not ongoing. That is the basis of these reforms—to ensure that that lethargy is taken out of the relationship and that there is ongoing disclosure. Under these arrangements, the basic requirement is that advisers must obtain their clients' agreement to renew at least once every two years, as well as giving clients the fee disclosure statement at least every year. The renewal notice empowers the client to renew or end the ongoing fee arrangement. If the client does not respond to the renewal notice, they are assumed to have
terminated the advice relationship and no further fees can be charged by the adviser. If the adviser breaches by overcharging after the client has not opted in, they could be subject to a civil penalty. There is flexibility as to when and how advisers obtain the renewal notice. The bill provides for additional grace periods if a client inadvertently opts out by not responding to a renewal notice on time.

The disclosure notice is an important supplement to the renewal requirement and supports fee transparency. It includes fee and service information about the previous and forthcoming 12 months and assists clients to understand whether they are receiving a service from their adviser commensurate with the ongoing fee that they are paying. This reform very much focuses on what is in the client's best interests.

The second aspect of this bill is that providers of financial advice must be licensed by ASIC as part of facilitating investor confidence that those persons are competent and of good fame and character. Licensees also have representatives who act on their behalf, and ASIC has powers to protect the public, including by applying a variety of administrative remedies against a licensee who breaches the law.

During the parliamentary joint committee inquiry into the provision of financial services, a number of witnesses and ASIC raised concerns about ASIC's ability to protect investors by restricting or removing unscrupulous operators from the industry. A number of factors were impacting on the exercise of ASIC's powers, including decisions of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal relating to when someone will breach the law, the difficulty with removing individuals given the focus on licensees in the Corporations Act and the lack of scope for ASIC to remove representatives in certain circumstances, such as where they are not of good fame and character. The changes in this bill implement the recommendations of the parliamentary joint committee and will strengthen that important gatekeeping function of the role the public expect ASIC to play when it comes to the licensing of those providing financial services in our economy.

The regime will extend ASIC's powers to remove unsatisfactory persons from the industry. The changes to the licensing and banning thresholds include that ASIC can refuse or cancel a licence or ban a person where that person is likely to contravene the law. ASIC may also remove representatives if they are not competent, if they are not of good fame and character or if they are involved in breaches of the law. Again, this ensures that integrity, respect and confidence are built into the system. This is aimed at providing better service for clients.

In respect of this law, an amendment was moved and accepted in the House of Representatives to allow for a voluntary commencement date rather than a compulsory commencement date for this provision of 1 July this year, with a mandatory commencement date to apply from July 2013. This will allow providers in the industry to do what they do best: compete with each other to ensure that there is a race to become FoFA compliant, thus ensuring that their advisers and those working to provide financial advice comply with the new laws. I think that we will see such a race to ensure compliance with FoFA and that particular firms and advisers will then advertise their compliance to the market. It will be a means of attracting customers and improving professionalism and of driving change in the industry with the aim of ensuring better financial advice for people.
The second tranche of the FoFA reforms is contained in the Corporations Amendment (Further Future of Financial Advice Measures) Bill 2012. This bill contains two key measures to improve professionalism, relating to the quality of advice and to boosting confidence. This will be done by employing and imposing a statutory best interest duty on financial advisers. As the name suggests, the duty requires advisers to act in the best interests of their clients and to put their clients' interests ahead of their own. One would think that would be a common practice. Unfortunately, advice to the parliamentary joint committee was that that does not always occur, particularly in circumstances where commissions may apply to the provision of particular products and to the on-selling of those to clients in the industry. The duty does not require advisers to give their best advice, but it is a legislative requirement that financial advisers' processes and motivations are focused on what is in the best interests of their clients. It is true that, ultimately, this will lead to better advice in most cases, but first and foremost it is about regulating conflicts of interest not about the intrinsic quality of the advice provided. The bill strikes a balance between certainty and flexibility for the adviser in satisfying the duty. The duty requires that the provider of the advice take steps that would reasonably be regarded as being in the best interests of the client.

The legislation states the circumstances and steps that a prudent adviser should take to satisfy the duty. They include identifying the objectives, financial situation and needs of the client that were disclosed; identifying the subject matter of the advice that is being sought; identifying the objectives, financial situation and needs of the client that would reasonably be considered to be relevant; making reasonable inquiries to obtain a complete and accurate picture of the client's circumstances and basing all judgments in advising the client on the client's relevant circumstances. Those are some of the points in the legislation that advisers can look to for guidance on fulfilling the best interest duty.

The second aspect of this tranche of the legislation is that the bill imposes a key aspect of the government's response to the Ripoll report—the parliamentary joint committee report—that is, a ban on the receipt of conflicted remuneration by financial advisers, including commissions from product issuers. It is crucial to the integrity of the advice industry that the consumer can be confident that the adviser is working for them rather than for the product provider. For the most part, advisers will not be able to receive remuneration from product issuers or from anyone else if that remuneration could reasonably be expected to influence financial advice provided to a retail client. These reforms do not prevent an adviser receiving a particular stream of income if the adviser is confident that that income does not conflict advice. For example, in the case of the receipt of income related to volume product sales or investable funds there is a presumption that the income will conflict advice; however, this is a presumption only. If the adviser can demonstrate that receipt of the income does not conflict advice then such remuneration will be permissible under the bill. There are reasonable exceptions built into this tranche of the legislation, which relate to advice associated with insurance products, life insurance that is not bundled as part of a superannuation product and other related advice.

The aims of these reforms are very much to ensure that people can have confidence in getting financial advice and ultimately that more Australians will seek financial advice, particularly in the context of their superannuation investments. It is well
understood by the Australian community that most people, particularly younger Australians, are uninterested in and uninformed about their superannuation investments. The focus of these reforms is to ensure that those investors can have confidence in the system of advice and, importantly, that they can get advice that is appropriate to their circumstances. It is often referred to as scaled advice and is particularly appropriate for younger investors and people investing in superannuation. For instance, if someone is seeking basic information about an investment product, they may walk into a bank or go to a financial adviser to seek advice on how they should invest the $10,000 or $20,000 they have sitting in a bank account. This 'best interests' duty and the other reforms to the Corporations Act will drive and inspire people's confidence in that advice, and ensure that there are appropriate safeguards and exemptions for the providers of that advice from authorised deposit-taking institutions—and there are certain carve-outs in respect of those ADIs.

All in all, these reforms are positive ones. They are part of the suite of reforms introduced into this area by the minister, Bill Shorten, aimed at boosting the confidence of people seeking financial advice in this country in the advice they receive, aimed at ensuring more people seek financial advice and aimed at improving the quality of the financial advice that is being given. But ultimately these reforms are ensuring that, as the population ages and people begin to invest more and more in their superannuation, they make wiser decisions, decisions that are in their best interests and in the interests of the productivity of this economy. I commend these bills to the Senate.

**Senator FARRELL** (South Australia—Parliamentary Secretary for Sustainability and Urban Water) (21:38): I table two supplementary explanatory memoranda relating to the government amendments to be moved to the Corporations Amendment (Future of Financial Advice) Bill 2012 and the Corporations Amendment (Further Future of Financial Advice Measures) Bill 2012.

**Senator BOYCE** (Queensland) (21:39): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the FoFA bills. We in the coalition support financial reform—intelligent, good financial reform. We are not entirely sure that that is what we have here. I am privileged, I think, to have been a member of the Parliamentary Joint Committee on Corporations and Financial Services for a number of years, and to be deputy chair in the more recent past. I was involved in what is now known as the Ripoll inquiry, which came up with a bipartisan report containing some very sensible ideas on how to go about improving the financial planning industry—improving not just the delivery of financial services but also Australians' knowledge of financial services.

I must admit that I continue to be concerned that, while we discuss the lack of engagement of investors in their investments in many cases, we do not really analyse why that might be. There have been a number of inquiries into how we get people to be more engaged. One thing that suddenly emerged from nowhere and is still in this legislation is the idea of a mandatory opt-in by people receiving financial planning services. Every two years, they must sign a letter sent to them by their adviser which says, 'Yes, I still want to be advised by you.' If it were that simple to engage people, that would be wonderful. But that is not how it happens.

It seems to me that we really need to consider more carefully the delivery of superannuation to the many investment funds
it currently goes into. Employees do not see their superannuation, under the super guarantee levy arrangements, except as a line item on a statement of their wages. It is not money that they are consciously asked to put into super. It is not money that they perceive as having been cordoned off from one use in favour of another use. In effect, the majority of workers in Australia see their pay minus the super levy, and that is what they see as their base income. They really do not think of that nine per cent amount, which is set to increase, as theirs. I think that is one of the issues that we need to look at far more closely: how we engage consumers, investors, in their investments.

So the Ripoll inquiry came up with its bipartisan report, and then suddenly, out of nowhere, some of the recommendations were taken up in the FoFA legislation, while others were completely ignored. One of the more irritating aspects of looking at this legislation when we did was that there was other legislation around the MySuper scheme that was not known at the time and other regulations that were not known at the time. A good deal of the inquiry was taken up by financial planners and others explaining to us how incredibly difficult it would be for them to redesign their systems so that they could meet the government's implementation date of 1 July 2012, which at the time was about four months away. Of course, all that is now irrelevant because yes—thank goodness—Mr Shorten did see that it was foolish to ask the financial sector to change systems for the purposes of the opt-in and fee disclosure provisions from 1 July 2012 when everything would have to be to rearranged all over again from 1 July 2013 for the MySuper provisions, which will affect pretty much the same information deliverers.

So at least that recommendation was taken up. But it did mean, as I said before, that quite a lot of the committee's work was wasted in looking into issues which subsequently changed. I think that can only be one demonstration of how poorly some of this material was thought out before it was first put into the legislation. The fact that we have yet more explanatory memoranda tabled tonight by the government about amendments to the legislation suggests at least that they are listening but also that they should have listened a lot earlier to what is being said by stakeholders throughout the industry and by others.

This is the second time today I have spoken about the government's implementation deadlines for material. It would be nice if only in the e-health area the government was also prepared to put the mandatory start date out to July next year not July this year when we have the bizarre situation described earlier by Parliamentary Secretary McLucas that for an e-health online system you can only register over the phone or in person at a Medicare office on the start date of 1 July. At least we know with this one that it is voluntary for financial planners to begin to send out information saying, 'Do you want me to be your financial adviser from 1 July 2012 and mandatory from next year?' At least that is a start. Hopefully online systems will all be sorted out by then. However, we continue to find the opt-in system a strange and anti-business approach to take.

We have quite a lot of governance in this area. There is no reason we cannot continue to improve it. Many financial planners are small businesses. It would seem to me there has been no effort whatsoever put into understanding the needs of small business involved in this area. They range from huge organisations through to quite small organisations and the different needs of those two areas have never been properly assessed or looked at by the government in terms of the legislation. The Financial Services
Council had a function in Parliament House this very evening which was addressed by Minister Shorten. Members of the Financial Services Council account for $1.8 trillion of Australian investments, a staggering amount and just a proportion of the funds under investment in Australia. In fact the financial services industry accounts for 10 per cent of GDP and, as was pointed out tonight by Minister Shorten, we have a very small export industry of financial services planning and advice. If that were to be expanded, as it certainly should be with the growing middle classes of Indonesia, China, India et cetera, we can expect this to become an even more massive industry. It is not a massive industry made up of all massive players; there are many small players in this industry, people represented by the Financial Planning Association, for example. They can be quite small, one professional adviser businesses with some administrative support. We need to think about that as well when we take issues around the provision of financial advice into consideration.

I was interested to see that the Financial Planning Association has looked at some with amendments to the FoFA bill and said: 'It's heavily amended. It's not exactly what we wanted but it does deliver. In the end, the final shape of FoFA delivers a sensible outcome for Australia's professional planners and their clients.' With some of the reforms that suddenly emerged halfway through, Mr Mike Rantall, the CEO of the Financial Planning Association said:

We have fought hard for our members from the first hurdle to the last. We hope they will see that the end result is what counts. For FPA members the formal opt-in process may not apply and they may not be subject to the law at all. Our members are also in the best possible position to be captured under the restricted definition of the term 'financial planner' which will be tabled in parliament next year. There are no other groups or bodies that can claim these concessions for their members.

So one hopes that all the mays and mights and 'We'll let you know next year' come to pass for the Financial Planning Association. It was more interesting that Mr Shorten tonight described the financial services industry—not just the Financial Services Council whose members were in attendance—as 'the quiet achievers of our economy'. I suspect they have in many ways been the quiet achievers but they have also been achievers who have not been terribly well consulted by the government, a point made by, for example, shadow Assistant Treasurer, Senator Cormann. He pointed out that we have the government to thank for the constant stream of people from the financial services industry seeking to see him to say: 'Please don't put this legislation through. Please do what you can to stop it.' As our shadow Treasurer, Mr Hockey, has said, we would not be intending to proceed; we will change the opt-in provision when we become the government.

Australia does have a very proud record of reform in the regulation of financial services with progressive unification and simplification of the regulation of the provision of financial services and also of financial services providers. This largely reflects the financial reforms made by previous coalition governments. Certainly, we have no problems with the fact that there is more work to be done, but we started it. We have a strong and proud history in that area and it is an area that we will continue to watch very closely, both to ensure that there is strong governance and that there is sustainability within the industry.

Financial services now comprise 10 per cent of Australia's gross domestic product, which is in fact a larger contribution to the economy than mining, manufacturing or
agriculture. So, clearly, it is very important to Australia.

Financial advice must be affordable and simple to understand and it must put the needs of the client first. We have no issues whatsoever with that approach. FoFA, of course, does not meet any of those three criteria. It does not make advice more affordable, it is not simple to understand and it does not put the needs of the client first. It pretends to, but it does not. It increases costs for practitioners and clients by adding unnecessary costs and red tape. It is overly complex and it will lead to a reduction in business activity and will cost jobs. As well, the rather conflated best interests duty used in this legislation fails to establish the strongest requirements of a fiduciary duty.

From 1 July this year the opt-in provisions are voluntarily available. I notice that the explanatory memorandum was produced so quickly that instead of using the word 'voluntary', it uses the words 'weren't voluntarily'. It is just a little grammatical slip, but it does demonstrate how quickly the government has tried to fling all of this together. However, it will be fascinating to see how many financial services advisers and planners are knocking on the door on 1 July saying: 'Let's voluntarily send out these things. We want to voluntarily get our clients to opt-in.' It will be fascinating to see the numbers there. I think we will find that the vast majority will wait for it to become mandatory, on 1 July 2013.

The current time frame for the implementation is now somewhat realistic. Businesses have to change processes and software and they have to train advisers, all before they have even seen the regulations that underpin the legislation. The fact that they have to take so long telling the government this and the fact that we had to hold an inquiry and spend a lot of time just repeating the fact that it was impossible for the industry to change in 3½ months are just two indicators of how this government goes.

The FoFA legislation is still quite likely to cost Australian jobs in the financial services industry. It will lead to the closure of a lot of smaller companies. It will just get too hard. There will be a need for new computer systems and better online facilities—it will just get too hard. In fact, our committee was told that there would be a $700 million initial implementation cost for the proposed changes and a $350 million cost annually thereafter, which would be borne by the industry. This was not agreed with by the Industry Super Network, which represents the union based superannuation programs. They thought differently, but they were the only organisation that did think differently.

We had evidence from AMP and from the CEO of the Association of Financial Advisers, all saying that there was a strong likelihood of jobs being lost. In fact, Mr Klipin from the Association of Financial Advisers said that over 6,800 adviser jobs are at risk. Nothing about this legislation has changed that, except that it has been somewhat pushed out by the fact that it is not mandatory until next year for the opt-in and other provision to have effect.

As the opposition, we see our role as being one of holding the government to account, and we are definitely going to do that. Our longstanding commitment to prospectively apply detailed fee disclosure statements stands. The government's commitment to that should stand, too, but of course it is not. I find it strange that the government has chosen not to implement a fiduciary-duty provision in this. The best thing we have is this confusion called the 'best interests duty'. That is better than nothing, but it is still a bit of a problem.
The other aspect of this legislation concerns some of the powers given to ASIC. They can now have the power to suspend somebody from their business on the basis of an assessment of what they might do, not what they have actually done. If they are likely to contravene the obligations of an Australian financial services licence, they can be suspended. I asked ASIC how they would know if an organisation or an individual was ‘likely to contravene’ its obligations. They said, ‘Oh, we can work it out from history, and we will have a tick and flick sheet that we can design for this.’ How ridiculous. This, too, is something that must be amended.

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Stephens) (21:59): Order! It being almost 10:00 pm, I propose the question:

That the Senate do now adjourn.

Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting

Refugee Week

Senator SINGH (Tasmania) (21:59): I would like to speak about an important part of Tasmania’s place in the nation—and that is, as the gateway to the Antarctic and the host of this year’s Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting held in Hobart. The Antarctic Treaty was signed by 12 nations in 1959 and came into force in 1961. It is an incredible and unique model of joint management, inspired by the exceptional environmental, scientific and heritage values of the world’s driest, coldest and most desolate continent. It defers problematic territorial claims in favour of scientific cooperation and creates a stable and practical modus vivendi. Decisions are taken by all parties to the treaty in the best interests of the continent itself and, unlike so many other decision-making forums, influence is derived not from money or power but from the respect a nation garners from its scientific endeavours in the Antarctic.

Australia has a proud history of engaging with the Antarctic, this year marking the 100th year of Mawson’s expedition from Hobart. So, too, do we have a proud place in the development and working of the treaty system. Indeed, one of the most essential elements, the Madrid Protocol—the moratorium on minerals exploration and extraction in the Antarctic—was spearheaded by the great Labor Prime Minister Bob Hawke and his counterpart, former French Prime Minister Michel Rocard, who I had the pleasure of speaking with about these matters just last week at the commencement of the 35th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting.

The Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, ATCM, is the primary forum for the parties to the Antarctic Treaty to take decisions that further the principles and objectives of the treaty. ATCM 35 has not been hosted in Australia since 1981, when it was held in Canberra, and the first time this year in Hobart—Australia’s gateway to the Antarctic region. Amongst its wide-ranging agenda are discussions on legal affairs, the growing tourism in the Antarctic, NGO presence in the region and the core environmental and scientific matters at the heart of all Antarctic operations.

They will be assisted, no doubt, by the depth of Antarctic expertise between the Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies; the Antarctic Climate and Ecosystems CRC; Commission to the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources; the Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels; and the Tasmanian Polar Network—all of which are based in Hobart.
I am sure that considerable progress has been made in these 10 days of discussion, but I do hope that international delegates have also had a chance to experience Hobart and Tasmania in addition to their important work. At the Australian Antarctic Division in Kingston, just south of our capital, there is a store with the national flags of expeditioners who have been outfitted by the division. These flags already number in the dozens, and it is my hope that Hobart and Tasmania can build on its reputation as the best base for Antarctic operations and continue to host treaty states parties well beyond the conclusion of the ATCM this Wednesday.

This week is Refugee Week, a nationwide celebration designed to celebrate the contributions of refugees and to bring attention to the stories of refugees living in Australia. I have spoken a number of times in this place about the important plight of refugees and asylum seekers, and our responsibility to ensure that people are able to enjoy their most fundamental rights: to build a home and a life in safety, security and free from persecution.

Australia's responsibility is not just to ensure that people are safe from the violence of persecution but that they are able to participate in a community that recognises and values them as people with unique and compelling contributions to make. Our country owes much to the diversity of its people. Australian society would be so much poorer without the art, faith, language, food, opinion and culture of those who have come from every part of the globe. Refugee Week is about making people aware that refugees are an important part of our community, and this year's Refugee Week theme, Restoring Hope, is about the transition that many refugees experience from trauma and tragedy to new and better lives.

I want to take a moment to mention a few of the events being held in my home town of Hobart which exemplify the spirit of this week. This week, the foyer of the Royal Hobart Hospital will be filled with posters and information to educate patients and staff about the journeys taken by refugees and the health services available to refugees and migrants. Students from Hobart College's students against racism group will be setting up a conversation pod in the Elizabeth Street Mall, running through Hobart's central business district. Members of the public will have the opportunity to enter a conversation pod and be face to face with a young refugee who knows what it is like to leave their country, live in a refugee camp and have to settle in a completely new place.

There is no more powerful way to confront one's beliefs about what it means to be a refugee than to hear directly from someone who has been through it, and I want to acknowledge this group of students and this initiative. Having been involved previously, with some of their initiatives with the Tasmanian Centre for Global Learning, these students are brave, patient and generous, and I have no doubt that anybody who joins a conversation pod will be moved by their stories and their journeys.

The Hobart Migrant Resource Centre will host an art exhibition at the Moonah Arts Centre, with arts from many amongst the migrant and refugee communities, with the theme 'Identity, Translation and Transformation'.

Finally, on Saturday the Welcome to Australia movement will be holding its Walk Together march in major cities across the country. I have been pleased to have met the Director of Welcome to Australia, Pastor Brad Chilcott, and I have no doubt that this march will be powerful symbol of this movement's resonance with the community.
Hobart's march will begin in front of the Tasmanian Skills Institute on Campbell Street and march down to Princes Wharf No. 1 shed, the same venue that just a few months ago hosted the world party celebration of diversity of cultures within our community.

Each of these events is a small demonstration of the enormous importance of celebrating refugees and their stories, and I encourage all Australians and senators in this place to reflect this week on our responsibilities to refugees and on the rewards in valuing diversity in our community.

Motor Neurone Disease

Senator BOYCE (Queensland) (22:06): I rise tonight to talk on the topic of Motor Neurone Disease Global Day, which is being held on 21 June, as it has been for every year since 1997. The day of 21 June or 22 June was chosen because it is the solstice, a turning point. The community wanted to use this day as another turning point in the ongoing search for the cause of, the treatment of and the cure for this awful disease. Motor neurone disease is a disgusting disease. Outside this parliament I have been known to use much stronger language about motor neurone disease. Senators would remember that former Senator Guy Barnett would speak each year because he was commemorating the fact that his father died of motor neurone disease. About four years ago my younger brother died of motor neurone disease at the age of 53.

MND is the name given to a group of diseases in which the nerve cells that control the voluntary movement of muscles progressively die. These include all the muscles of the arms, legs, back and neck and the muscles that control speech, swallowing and breathing. It is that inability to swallow and breathe which tends to be the reason in the end that people with MND die. MND is also known as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, ALS. In the US, it is known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

With no nerves to activate them, muscles gradually weaken and waste and paralysis ensues. Weakness is often first seen in the hands or feet or the first sign might indeed be swallowing difficulty or slurred speech. Muscle twitching and cramps may also occur. My brother first noticed that he seemed to be stubbing his left toe quite a bit. From what seemed to be a trivial thing to be seeking medical advice on, it took more than three months before he was diagnosed with motor neurone disease. There is no real diagnosis for it except for diagnosing what it is not. It can mirror many other diseases, such as multiple sclerosis, in its earlier symptoms.

In most cases the senses, the intellect and the memory are not affected by motor neurone disease, which is a wonderful blessing. But it can also be a complete curse, too, for the people who see day after day the gradual and progressive decline of their bodies and their ongoing inability to do any activity, including, in the end, swallowing.

MND affects everybody at a different rate. The initial symptoms, the pattern of progression and the survival time can be quite different from person to person. There have been no known remissions of MND. The average survival time from diagnosis is two to three years but some people survive five or more years. The author and scientist Stephen Hawking, who has survived for more than 20 years now with a form of motor neurone disease, is an outstanding example of this. There are members of Motor Neurone Disease Australia who have had the illness for more than 10 years and...
who continue to be partly mobile and able to speak.

Progression of MND is rapid, creating high levels of disability and consequent high support needs. People with MND will need assistance with feeding, communication, movement, transferring, toileting and breathing. It has an impact on all activities of living. One thing that MND Australia is currently looking at is the fact that the National Disability Insurance Scheme only applies to people under 65. MND can strike at any time in a person's life. It is quite common for it to strike people over 65 and they have a far greater need for services than a normal person receiving the age pension. This is something that we are looking at at the moment.

The key feature of the disease is the speed at which it can progress. One ongoing issue is the Medical Aids Subsidy Scheme, which will provide wheelchairs and the like for people with motor neurone disease, but it can take up to three months to provide a wheelchair. By the time that wheelchair is provided, the needs of the person with motor neurone disease may have changed so much that that wheelchair may no longer be of any use. They might have been able to push a wheelchair with their hands three months earlier but they cannot by the time they get the wheelchair. Their need for a very rapid response is not something that our current assistance schemes are set up to meet.

MND is not contagious. The causes are not known, although it is known that between five to 10 per cent of cases are familial. Because of research that has been done in Australia, the genetic fault in about 60 of these cases in Australia is now known to those families—in other words, out of that five to 10 per cent, the genetic issue in 60 per cent of them is known.

Research taking place around the world—including some very worthwhile research being done in my own state and yours, Mr President, at the Queensland Brain Institute, which is attached to the University of Queensland—is looking at genetic factors; toxic factors; the chemicals that control nerve cells and allow them to communicate; the potential for stem cell therapy; the growth, repair and ageing of motor neurons; and also the better provision of care for people with this rapidly progressing and disabling condition. On Thursday I will be distributing pale blue cornflowers as a way of commemorating Motor Neurone Disease Global Day. The cornflower has been chosen because, so MND Australia tells us, although it has a fragile appearance, it has a very hardy nature. Like the cornflower, people living with MND show remarkable strength in coping with what is a devastating disease. That symbol has now been used since 1997.

I should point out that MND does occur in every country in the world. It is not necessarily a disease of ageing—it can affect people at any age—but the peak onset period is in the 50s and 60s. In fact my brother was just over 50 when he was diagnosed and 53 when he died. It affects men slightly more than women, but in many circumstances that 50-60 age group is when people are raising children or helping their older teenage children. It can have a devastating effect on families. A drug called Riluzole, developed by Sanofi, is the only treatment that has been demonstrated to assist in extending life expectancy. It is registered in Australia now and, because of the work of MND Australia, it is now included on the PBS.

MND Global Day will be celebrated throughout Australia, and here in Canberra on Sunday, 24 June. Anyone who is in town can join the walk ‘to d'feet MND’, which will leave from the city centre. You can have a
look on the MND Australia website for activities in other states.

Mental Health

Senator WRIGHT (South Australia) (22:16): I rise to speak tonight about the rural, remote and regional mental health consultations I am currently undertaking throughout Australia. As the national mental health spokesperson for the Australian Greens, working towards improving mental health services for people living in rural, remote and regional Australia is one of my key priorities. In order to do this effectively, I feel it is important to give people living in rural and regional Australia a say about the decisions and policies that affect them. This is particularly important at a time when we are living in what seems to be an increasingly divided Australia. I am keen to bridge the rural-city divide by learning about the needs of rural people and helping to advocate for better services on their behalf.

Over the coming months I will meet with individuals and organisations in rural and regional Australia to gain a better understanding of their access to mental health services, the quality of those services, workforce issues and unmet needs and gaps in service delivery. As part of this consultation process, I am conducting face-to-face meetings with individuals and organisations. So far, I have travelled to Albany and Geraldton in Western Australia, Hobart in Tasmania and Newcastle in New South Wales. I have also spoken with rural doctors networks across the country.

Soon, I will also kick off an online consultation process through which anyone living in rural, remote and regional Australia can provide their views to me on mental health issues and services in their community. This is an important opportunity for individuals and organisations in rural, remote and regional Australia to have a say about the provision of mental health services in their community and so participate in the development of policy that directly affects them as Australians living in rural, remote and regional areas. These consultations will significantly inform the Greens' policy development process, resulting in a comprehensive and robust policy that is underpinned by the voices of people affected by and with expertise in mental health issues in rural, remote and regional Australia—the real experts.

Access to quality health care, including mental health care, is a basic human right. With one in five Australians experiencing mental health issues in any given year, mental health policy goes to the heart of our nation's wellbeing and touches all of us. Generally, it is estimated that the prevalence of mental health conditions in rural and remote Australia is equivalent to that of our major cities, but the consequences of mental illness are often far greater for many people living in country areas, because access to services and specialist health professionals is extremely limited.

The National Rural Health Alliance has highlighted that:

… there is a general downward gradient in health and health services from major cities to remote areas: the more remote the community, the poorer the health status of its people and the less access it has to health services and health promoting infrastructure.

These are fellow Australians that we are talking about. The unequal distribution of mental health services in rural and regional Australia poses far-reaching consequences for both individuals and communities. An inability to obtain proper mental health care can affect a person's ability to complete their education, maintain employment, engage in social and community activities and form healthy relationships, and it also contributes to a greater risk of developing physical...
illnesses. It is therefore vital that adequate funding and attention is given to all aspects of mental health in Australia. In relation to rural and remote Australia, we must ensure that equal need equates to equal distribution of mental health services.

From my recent consultations and meetings with service providers and community leaders, it is clear that people living outside our capital cities face distinct challenges when it comes to mental health care. There are clear geographical challenges where distance can indeed be tyrannical when it comes to service delivery in rural and remote areas. As well, a shortage of specialist mental health professionals is a key problem for many communities—with general practices often having long waiting lists and limited referral options.

Privacy concerns, together with the stigma that is still attached to mental health issues everywhere, both urban and rural, and attitudes of stoicism and a 'she'll be right' approach to life mean that many people in small communities are reluctant to seek help when they need it. Suicides in rural Australia are reportedly as high as one a week. With changes to rural economies and farming practices, and climate variability predicted to worsen due to climate change, these numbers may well rise in the future. Suicide has a profound impact on small communities and it is vital that we consider the most effective ways to reverse this devastating trend.

Despite these significant challenges, I have constantly witnessed the creativity, initiative and strength of rural communities, where people see a need and join together to respond to it, rather than waiting for government or someone else to step in. This has been very evident in relation to responses to significant mental health and social issues facing the communities I have visited.

The Men's Resource Centre at Albany is a fine example. Their mission? To enable rural men to live healthier, happier lives and so reduce morbidity—and the risk of suicide in their peers. They do this by focusing on mental, physical and spiritual health through the Pitstop Wellness Check, which is designed to apply plenty of humour while they check a bloke's 'oil pressure', being their blood pressure, give them a 'chassis' check—which involves measuring their girth, a particularly challenging exercise when they tried it out on me in Albany!—and then check their 'shock absorbers', by asking 10 'coping questions' to elicit how well a man is 'travelling' in his moods and wellbeing. Not content to wait for men to come to them, they now do outreach in local and far-flung towns, through GPs, schools, business and community groups—transforming their regular five to 10 contacts per month to 1,000 a year. The Men's Resource Centre works closely with the Regional Counselling & Mentoring Service in Albany, which support people experiencing mental health and drug and alcohol problems and also provide support to prisoners in the nearby facility and their families. They are also about to start providing crisis accommodation to meet a demand for homelessness services in Albany.

Fusion, in Geraldton, is a great example of community endeavour establishing a supported accommodation service for people recovering from mental illness. They provide support and a haven before those people move back into the community. In an atmosphere of safe encouragement and respect, they nurture people and allow them to develop the confidence to move back into the community. They also manage another supported accommodation facility for those on the verge of homelessness and low incomes.
Over in New South Wales, I was hugely impressed by the work of the Samaritans in Newcastle, who run Monet's Catering and Garden Maintenance Service. Set, ironically, on the site of an old psychiatric hospital, an historic building has been developed to provide catering services for community groups and businesses in the Newcastle area. They train people who are recovering from mental illness to be equipped with new skills in the workforce. As well they run a gardening maintenance facility that provides services for people in the community and, again, re-skills people who are recovering from difficult times in life and may have been unemployed for a long period of time and often have mental health issues as well. These sorts of initiatives indicate the degree of creativity and ingenuity that is out there among people in rural communities who are determined to help each other and to help themselves.

I will be continuing my tour until September this year and I look forward to talking and listening more to people in rural, regional and remote Australia about mental health services in their community. Throughout my visits, I am very keen to talk to people who have experiences of mental ill-health; after all, they are the real experts. As well as being entitled to be consulted about matters affecting them so directly, they will also bring practical insights and ideas to the development of effective policy. By the end of these consultations I will be identifying gaps in service delivery so we can determine what is needed to build across Australia healthier, more resilient communities where people with equal need have access to equal services.

Child Care

Senator POLLEY (Tasmania—Deputy Government Whip in the Senate) (22:26): Yesterday I met with representatives of Australia's early childhood education and care union as part of the national campaign, Big Steps. Big Steps in child care is a campaign to transform the childcare profession into what it should be: stable, respected and well paid. Childcare professionals nurture and educate our most valuable assets, our children. Big Steps is focused on ensuring they get the recognition that they deserve. United Voice tracked fees from April 2011 to April 2012 using the government's mychild.gov.au website. Early childhood education and care fees in Australia have increased dramatically over the past 12 months from $63.21 to $70.29 per day or on average 11.2 per cent. Families need affordable, quality early childhood education and care with a professional workforce to deliver it, but the workforce is abandoning this sector because of low wages and conditions; 180 educators leave every week.

The funding model introduced by the Howard government is broken. This massive fee increase is more evidence that the childcare funding scheme is failing and is placing children, parents and educators under severe strain. As I said, families need affordable, quality early childhood education and care with a professional workforce to deliver it. A qualified educator earns around $17.50 an hour to educate and care for our greatest resource while on average a schoolteacher earns $35 per hour, an unskilled labourer $30 per hour, a truck driver $25 an hour and a babysitter $25 an hour. Early childhood educators provide first-class education and care for children while also providing an invaluable service for families and the wider community. They should be paid a salary that reflects their vital role. Parents are already burdened with the enormous cost of raising children and making a hefty contribution to their childcare fees.
Fair Work Australia announced a 2.9 per cent increase in the minimum wage. The increase applies from the first full payday on or after 1 July 2012 for those whose pay rates are tied to the Children's Services Award. An educator with certificate III will earn $18.58 per hour. An educator with a diploma will earn $22.12 per hour. A director of a centre with up to 39 children will earn $27.05 per hour. Without professional wages to keep the best staff from leaving the sector there will not be enough educators to deliver the quality outcomes that our children deserve. Without professional wages there is no meaningful recognition of the professional and vital work that is being done in those centres. The Productivity Commission's draft report recognised systematic issues in the early childhood education and care sector. As Alice Voigt, director and owner of Moore Park Gardens Preschool and Long Day Care Centre reported:

Professionals come to work in ECEC because they love working with children. But, as the draft report reveals, that there's a huge issue with staff leaving the sector because of wages. There needs to be higher wages for all professionals in ECEC who work so hard to educate the next generations of Australians at a crucial time in their development.

Ms Voigt continued:
The amount of people who have been in the sector for less than 6 years is a huge problem. There's high turnover, and it's because of massive burn out.

Ms Voigt asked:
Who's going to implement these educational reforms if we don't have the staff to do it?
The Productivity Commission continued:
The sector's low wages lead to high turnover, creating problems for specialised, long-term care for our children. The Workforce Census showed that about 60% of qualified staff have worked in the sector for 6 years or less. This means that committed professional educators are unable to stay in the sector long-term because of poverty wages.

Meanwhile, as we have come to expect, Tony Abbott has not allowed the facts to get in the way or get on the road nor has he talked about anything that is positive. Tanya Robinson, a childcare professional in New South Wales, said Mr Abbott's assertions about the childcare sector and the government's contributions are not matched with fact or reality. She said:

I believe that the ratio changes promote better care of the children and more focused time to the children, hence us being able to better educate them.

The coalition announcement that it would immediately slow down childcare industry reforms if elected is a direct threat to the future of the quality and sustainable education and care of our young children. Furthermore, the coalition's plan to slow down quality reforms, to offset cost, is not the solution. There is no evidence that the reforms have had a major impact on fees, and repealing quality will be damaging for our children. Similarly, their plan to lift the childcare rebate cap will do nothing to fix the long-term crisis. Affordability comes down to the way the sector is funded. On the issue of our children, Mr Abbott should let the experts talk about child care instead of spreading misrepresentation and fear. But, let us face it, that is his track record. That is what the opposition is renowned for.

From 1 July 2010 the Labor government increased the childcare rebate annual cap to $7,500 per child per year, covering 50 per cent of out-of-pocket childcare expenses for approved child care. The Productivity Commission has estimated out-of-pocket fees would be 15 per cent higher without the reforms, though this would depend on present staff wage arrangements. The Big Steps campaign is calling on the federal
government to celebrate the vital work being done by early childhood professionals, by increasing wages to ensure there are qualified, consistent staff who can stay in the industry. On 6 June this year the Prime Minister, Julia Gillard, announced that she would meet with the early childhood education and care sector to examine options to reform Australia's childcare funding sector. Sue Lines, Assistant National Secretary of United Voice, the early childhood education and care union, said:

We warned that without Government intervention the childcare funding crisis would continue to deteriorate. The current system is well past its use by date and is a threat to standards in the sector. This situation cannot continue: it is damaging to children and the workforce dedicated to meeting their developmental needs.

... childcare educators across Australia are delighted Prime Minister Gillard is listening. High-standard child care is one of the most important issues for the Labor government. We recognise that there are issues and we are listening to the industry to find solutions— unlike those opposite.

The four women who met with me yesterday afternoon are inspirational educators. They are a sample of the truly professional and high-standard carers we have in this country. When I talk about this issue I talk about it not only as a member of this chamber but as a mother of a consumer of childcare services. Prior to becoming a mum herself, my youngest daughter worked in this industry. I know firsthand the challenges for those working in the industry and, just as importantly, I know that for the parents of children going into these centres it is about affordability. We need to respect those who are caring for our children. We need to ensure that they are of the highest standard when it comes to being educators. They need our support. I commend the work of the Australian early childhood education and care union's Big Steps campaign and I urge people to get behind it.

Senate adjourned at 22:35
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Tabling

The following government documents were tabled:

Australian Human Rights Commission—
Reports—
No. 49—Cherkupalli v Commonwealth of Australia (Department of Immigration and Citizenship).
No. 50—Campbell v Black & White Cabs Pty Ltd and Tighe.
No. 51—Brown v Commonwealth of Australia (Department of Immigration and Citizenship).

Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency—Quarterly report for the period 1 January to 31 March 2012.

Australian River Co. Limited—Report for the period 1 December 2010 to 30 November 2011.


Surveillance Devices Act 2004—Commonwealth Ombudsman's reports on inspections of surveillance device records for the period 1 July to 31 December 2010—Australian Crime Commission and Australian Federal Police, and Victoria Police Special Projects Unit for the period 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011.

Sydney Airport Demand Management Act 1997—Quarterly report on the maximum movement limit for Sydney Airport for the period 1 January to 31 March 2012.


Treaties—Bilateral—Text, together with national interest analysis—

Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the Republic of Singapore concerning the Location of a Republic of Singapore Air Force Helicopter Squadron at the Australian Army Aviation Centre Oakey, done at Singapore on 1 June 2012.
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The following documents were tabled by the Clerk:

[Legislative instruments are identified by a Federal Register of Legislative Instruments (FRLI) number. An explanatory statement is tabled with an instrument unless otherwise indicated by an asterisk.]

Australian Communications and Media Authority Act—Broadcasting (Charges) Amendment Determination 2012 (No. 1) [F2012L01229].

Telecommunications (Charges) Determination 2012 [F2012L01231].


Undergraduate Awards Rules 2012 [F2012L01218].

Australian Prudential Regulation Authority Act—Select Legislative Instrument 2012 No. 113—Australian Prudential Regulation Authority Amendment Regulation 2012 (No. 1) [F2012L01219].

Clean Energy Act—Select Legislative Instrument 2012 No. 100—Clean Energy Amendment Regulation 2012 (No. 3) [F2012L01230].

Corporations Act—ASIC Class Order [CO 12/749] [F2012L01235].


Insurance Contracts Act—Select Legislative Instrument 2012 No. 116—Insurance Contracts Amendment Regulation 2012 (No. 1) [F2012L01232].

Migration Act—Select Legislative Instrument 2012 No. 105—Migration Amendment Regulation 2012 (No. 3) [F2012L01223].

National Consumer Credit Protection Act—Select Legislative Instrument 2012 No. 117—National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment Regulation 2012 (No. 1) [F2012L01233].

Navigation Act—Marine Order No. 4 of 2012—Marine Orders Part 31 Amendment 2012 (No. 1) (Ship Surveys and Certification) [F2012L01221].


Telecommunications (Carrier Licence Charges) Act—Telecommunications (Carrier Licence Application Charge) Determination 2012 [F2012L01234].


Universal Service Subsidies (2011-12 Contestable Areas) Determination (No. 1) 2012 [F2012L01225].

Universal Service Subsidies (2011-12 Default Area) Determination (No. 1) 2012 [F2012L01227].
Universal Service Subsidies (2011-12 Extended Zones) Determination (No. 1) 2012 [F2012L01224].
QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The following answers to questions were circulated:

Defence
(Question Nos 1742, 1771 and 1775)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 5 March 2012:

1. Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   (a) the department or agency;
   (b) the location;
   (c) the size;
   (d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   (e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   (f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      (i) value, and
      (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

2. For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
   (a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location;
   (b) the number of non-ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location; and
   (c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location.

Senator Bob Carr: The Minister has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The following table responds to question (1) (a-f) as related to the Department of Defence:
### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total Building Fitout OP&amp;E Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 McMinn Street, Darwin NT 8000</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>Total 29: APS x 16, Exec x 7, Commissioned x 4, Non Commissioned x 2</td>
<td>0.215</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Tybell Street, Winnellie NT 8200</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>Total 12: APS x 8, Exec x 1, Commissioned x 2, Non Commissioned x 1</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 Coonawarra Road, Winnellie NT 8200</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>26900</td>
<td>Total 51: Contractors x 26, Non Commissioned x 18, Commissioned x 2, APS x 4, Exec x 1</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-32 King Street, Raymond Terrace NSW 2324</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>Total 198: APS x 156, Exec x 4, Non Commissioned x 35, Commissioned x 3</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>2.823</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>3.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012

### Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>270 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW 2000</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>24141</td>
<td>Total 892: APS x 397, Exec x 122, Commissioned x 132, Non Commissioned x 128, Contractors x 112, Medical Officer Class 4 x 1</td>
<td>13.457</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>3.094</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Station Street, Wollongong NSW 2500</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>Total 159: APS x 107, Exec x 15, Non Commissioned x 21, Commissioned x 16</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>1.123</td>
<td>1.426</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 Sharp Street, Cooma NSW 2630</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1425</td>
<td>Total 90: APS x 82, Exec x 3, Non Commissioned x 3, Contractors x 2</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.492</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85 Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham WA 6168</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4190</td>
<td>Total 273: Contractors x 100, Non Commissioned x 56, Commissioned x 46, Exec x 20, APS x 51</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.449</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>2.892</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661 Bourke Street, Melbourne VIC 3000</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>19027</td>
<td>Total 922: APS x 562, Exec x 128, Commissioned x 101, Contractors x 68, Non Commissioned x 62, Senior Executive x 1</td>
<td>7.445</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.569</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>5.005</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 Coventry Street, Southbank VIC 3006</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>Total 12: APS x 6, Exec x 4, Commissioned x 2</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell Park, Northcott Drive, Campbell ACT 2612</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>36449 m²</td>
<td>Total 2,299; Commissioned x 419, Exec x 596, APS x 768, Contractors x 338, Non Commissioned x 129, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Above x 20, Senior Executive x 16, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Below x 5, Medical Officer Class 4 x 4, Statutory Office Holders x 2, Medical Officer Class 3 x 2</td>
<td>10.356</td>
<td>284 $/m²</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,200 $</td>
<td>3,296 $</td>
<td>5,496 $</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.152 $</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

#### Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>Total 2,524: Exec x 755, APS x 904, Commissioned x 430, Contractors x 279, Non Commissioned x 124, Senior Executive x 22, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Above x 4, S&amp;T Level 6 x 2, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Below x 2, Medical Officer 6 x 1, S&amp;T Level 7 x 1</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.705</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>8136</td>
<td>3.634</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012</th>
<th>Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout OP&amp;E Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>m2</td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>$/m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1781</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>6220</td>
<td>2.783</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>6501</td>
<td>2.832</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Brindabella Circuit, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>7540</td>
<td>2.989</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4789</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4832</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Fairbairn Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4537</td>
<td>1.663</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Molonglo Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>12945</td>
<td>4.961</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Richmond Avenue, Canberra Airport ACT 2610</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>780 m²</td>
<td>1,050: Contractors x 278, Commissioned x 211, Non Commissioned x 131, Exec x 162, APS x 179, S&amp;T Level 6 x 26, S&amp;T Level 5 x 21, S&amp;T Level 3-4 Above x 15, S&amp;T Level 7 x 8, S&amp;T Level 3-4 Below x 5, S&amp;T Level 8 x 4, Senior Executive x 4, Chief of Division x 3, Medical Officer Class 4 x 2, Medical Officer Class 3 x 1</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012
Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Thesiger Court, Deakin ACT 2600</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1560 m²</td>
<td>Total 81: Contractors x 12, APS x 43, Exec x 14, Commissioned x 8, Non Commissioned x 3, Senior Executive x 1</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 Kent Street, Deakin ACT 2600</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>9036 m²</td>
<td>Total 412: Contractors x 295, Exec x 50, APS x 57, Non Commissioned x 9, Commissioned x 1</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.739</td>
<td>15.739</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anzac Park West, Constitution Avenue, Canberra ACT 2600</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>15000 m²</td>
<td>Total 911: Contractors x 290, Exec x 312, APS x 258, Commissioned x 36, Senior Executive x 10, Non Commissioned x 5</td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.190</td>
<td>19.190</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>21.800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6), Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2601</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>7372</td>
<td>Total 248: Commissioned x 97, Non Commissioned x 61, Contractors x 37, APS x 41, Exec x 11, Medical Officer Class 4 x 1</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>Total 28: Commissioned x 17, Exec x 5, Non Commissioned x 2, APS x 3, Statutory Office Holders x 1</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Barrow Place, Queanbeyan NSW 2620</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>Total 85: APS x 79, Exec x 4, Commissioned x 1, Non Commissioned x 1</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dairy Road, Fyshwick ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>Total 56: Commissioned x 23, Non Commissioned x 19, APS x 11, Contractors x 1, Exec x 2</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/101 Tennant Street, Fyshwick ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Total 54: APS x 37, Commissioned x 12, Exec x 5</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Whyalla Street, Fyshwick ACT 2609</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>Total 43: Contractors x 30, Commissioned x 7, Non Commissioned x 2, APS x 3, Exec x 1</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Building Fitout</td>
<td>OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205 Anketell Street, Greenway ACT 2900</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4961</td>
<td>Total 269: Exec x 68, APS x 104, Contractors x 39, Commissioned x 36, Exec x 14, Non Commissioned x 8</td>
<td>2.126</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101/109 Flemington Road, Mitchell ACT 2911</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>Total 334: Contractors x 324, Exec x 6, APS x 3, Non Commissioned x 1</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thynne Street, Bruce ACT 2617</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>Total 63: APS x 27, Exec x 13, Contractors x 12, Commissioned x 5, Non Commissioned x 3, Exec x 3</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Lowe Street, Queanbeyan ACT 2620</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>Total 18: Commissioned x 3, APS x 9, Exec x 4, Senior Executive x 1</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Moore Street, Canberra ACT 2600</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-9 Moore Street, Canberra ACT 2600</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601</td>
<td>Leased</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Location</td>
<td>Owned or Leased</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area</td>
<td>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</td>
<td>Annual Rent (ex GST)</td>
<td>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</td>
<td>Building Fitout OP&amp;E</td>
<td>Total Building Fitout OP&amp;E Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1, Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>27226 m²</td>
<td>Total 7,131: Commissioned x 1,646, Exec x 1731, APS x 2123, Non Commissioned x 956, Contractors x 529, Senior Executive x 99, S&amp;T Level 6 x 12, S&amp;T Level 5 x 12, S&amp;T Level 7 x 8, S&amp;T Level 8 x 4, Statutory Office Holders x 3, S&amp;T Level 3-4 Below x 2, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Above x 2, S&amp;T Level 3-4 Above x 1, APS3—EL1 (Legal 1) Below x 1, APS6—EL1 (Academic Level 2) x 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69,551 $m</td>
<td>4.315 $/m²</td>
<td>2.016 $m</td>
<td>75.881 $m</td>
<td>2.250 $m</td>
<td>1.233 $m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Book Value as at 31/3/2012

Depreciation—1/7/2011 to 31/3/2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Location</th>
<th>Owned or Leased</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area</th>
<th>Employees at locality (includes: Australian Public Servants (APS levels 1-6, Executive levels 1-2, and Senior Executive Service), military members, and contractors)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (ex GST)</th>
<th>Rent per Square Metre (ex GST)</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Building Fitout</th>
<th>OP&amp;E</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2, Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>24785</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61.422</td>
<td>3.672</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>66.130</td>
<td>1.989</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3, Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>7175</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.149</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>15.714</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8, Sir Thomas Blamey Square, Russell ACT 2601</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>9438</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.475</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.936</td>
<td>39.411</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.473</td>
<td>2.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The above information does not include office functions located on Defence bases, high security sites or premises of less than 500 square metres in area. Outgoings may or may not be included in the Annual Rent amount. This will impact the ability to conduct a like for like comparison.

The information on staff levels and locations was derived by merging data from the Defence human resources system and the internal Defence telephone directory. It is not possible to match the two systems exactly as each stores details in slightly different formats.

(1) (g)

The work undertaken by Defence covers a broad range of disciplines and job types, including administration, procurement, logistics, research and development, planning, training, information communications technology and engineering. Work performed will also include Service-specific trades and employment categories and the broad range of unit-specific work undertaken by soldiers, sailors and airmen/airwomen. A mix of these work types will be performed at most Defence sites.

(2) (a) to (c) The majority of staff engaged in public affairs roles within the Department of Defence are located in the Communication and Media Branch and Strategic Communication Branch.

As at 31 December 2011 the Communication and Media Branch employed 58 civilians, nine military personnel and four contractors.

As at 31 December 2011 the Strategic Communication Branch employed 41 permanent military and 15 part-time military and five civilians.

In addition, as at 31 December 2011, outside of the Communication and Media and Strategic Communication Branches there were 44 civilians and 15 military staff who provided public affairs support as part of their regular duties within the Defence Groups and Services.

Further detail is provided in the following table. A key detailing the acronyms used is at the end of the table.

### Communication and Media Branch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1 x permanent SES</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Assistant Secretary of the Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Executive assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Defence Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News</td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Service Newspaper editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Marketing manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Operations</td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Sub-editors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x temporary APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Sub-editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Distribution officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent CPL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military reporters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent SGT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military reporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Media, Entertainment Media, Liaison and Branding</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Media Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent APS4-5</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison and Branding</td>
<td>4 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Acting Director Digital Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Assistant Director Digital Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Multi media producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Stills imagery manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Department of Defence brand manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x temporary APS4</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Digital archivist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x contractors</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Web specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x contractors</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Imagery specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services, Operations &amp; Training</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Adviser for Services and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Coordination of Executive media awareness training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Public Affairs, Communication Advisers and Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Communication and Media Regions and Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS2</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Manager Regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Leadership Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Deputy Director Leadership Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary transfer to another</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Extended leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work area or deployed</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Extended leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Extended leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Extended leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Communication Branch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>1 x permanent BRIG</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director General of the Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Plans &amp; Policy</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Assistant Director Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Communication officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate Operations</td>
<td>1 x permanent COL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Public Affairs Preparedness, Plans and Training</td>
<td>1 x permanent LTCOL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, SO1 training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LT</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x Reserve LTCOL</td>
<td>Note: Reserve personnel</td>
<td>Note: Reserve Military Public Affairs Officer are employed on a daily basis (as required) to deliver media awareness training around the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x Reserve MAJ</td>
<td>live regionally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 x Reserve CAPT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve LT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve LEUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x Reserve SQNLDR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Joint Public Affairs Unit</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Officer Commanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Camera team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve CFTS</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Operations officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Operations officer (future planning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent FLTLT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Administration officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent FLTLT</td>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent LT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Camera team leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LT</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent WO2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Sergeant Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent WO2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Training Warrant Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 x permanent Army SGT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Army SGT</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent RAAF SGT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LS</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 x permanent Army CPL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent RAAF CPL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent AB</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LAC</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military photographer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Headquarters Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ FORCOMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ 1 BDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, FBW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve CFTS</td>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ NORCOMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ FORCOMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ 1st Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ 3 BDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LT</td>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQ 7 BDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Extended leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Directorate of Plans &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
### Section: Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative / Logistic Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent WOCGR</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Staff Officer to DG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x part-time Reserve SGT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS4</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personnel outside of the Communication and Media Branch and the Strategic Communication Branch who provide public affairs support as a part of their regular duties within Groups and Services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Group</th>
<th>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chief of the Defence Force</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Strategic Communication adviser, Joint Logistics Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Strategic Communication adviser, Joint Health Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Strategic Communication adviser, Australian Defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Strategic Communication adviser, Cadet, Reserve &amp; Employer Support Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Employer Support Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>1 x permanent CMDR</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Navy Communications and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent Reserve CFTS MDR</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, HQJTF633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, Media plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, Reputation Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent PO</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Imagery manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Navy media management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Navy external communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Manager Communications and Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Navy Media Management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Director Army Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Group</td>
<td>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Branding and marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer (Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS5</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x temporary EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>PA support to Victoria Cross recipients communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x temporary EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>strategy adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Officer Grade 2 (Brand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer, SOCOMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1,</td>
<td>Glenbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Communication Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS 4-5</td>
<td>Glenbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>Williamtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent FLTTLT</td>
<td>Amberley</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent FLTTLT</td>
<td>Williamtown</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent part-time FLTTLT</td>
<td>Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Strategies and Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director Public Affairs (Recruiting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community engagement adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director Events and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Events and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Science and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Defence Science Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Corporate communications manager and media liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manager regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Group</td>
<td>Staffing as at 31 Dec 2011</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Manager regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Manager regional communication support and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>Internal communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent APS6</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Internal communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Materiel Organisation</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL2 (50% of role)</td>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>Director DMO Media &amp; Executive Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Senior media &amp; communications adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 x permanent APS 6</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Communications advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence Support</td>
<td>1 x permanent part-time EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Manager Communications – DCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Strategic communications adviser—DSG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability Development</td>
<td>1 x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Executive Officer to Head Capability Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PA only a small component of other duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Finance Office</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Information Office</td>
<td>1x permanent EL1</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Senior communication manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQJOC</td>
<td>1 x permanent LTCOL</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent MAJ</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent CAPT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent SQNLDR</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 x permanent LEUT</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Military Public Affairs Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key

SES: Senior Executive Service; EL: Executive Level; APS: Australian Public Service.
Navy Ranks: CMDR, Commander; LEUT, Lieutenant; PO, Petty Officer; AB, Able Seaman; LS: Leading Seaman
Army Ranks: BRIG, Brigadier; COL, Colonel; LTCOL, Lieutenant Colonel; MAJ, Major; CAPT, Captain; LT, Lieutenant; WO2, Warrant Officer Class 2; SGT, Sergeant; CPL, Corporal; LCPL, Lance Corporal; PTE: Private.
Air Force Ranks: WGCDR, Wing Commander; SQNLDR, Squadron Leader; FLTLT, Flight Lieutenant; SGT, Sergeant; LAC, Leading Aircraftsman.
CFTS, Continuous Full-time Service; E, of equivalent rank; HQ FORCOMD, Headquarters Forces Command; HQ 1 BDE, Headquarters 1st Brigade; FBW, Fleet Base West; HQ NORCOMD, Headquarters Northern Command; HQ 3 BDE, Headquarters 3rd Brigade; HQ 7 BDE, Headquarters 7th Brigade; DG, Director General; HQJTF633, Headquarters Joint Task Force 633; SOCOMD, Special Operations Command; DCO, Defence Community Organisation; DSG, Defence Support Group; HQJOC, Headquarters Joint Operation Command
Attorney-General's, Emergency Management, Home Affairs and Justice  
(Question Nos 1745, 1746, 1776 and 1777)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, Emergency Management, Home Affairs and Justice, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   (a) the department or agency;
   (b) the location;
   (c) the size;
   (d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   (e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   (f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      (i) value, and
      (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
   (a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location;
   (b) the number of non-ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location; and
   (c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location.

Senator Ludwig: The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question.

QUESTION 1
Attorney-General’s Department

(1)(a) The Attorney-General’s Department.
   (b) & (c) See Table 1.1.
   (d) See Table 1.2.
   (e) See Table 1.1

(f) The Department owns 71 State Circle, Yarralumla ACT 2600. The land is valued at $865,000. The building has a book value at 29 February 2012 of $305,222.21 and has accumulated depreciation of $29,777.79. The Acquisition cost is $335,000.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Table 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-5 National Circuit, Canberra</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>$455.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie St., Canberra</td>
<td>3,656.80</td>
<td>$434.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 National Circuit, Canberra</td>
<td>4,051.25</td>
<td>$424.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symonston, Canberra</td>
<td>4,720.00</td>
<td>$380.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce, Canberra</td>
<td>782.50</td>
<td>$355.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin, Canberra</td>
<td>1,776.00</td>
<td>$403.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills, Sydney</td>
<td>2,485.30</td>
<td>$439.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Macedon, VIC</td>
<td>1,109.00</td>
<td>$450,204.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kings Ave, Canberra</td>
<td>2,763.83</td>
<td>$343.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 State Circle, Yarralumla, Canberra</td>
<td>460.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Castlereagh St., Sydney</td>
<td>124.50</td>
<td>$697.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Castlereagh St., Sydney</td>
<td>119.80</td>
<td>$650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitt St., Sydney</td>
<td>141.70</td>
<td>$775.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton, QLD</td>
<td>320.00</td>
<td>$408.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Yearly basis on whole of property.

Table 1.2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>QLD</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 6</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AGD does not readily capture the location of staff by office location. For that reason staffing figures are compiled at State/Territory level only.

**Administrative Appeals Tribunal**

(1)(a) Administrative Appeals Tribunal.

(b-f) See Table 1.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
<th>(f) if owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>APS2 to EL2 plus 6 Members</td>
<td>$364.26</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>3,203</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>APS3 to SES1 plus 1 President 1 Registrar 22 Members</td>
<td>$506.25</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>3,767</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>APS2 to EL2 plus 13 Members</td>
<td>$249.89</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>APS2 to EL2 plus 10 Members</td>
<td>$398.41</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1,636</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>APS3 to EL2 plus 6 Members</td>
<td>$368.72</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>APS2 to EL2 plus 10 Members</td>
<td>$182.41</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS4 plus3 Members</td>
<td>$223.04</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity

(1)(a) The Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity (ACLEI).
(b) ACLEI has one office located in Canberra.
(c) 868 square metres.
(d) 34 total staff with classifications from APS4 to SES Band 3 (including the Integrity Commissioner).
(e) Rent per square metre is $416 per annum.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Australian Crime Commission

(b-d) See Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>NT Police provide free accommodation within their building free of charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>4,006</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>APS3 to SES B1</td>
<td>$432.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>APS 2 –SES B1</td>
<td>$327.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton (QLD)</td>
<td>2,026</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>APS2 to SES B1</td>
<td>$448.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>APS3 to EL2</td>
<td>$605.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>APS2 to EL2</td>
<td>$376.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>APS3 to SES B2</td>
<td>$441.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Secondee from Tasmania Police</td>
<td>Serbia Police provide free accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Springs</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>APS4 to EL2</td>
<td>NT Department of Health provide free accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) See Table 1.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Australian Customs and Border Protection Service
1(a-e) See Table 1.
Note: The answers to (d) identify where staff are located for administrative purposes. This may not include where operational staff are physically located. For example, operational staff based in Sydney International Airport are included in the staff numbers for Customs House Sydney (10 Cooks River Drive, Mascot NSW) for administrative purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide SA</td>
<td>2,918.00</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>CL1 – CL5</td>
<td>$357.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Lincoln SA</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$294.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Pirie</td>
<td>91.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$135.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart TAS</td>
<td>832.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CL1 – CL5</td>
<td>$333.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnie TAS</td>
<td>248.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>$144.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston TAS</td>
<td>388.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>CL1 – CL3</td>
<td>$279.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geelong VIC</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$228.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docklands VIC</td>
<td>9,962.60</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>CL1 – SES B1</td>
<td>$315.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland VIC</td>
<td>140.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$228.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broome WA</td>
<td>438.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CL1 – CL4</td>
<td>$359.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunbury WA</td>
<td>148.70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$379.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnarvon WA</td>
<td>148.40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$323.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Island (co-located in Christmas Island Police Station)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>CL1 – CL3</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dampier WA</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>CL1 – CL4</td>
<td>$251.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperance WA</td>
<td>624.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CL1 – CL2</td>
<td>$149.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldton WA</td>
<td>241.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CL1 – CL3</td>
<td>$184.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle WA</td>
<td>5,963.40</td>
<td>170*</td>
<td>CL1 – SES B1</td>
<td>$312.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany WA</td>
<td>222.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$134.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Airport WA</td>
<td>673.30</td>
<td>37*</td>
<td>CL1 – CL4</td>
<td>$237.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hedland WA</td>
<td>246.30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>CL1 – CL3</td>
<td>$687.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(f) Customs House Gove, NT, is the only premises owned by Customs. It is valued at $2,569,678.16 with depreciation of $191,585.18.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

**Australian Federal Police & the Australian Institute of Police Management**

(1)(a) Australian Federal Police.

(b)-(f) See Table 1.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane Ave, Barton ACT</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>$261.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woden ACT</td>
<td>13,546.70</td>
<td>0*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$227.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackall St, Barton ACT</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>AFP Band 1—SES</td>
<td>$365.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston ACT</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>AFP Band 3—SES</td>
<td>$215.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majura ACT</td>
<td>3,127.20</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn St, Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>14,333</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>$559.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford St, Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>2,875</td>
<td>0***</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$456.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne, VIC</td>
<td>9,679</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>$389.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robina, QLD</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—AFP</td>
<td>$456.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns, QLD</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>AFP Band 3—Executive Level</td>
<td>$343.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill, QLD</td>
<td>5,058</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>$440.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Island, QLD</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>AFP Band 3—AFP</td>
<td>$478.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide, SA</td>
<td>1,763.80</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—Executive Level</td>
<td>$372.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Perth, WA</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—SES</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin Airport, NT</td>
<td>2,502.15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>AFP Band 2—Executive Level</td>
<td>$491.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart, TAS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AFP Band 3—AFP</td>
<td>$329.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Woden premises are used for office space and records storage.
**The property at Majura ACT is owned by the AFP, with a land value of $16.2 million and $680,423 worth of depreciation of the buildings.
***The Oxford St premises are used for operational staff office space.

**Notes**
(1) ‘Non-office’ locations consistent with the principles of Australian Government Property Data Collection (PRODAC) have been excluded. These include:
- ACT Policing
- Airport Police Stations
- Operational, training and storage facilities
- Discreet locations
- Offshore sites
(2) Some of the rental costs per m² are averaged across the site, that is, they are comprised of the average rent for all components of the site e.g. storage, basement, office space, etc.

**Australian Government Solicitor**
(1)(a) Australian Government Solicitor (AGS).
(b-d) See Table 1.
(e) AGS leases all its office premises. As a GBE operating in a competitive environment, AGS regards detailed information about its overhead costs, such as its office lease costs in each location, as being commercially sensitive including because disclosure of its current lease rates could disadvantage AGS business interests when negotiating lease and sublease terms.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (3 premises)</td>
<td>6047 (total)</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>3311</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The response to part (c) represents the total office space leased by AGS. AGS sublets some of this space in a number of the locations referred to in the response to part (b).
2. AGS is a government business enterprise (GBE) operating on a commercial and competitive basis in providing legal and related services to government and its agencies. AGS is not subject to the Public Service Act 1999 and its employees are not Australian Public Service (APS) employees. AGS has a broadband classification structure which is significantly different to that for APS agencies. For the purposes of responding to part (d), AGS staff are classified as either 'lawyers' or 'legal and business support'. The numbers include casuals but not employees on unpaid leave nor contractors.

Australian Human Rights Commission
(1)(a) Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC).
(b) AHRC has one office located in Sydney.
(c) 4142.2 square metres (of which 1346 square metres is subleased to the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner and the Secretariat of the Asia Pacific Forum under long term lease arrangements).
(d) AHRC employs 147 staff ranging from APS1 to SES Band 2, plus 6 Statutory Office Holders.
(e) The premises are rented at the cost of $520 (excluding GST) per square metre per annum.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Australian Institute of Criminology & the Criminology Research Council
(1)(a) Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC).
(b) AIC has one office located in Canberra.
(c) 1729 square metres, representing total office space.
(d) AIC employs 52 staff ranging from APS2 to SES Band 1.
(e) Total rent payable per annum for total office space as at February 2012 is $474,213 at a rate of $274.27 per square metre.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Australian Law Reform Commission
(1)(a) Australian Law Reform Commission (ALRC).
(b) ALRC has one office located in Sydney.
(c) 390 square metres.
(d) ALRC employs 17 staff ranging from APS4 to SES Band 3.
(e) The premises are rented at the cost of $755 per square metre including outgoings.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

**Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**

(a) Australian Security Intelligence Organisation (ASIO).
(b) ASIO has one declared office building located in Canberra.
(c) The agreed Net Lettable Area is 14,500 sqm.
(d) For security reasons, ASIO does not reveal specific details on staff members, including the number of staff in specific locations and their classifications.
(e) The premises are rented at the cost of $241.53 per square metre per annum ex GST, inclusive of office space, storage and parking.
(f) ASIO Central Office is located in a building owned by the Department of Finance and Deregulation.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

**Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre**

(a) Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (AUSTRAC).
(b-e) See Table 1.
(f) Not applicable as AUSTRAC leases all its tenancies in commercial premises.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chatswood</td>
<td>5,283.40</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>APS3 – SES B2 plus 1 CEO</td>
<td>$406.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>APS4 – SES B1</td>
<td>$454.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>APS4 – SES B1</td>
<td>$434.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>APS4 – EL2</td>
<td>$692.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Adelaide and Perth staff are located in partner agency premises (the Australian Federal Police, the Australian Customs and Border Protection Service and state police forces) and undertake FIU-related work.

**Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions**

(a) The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (CDPP).
(b-e) See Table 1.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>996.60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>SES B1 – APS3</td>
<td>$424.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>SES B2 – APS2</td>
<td>$662.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EL2 – APS3</td>
<td>$381.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (Marcus Clarke St)</td>
<td>2,353.80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>SES B3 – APS3</td>
<td>$417.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (Farrell Place)</td>
<td>289.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SES B1 – APS3</td>
<td>$404.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>521.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EL2 – APS3</td>
<td>$460.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>384.90</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>EL2 – APS 3</td>
<td>$488.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>SES B1 – APS2</td>
<td>$380.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>SES B1 – APS2</td>
<td>$275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>6,056.90</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Director – APS1</td>
<td>$486.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SES B1 – APS 3</td>
<td>$252.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CrimTrac

(1)(a) CrimTrac.

(b) CrimTrac has one office located in Canberra.

(c) 3872.2 square metres.

(d) CrimTrac employs 198 staff ranging from APS 1 to SES Band 1, plus one CEO.

(e) The office is leased at a cost of $1,534,758.84 per annum (excluding GST). This equates to a cost of $396.35 per square metre (excluding GST).

(f) The office is not owned by the agency.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Family Court of Australia

(1)(a) Family Court of Australia.

(b-e) See Table 1.

Note: The Commonwealth Law Courts tenancies are shared with other jurisdictions and the lease is not specific to the exact space leased, areas are based on the percentage of the building occupied by the Family Court.

(f) Not applicable.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide—Roma Mitchell Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>56.05%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>APS2 – SES B1</td>
<td>$452.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>512.83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS3 – APS4</td>
<td>$271.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e) if rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size (Square metres)</td>
<td>Number of Staff</td>
<td>Staff Classifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Springs</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APS3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane – Harry Gibbs Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>49.67%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>APS2—SES B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns—L3 Cnr Grafton &amp; Shield St</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>APS3 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns—Part L4 Cnr Grafton &amp; Shield St</td>
<td>666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra, 15 London Cct Level 7</td>
<td>297.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>APS2 – SES B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra, 15 London Cct Levels 2, 3 and 4</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra, 15 London Cct Storage</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra—Nigel Bowen Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>71.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffs Harbour</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandenong</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>APS2—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS3—APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>692.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart—Edward Braddon Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>30.73%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>APS2—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS3–APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>912.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS3—EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne—Owen Dixon Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>51.05%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>APS2—SES B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>2,419.20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>APS2—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta—Garfield Barwick Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>92.14%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>APS2—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS3–APS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney—Lionel Bowen Building Commonwealth Law Courts</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>APS1—SES B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>APS2—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>748.40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS3—EL2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Court of Australia
(1)(a) Federal Court of Australia.
(b) See Table 1.
(f) Regarding the Sydney office, an agreement is in place to provide accommodation free of charge, but it is recognised in our accounts as a notional market rent.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e) if rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Square metres)</td>
<td>of Staff</td>
<td>Classifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>5,848</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>CO2 – JUDGE</td>
<td>$377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>CO2 – JUDGE</td>
<td>$460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CO2 – S6</td>
<td>$252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>649.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S3 – S6</td>
<td>$519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S3 – L1</td>
<td>$319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>9,558</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>S1 – JUDGE</td>
<td>$427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>4,981</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>CO2 – JUDGE</td>
<td>$713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>9,591</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>CO2 – JUDGE</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal Magistrates Court of Australia
(1)(a) Federal Magistrates Court of Australia.
(b), (c), and (e) See Table 1.
(d) See Table 2. Staff work out of the same locations as those of the Family Court, as well as the three locations listed below.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(e) if rented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Magistrates Court—Newcastle</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Magistrates Court—Sydney; 88 Goulburn Street, Floor 6</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>$529.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Magistrates Court—Sydney 88 William Street</td>
<td>1,116.50</td>
<td>$505.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>APS4 – EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>APS3 – EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS4 – EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS4 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandenong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS4–EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS4 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS4 – EL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>APS3–SES B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>APS4 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>APS3—EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS4 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>APS3–EL2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS4 – APS5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>APS3—EL1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Court of Australia

(a) The High Court of Australia.
(b) See Table 1.
(c) The High Court owns the Canberra building. The building value is $184.615 million as at 22 March 2012. The building depreciation is valued at $2.617 million for the period to 29 February 2012.
(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Leased/Owned</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>High Court Employee 1 to Senior Executive Officer</td>
<td>Owned</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High Court Employee 3 to Executive Level 2</td>
<td>Commonwealth/State Government Agreement</td>
<td>The Court does not pay rent for these premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Court Employee 3 to Executive Level 2</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding with Department of Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>$608.88 per square metre per annum (excluding GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Court Employee 5 and High Court Employee 6</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding with Department of Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>The Court does not pay rent for these premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Court Employee 6</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding with</td>
<td>The Court does not pay rent for these premises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Leased/Owned</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Finance and Deregulation Memorandum of Understanding with Department of Finance and Deregulation $669.72 per square metre per annum (excluding GST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia**

1(a) Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia (ITSA).

(b–e) See Table 1.

(f) Not applicable.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates statements.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>APS2—SES B1</td>
<td>$426.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>1,438</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>APS1—SES B1</td>
<td>$542.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>1,537.4</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>APS3 – SES B1 (plus 1 CEO)</td>
<td>$444.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>419.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>APS3 – EL1</td>
<td>$360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1,493</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>APS2 – SES B1</td>
<td>$362.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>814.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>APS3—EL2</td>
<td>$422.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>1,715.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>APS3—EL2</td>
<td>$622.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All work in all locations is office based but may also involve visits/inspections to other workplaces including courts, other government agencies, commercial and private businesses, or private residences. Additionally the Adelaide office operates a seven day a week phone contact centre.

**National Native Title Tribunal**

1(a) National Native Title Tribunal (NNTT).

(b–e) See Table 1.

(f) Not applicable.

(g) Please refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget statements.
Office of Parliamentary Counsel

(a) Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC).
(b) OPC has one office located in Barton, Canberra.
(c) 1,953 square metres.
(d) OPC employs 53 staff with classifications from APS2 to SES Band 2 and 3 statutory officers.
(e) $415 per square metre.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget statements.

Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

(a) Office of the Australian Information Commissioner (OAIC).
(b-e) Please see Table 1.
(f) Not applicable.
(g) Refer to the 2011-12 Portfolio Budget statements.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (Square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Staff Classifications</th>
<th>Annual Rent per square metre (excl GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>APS1 – EL2</td>
<td>$36.42 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>APS2 – EL1</td>
<td>$33.75 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>APS3 – SES Band 1</td>
<td>$49.95 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>APS2 – EL1</td>
<td>$23.81 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>APS2 – APS6</td>
<td>$35.21 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>2,949</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>APS2 – SES B1</td>
<td>$51.55 per sq metre per month.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION 2

Attorney-General's Department

(a)(i) See Table 2.1 below
(ii) See Table 2.1 below
(iii) All are located in Canberra

Table 2.1: AGD communication and media employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
Table 2.1: AGD communication and media employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Editor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b)(i),(ii) See Table 2.2 below

and (iii): All are located in Canberra

Table 2.2: AGD media and communications employees (non-ongoing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Nil.

**Administrative Appeals Tribunal**

(2)(a-c) Nil.

**Australian Commission for Law Enforcement Integrity**

(2)(a)(i) Two ongoing staff have media and communications functions as part of their roles, 1 EL2 and 1 EL1.

(a)(ii) Media and communications functions—respond to questions from the media and draft briefings, presentations and speeches on behalf of the agency.

(a)(iii) These staff work in Canberra.

(b) and (c) ACLEI employs no non-ongoing or contracted staff in media or communications roles.

**Australian Crime Commission**

2(a)(i),(ii) See Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Web and Graphic Design (1), Communication Officer (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>Team Leader Media and Government Relations and Team Leader Engagement and Communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(a)(iii) All staff are based in the ACC’s National Headquarters in Canberra.

(b-c) Nil.

**Australian Customs and Border Protection Service**

(2)(a)(i) As at 22 March 2012, 29 ongoing staff were employed within the Customs and Border Protection Communications and Media team. See Table 1.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a)(ii) The Communication and Media team delivers communication advice, services and tools to support Customs and Border Protection’s strategic aims. This includes responding to media inquiries and developing both internal and external communication strategies.

(a)(iii) These staff are located in Canberra.

(b)(i), (ii) and (iii) As at 22 March 2012, no non-ongoing staff were employed within the Customs and Border Protection Communications and Media team.

(c)(i), (ii) and (iii) As at 22 March 2012, no contracted staff were employed within the Customs and Border Protection Communications and Media team.

**Australian Federal Police**

(2)(a)(i) See Table 1.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band 3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a)(ii) These staff undertake public affairs, marketing, production and online services work.

(a)(iii) These staff are located in Canberra.

(b)(i)-(iii) There is one non-ongoing staff member at Band 6 level who is involved in marketing and based in Canberra.

(c)(i)-(iii) Nil.

**Australian Government Solicitor**

(2)(a), (b), (c) AGS does not have any positions that are dedicated to public relations, communications of government policies and programs, or media management/liaison. AGS has a media
contact person at the SES equivalent level but these duties form a very small part of their role. AGS has
a corporate communications team that is responsible for marketing and promotional activities associated
with AGS’s provision of legal services, as well as for internal communications.

**Australian Human Rights Commission**

(2)(a)(i), (ii) See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Web Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Events and Marketing Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Web Manager and 2 Media Advisers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Director Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a)(iii) All staff are located in Sydney.

(b)(i) See Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Web Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Media Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b)(iii) All staff are located in Sydney.

(c) (i)-(iii) Not applicable.

**Australian Institute of Criminology & the Criminology Research Council**

(2)(a)(i)-(iii) Not applicable.

(b)(i) One EL2 staff member.

(b)(ii) AIC’s communications resources publish hard copy, web, social media and via events are an
essential and recognised component of its outcome of disseminating research on crime and justice,
which it does to an external audience.

(b)(iii) The staff member is located in our Canberra office.

(c) Not applicable.

**Australian Law Reform Commission**

(2)(a)(i) The ALRC has no communications, public relations, or media staff. This function is part of
the Executive Director’s role (SES Band 1).

(a)(ii) Type of work is to prepare media releases regarding inquiries, appointments, release of
consultation papers and final reports, answer media inquiries to the ALRC, oversee communications to
stakeholders, coordinate publication of consultation papers and final reports.

(a)(iii) The staff member is located in our Canberra office.

(b) Nil.

(c) Nil.

**Australian Security Intelligence Organisation**

For security reasons, ASIO does not reveal specific details of staff members, including the number of
staff in specific areas, their classifications and the work they undertake.
Australian Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre

(2)(a)(i) See Table 1.

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1 (acting)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a)(ii) The acting EL1 is responsible for managing the day-to-day operations of the team; developing, implementing and evaluating a range of internal and external communication strategies; coordinating responses to media enquiries; and oversees the production of printed publications including AUSTTRAC's annual report, and annual typologies and case studies report.

The APS6 is responsible for providing strategic website advice and projects, production of articles for various forums/media; editing/proofreading; and contributing to communications projects as required.

The APS5 is responsible for the application of AUSTTRAC branding (that is, graphic design); design and layout of external/internal corporate publications; management of photo gallery; and production of various documents, forms and presentations; publishing material on the AUSTTRAC website; and contributing to communications projects as required.

All staff in this team may be called upon to provide assistance in the completion of other correspondence to a range of stakeholders including government, partner agencies, industry and the community.

(a)(iii) These staff are located in Melbourne.

(b)(i) There is one non-ongoing staff member in Communications & Products at EL2 level.

(b)(ii) The EL2 is responsible for overseeing the development and implementation of various communications strategies and providing strategic advice on communication and media matters. This staff member also oversees the Communications & Products team.

(b)(iii) This staff member is located in Melbourne.

(c)(i-iii) Nil.

**Commonwealth Director of Public Prosecutions**

CDPP does not employ any public relations, communications and media staff.

**CrimTrac**

(2)(a)(i) CrimTrac employs two ongoing staff in its Strategic Communication team, one at the APS 6 level and one at the EL 2 level.

(a)(ii) The Strategic Communication Team is responsible for ensuring that the Agency engages effectively, influences and develops relationships with its partner agencies, stakeholders and clients. The Team manages the agency's communication strategy, media liaison and corporate publications and assists with presentations and functions.

(a)(iii) All staff are located in the Canberra office.

(b)(i)-(iii) CrimTrac does not employ any non-ongoing staff in public relations, communications and media roles.

(c)(i)-(iii) CrimTrac does not employ any contracted staff in public relations, communications and media roles.
Family Court of Australia

(2)(a)(i), (ii) See Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal/external communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Internal/external communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Internal/external communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Media manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All the staff in the media and communications team are employed by the Family Court of Australia; however, as part of the single administration with the Federal Magistrates Court, the staff are shared 50/50 between each court and perform their functions accordingly.

(a)(iii) All staff are located in Canberra with the exception of one EL1 member who is located in Melbourne.

(b)(i) There is one non-ongoing APS6 staff member.

(b)(ii) This person performs internal and external communications work.

(b)(iii) This person is located in Canberra.

(c)(i)-(iii) Not applicable.

Federal Court of Australia

(2)(a)(i) The Federal Court employs one staff member at EL2 level.

(a)(ii) The EL2 performs public relations, communication and media liaison.

(iii) The EL2 is located in Melbourne.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

Federal Magistrates Court of Australia

The Federal Magistrates Court does not employ public relations, media and communications staff, however, as part of the single administration with the Federal Magistrates Court, the staff are shared 50/50 between each court and perform their functions accordingly.

High Court of Australia

The High Court of Australia does not employ any public relations, communications and media staff.

Insolvency and Trustee Service Australia

(2)(a)(i), (ii) See Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Communications officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Web content manager; Stakeholder engagement officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assistant Director; Stakeholder engagement Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Director, Client, Communications and Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a)(iii) All staff are employed in Canberra.

(b)(i) ITSA employs one APS 5 and one part-time APS 6.

(b)(ii) These staff are employed as a Communications Officer and Media Adviser respectively.

(b)(iii) All staff are employed in Canberra.
(c) Not applicable.

National Native Title Tribunal

(2)(a)(i)—(iii) Not applicable.

(b)(i) NNTT employs one APS6 Communications Officer.

(b)(ii) The Communications Officer develops content for the NNTT’s intranet and internet; writes and edits a range of business focused information products (publications, external newsletters, corporate documents and procedures). The NNTT does not engage in externally focused public affairs activities such as promoting events to media or engaging media on a daily basis. However, the Communications Officer deals with media inquiries when they arise.

(b)(iii) The Communications Officer is located in Perth.

(c) Not applicable.

Office of Parliamentary Counsel

The Office of Parliamentary Counsel does not employ any public relations, communications or media staff.

Office of the Australian Information Commissioner

(2)(a)(i) OAIC employs two staff members in public relations and communications.

There is one EL 2 (this is a full time role, but only about 20 per cent of it relates to externally focused public affairs activities), plus one EL 1 staff member.

(ii) The EL1 staff member is the Director, Corporate and Public Affairs and Deputy Director, Corporate and Public Affairs.

(iii) The EL1 and EL2 staff members are located in Sydney.

(b) Not applicable.

(c) Not applicable.

1 Human resource information system data does not currently specify the physical office location of staff located in Canberra.

2 This figure includes operational staff based at Newcastle Container Examination Facility.

3 This figure includes operational staff based at Sydney International Airport.

4 This figure includes operational staff based at Darwin Container Examination Facility.

5 This figure includes operational staff based at Brisbane International Airport.

6 This figure includes operational staff based at Cairns International Airport.

7 Human resource information system data does not currently specify the physical office location of staff located in Fremantle and Albany.

8 This figure includes operational staff located within the Perth Detector Dog Unit.

Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Disability Reform, Housing, Homelessness, Community Services and Status of Women: Staffing (Question Nos 1747, 1748, 1765, 1766, 1778 and 1779)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and the Minister for Disability Reform; the Minister for Housing and the Minister for Homelessness; and the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for the Status of Women, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:
(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   (a) the department or agency;
   (b) the location;
   (c) the size;
   (d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   (e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   (f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      (i) value, and
      (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

   (2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
      (a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
         (i) their classification,
         (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
         (iii) their location;
      (b) the number of non ongoing staff, specifying:
         (i) their classification,
         (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
         (iii) their location; and
      (c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
         (i) their classification,
         (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
         (iii) their location.

Senator Chris Evans: and Senator Wong: The Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs and the Minister for Disability Reform; the Minister for Housing and the Minister for Homelessness; and the Minister for Community Services and the Minister for the Status of Women provide the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) to (g) A response is provided at Attachment A for the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA) properties; Attachment B for Portfolio Bodies less Aboriginal Hostels Limited; and Attachment C for Aboriginal Hostels Limited.

(2) (a) to (c) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, the number of public relations, communications and media staff at 31 January 2012 is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/agency</th>
<th>Staff (Ongoing) FTE</th>
<th>Staff (Non ongoing) FTE</th>
<th>Staff (contracted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FaHCSIA</td>
<td>45.97 (SES Band 1, SPAO2, SPAO1, PAO3, PAO2, PAO1, EL1, APS6, APS4, and APS3)</td>
<td>8.40 (SPAO1, PAO3, PAO2, EL1, APS6, APS5, APS4)</td>
<td>7 (PAO3, PAO2, PAO1, APS6 and APS5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/agency</td>
<td>Staff (Ongoing) FTE</td>
<td>Staff (Non-ongoing) FTE</td>
<td>Staff (contracted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Hostels Limited</td>
<td>2 (APS6 and APS4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anindilyakwa Land Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (ASO5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of Family Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (EL1 and APS5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Land Council</td>
<td>2 (SOG B and ASO5-6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency</td>
<td>1 (APS6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Business Australia</td>
<td>2.5 (IBA7, IBA6 and IBA5)</td>
<td>2 (IBA6 and IBA5)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Land Corporation</td>
<td>2 (EL2 and ILC 3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Land Council</td>
<td>2 (NLC classification does not align with Commonwealth Government levels)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outback Stores</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Appeals Tribunal</td>
<td>1 (APS6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiwi Land Council</td>
<td>1 (CEO)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres Strait Regional Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (APS6 and APS4)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wreck Bay Aboriginal Community Council</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FaHCSIA’s SES Band 1 position, located in Canberra, provides high level strategic communications advice to Ministers and Parliamentary Secretaries, and represents FaHCSIA on internal and interdepartmental committees and working groups.

FaHCSIA communication positions, located in Canberra, Melbourne and Darwin, develop and implement communication and media strategies and campaigns; write, edit and proofread, design, print and market research briefs, online content, media releases, speeches, editorial, reports, minutes and correspondence; contract management; event management; organise the placement of advertising; organise and manage photographic and film shoots; and organise website content updates.

The Aboriginal Hostels Limited positions, located in Canberra, manage internal publications such as the Hostel News, general media enquiries, website creation and maintenance.

The Anindilyakwa Land Council position, located on Groote Eylandt, prepares the community magazine and manages general media.

The Australian Institute of Family Studies positions, located in Melbourne, undertake programmed public relations and corporate communications activities.

The Central Land Council (CLC) positions, located in Alice Springs, undertake general media and public relations duties such as answering public enquiries; liaising with the media and arranging interviews; issuing press releases; issuing written educational and promotional material; maintaining the website to Australian Government standards; editing and publishing the CLC Annual Report and arranging it to be tabled in the Australian Parliament; and managing stakeholder engagement.

The Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Agency position, located in Sydney, manages external communication including media.

The Indigenous Business Australia positions, located in Canberra and Sydney, manage public relations, communications and marketing and undertake graphic design.

---

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
The Indigenous Land Council (ILC) positions, located in Adelaide, coordinate the preparation and release of ILC publications, including the Annual Report, newsletters, media releases, speech writing and are the first point of contact for all media enquiries.

The Northern Land Council positions, located in Darwin, undertake general media and public relations duties; provide media related briefings; process media permits; contribute to media releases, interviews and publications; and undertake marketing, educational and public awareness activities.

The Social Security Appeals Tribunal position, located in Melbourne, prepares the Annual Report; maintains internal and external publications, brochures and forms; maintains website content; responds to media enquiries; and assists with other external communication activities.

The Tiwi Land Council position, located in Darwin, attends to public relations as a function of the Chief Executive Officer's role.

The Torres Strait Regional Authority positions, located on Thursday Island, undertake media liaison, website maintenance and develop media releases, speaking notes, speeches, publications, artwork descriptions, marketing and advertising.

Attachments A, B and C are available from the Senate Table Office.

Foreign Affairs and Trade
(Question Nos 1749 and 1756)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Minister representing the Minister for Trade and Competitiveness, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Ministers' portfolio, detailing:
   (a) the department or agency;
   (b) the location;
   (c) the size;
   (d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   (e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   (f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      (i) value, and
      (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Ministers' portfolios, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
   (a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location;
   (b) the number of non-ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location; and
   (c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
(i) their classification,
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and
(iii) their location.

**Senator Bob Carr:** The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

**DFAT**

(1) (a) Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

(b) (c) and (e) Refer to locations in Australia only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Size (Net Lettable Area)</th>
<th>Rent p/m2 (per month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RG Casey Building</td>
<td>John McEwen Crescent Barton</td>
<td>45,382m²</td>
<td>$36.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Arts House Blackall Street</td>
<td>817m²</td>
<td>$31.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW State Office</td>
<td>Gateway House Lee Street Sydney</td>
<td>1,833.6m²</td>
<td>$41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Passports Office</td>
<td>Angel Place Pitt Street</td>
<td>815.3m²</td>
<td>$50.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle Passports Office</td>
<td>Hunter Street Newcastle</td>
<td>217m²</td>
<td>$32.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory Office</td>
<td>NT House Mitchell Street</td>
<td>314m²</td>
<td>$44.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland State Office</td>
<td>Ann Street Brisbane</td>
<td>1211m²</td>
<td>$50.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia State Office</td>
<td>Currie Street Adelaide</td>
<td>607.8m²</td>
<td>$35.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania State Office</td>
<td>Macquarie Street Hobart</td>
<td>335m²</td>
<td>$33.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia State Office</td>
<td>Exchange Plaza Sherwood Court Perth</td>
<td>827m²</td>
<td>$82.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria State Office</td>
<td>Casseldon Place Lonsdale Street Melbourne</td>
<td>2044m²</td>
<td>$39.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday Island Office</td>
<td>Chester Street</td>
<td>68m²</td>
<td>$46.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.2m²</td>
<td>$43.92 (storage rent rate)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) The number of staff at each location as at 31 December 2011 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland*</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales**</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Thursday Island Office; ** Includes NSW State Office, Sydney Passports Office and Newcastle Passports Office

The classification of employees by location as at 31 December 2011 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Canberra</th>
<th>State Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Canberra</th>
<th>State Offices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 5</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Level 1</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Level 2</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non SES Unattached*</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (Spec.) Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES (Spec.) Band 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG Safeguards**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Unattached*</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate APS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Officer Cl. 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Officer Cl. 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unattached includes staff on leave without pay, long service leave, seconded to other agencies and staff covered by the Members of Parliament (Staff) Act 1984. ** Director of Safeguards, a statutory officer responsible to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, occupies the position of Director General of the Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office

(f) All Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade premises are leased.

(g) Refer to Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements 2011-12:

- Outcome 1, page 23
- Outcome 2, page 29
- Outcome 3, page 35

(2) (a) (b) and (c) Number of staff by function and location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Non-Ongoing</th>
<th>Contractors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media – Canberra</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Diplomacy – Canberra</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (b) and (c) Type of work by classification:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Public Diplomacy</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate APS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS Level 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Level 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec. Level 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AusAID

(1) (a) Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID)
(b) the location of AusAID's office accommodation is shown in Table 1
(c) the size of AusAID's office accommodation is shown in Table 1
(d) the number of AusAID staff at each location and their classification is shown in Table 1
(e) the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre for AusAID's office accommodation is shown in Table 1
(f) Not applicable.

(g) in Canberra, AusAID staff undertake public administration, policy development and oversight the programs to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. At overseas posts AusAID staff manage the delivery of the aid programs by designing, planning, managing, coordinating and monitoring poverty reduction activities in partnership with developing countries and international development organisations.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (square metres)</th>
<th>Number of Staff (and Classifications)</th>
<th>Annual Rent Per Square Metre (AUD)</th>
<th>Annual Rent (AUD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (255 London Cct)</td>
<td>9167.0</td>
<td>588 (31 SES, 76 EL2, 208 EL1, 170 APS6, 82 APS5, 14 APS4, 7 APS 3)</td>
<td>$459.00</td>
<td>$4,207,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (20 Allara St)</td>
<td>9914.8</td>
<td>528 (19 SES, 84 EL2, 175 EL1, 133 APS6, 69 APS5, 42 APS4, 6 APS3)</td>
<td>$383.58</td>
<td>$3,803,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra (40 Allara St)</td>
<td>3038.7</td>
<td>Planned 227 (11 SES, 26 EL2, 54 EL1, 95 APS6, 41 APS5 (occupancy due June 2012)</td>
<td>$380.00</td>
<td>$1,154,706</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) (a) 34
(i) their classification (refer to table 2),
(ii) the type of work they undertake, (refer to table 2),
(iii) their location (refer to table 2)

(b) 3
(i) their classification (refer to table 2),
(ii) the type of work they undertake, (refer to table 2),
(iii) their location (refer to table 2)

(c) 1
(i) their classification (refer to table 2)
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and (refer to table 2),
(iii) their location (refer to table 2)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Non-Ongoing</th>
<th>Contractors</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Media liaison</td>
<td>EL2—1</td>
<td>APS6 – 2</td>
<td>EL1 – 2</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Communications, public</td>
<td>EL2 – 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Austrade

(1) (a) Australian Trade Commission (Austrade)

(b) (c) (d) and (e)

Note: The response for (1) (b) (c) (d) and (e) applies to Australian office locations and is accurate as of 31 March 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (square metres)</th>
<th>Total staff (APS1 to SES 3)</th>
<th>Rent paid (annually)</th>
<th>Breakdown of rent ($ per square metre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>130,700</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brisbane</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>221,011</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1,645,541</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51,217</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>86,083</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>546,187</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15,432</td>
<td>572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28,595</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>305,428</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1,449,881</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21,265</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werribee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8,404</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This staff member is located in an ally office (Wyndham City Council) and therefore has no location details recorded.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
(f) Not applicable.

(g) Austrade advances Australia’s trade and investment interests through information, advice and services to businesses, industry and governments as well as contributes to the protection and welfare of Australians abroad through timely and responsive consular and passport services in specific locations overseas.

(2) (a) (b) and (c)
Nine (five as Austrade ongoing staff, two as non-ongoing and two on contract)
(i) From APS5 to EL2.
(ii) Media, communications and content production.
(iii) Austrade Sydney office.

EFIC
(1) (a) Export Finance and Insurance Corporation (EFIC)
(b) Export House, Level 8-10, 22 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW
(c) Approximately 1,939 m²
(d) Sydney: 85.2 Full-time equivalent (FTE) staff
   Perth: One FTE based in Austrade office (Level 26, Exchange Plaza, Sherwood Court, Perth WA)
   Melbourne: One FTE based in Austrade office (Level 31, 140 William Street, Melbourne VIC)

N.B. EFIC is not an Australian Public Service (APS) body.
(c) N/A
(f)
   (i) Freehold land and building at last valuation—$32.8 million.
      Net book value as at 1 July 2011—$29.6 million
   (ii) Accumulated depreciation as at 30 June 2011 – ($3.2 million)

(g) Export House (Sydney) is EFIC’s central office and caters for the range of activities related to the execution of EFIC’s mandate to support Australian exporters with export finance and insurance solutions across Australia. The two EFIC staff outside of Sydney based in Austrade offices (1 FTE in Perth and 1 FTE in Melbourne) are both Directors in EFIC’s SME and Mid-Market team. Both staff undertake business development activities.

(2) Two ongoing staff:
   (a) (i) Not under APS classification.
      (ii) One FTE Senior Manager, PR and Communications
          One FTE Manager, Marketing Communications
          Public relations and communications activities for EFIC.
   (iii) Export House, Sydney (22 Pitt Street)
(b) Nil.
(c) Nil.
ACIAR

(1) (a) Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research (ACIAR)
(b) 38 Thynne Street, Fern Hill Park, Bruce ACT 2617
(c) 1500m2
(d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APS Classification</th>
<th>Employees by Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SES Band 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(e) $32.83/m2 (including GST)
(f) Not applicable
(g) ACIAR is a statutory authority that operates as part of Australia's overseas aid program. ACIAR's functions are to:
- commission research into improving sustainable agricultural production in developing countries
- fund project-related training
- communicate the results of funded research
- conduct and fund development activities related to research programs
- administer the Australian Government's contribution to the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR).

(2) (a) Five ongoing staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Work undertaken</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EL 1 Manager</td>
<td>Team leadership, development of strategic communications</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 1 Publications Manager</td>
<td>Management of publications program</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL 1 Science Communicator</td>
<td>Production of corporate magazine and information resources</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 6 Public Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Media liaison and public affairs coordination</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS 4 Communications Officer</td>
<td>Website content management, administrative support</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Nil
(c) Nil

Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities
(Question No. 1750)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
(a) the department or agency;
(b) the location;
(c) the size;
(d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
(e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
(f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
   (i) value, and
   (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
(g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:

(a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location;
(b) the number of non-ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location; and
(c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location.

**Senator Conroy:** The Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

A response to Questions 1 and 2 are provided in the attached table.

**Response to Question 1 – Senate Question on Notice 1750**

**Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities (DSEWPaC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total ($/m²)</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>John Gorton Building, King Edward Tee, Parkes ACT 33 Allara St, Civic, ACT 18 Marcus Clarke St, Acton ACT 13 Keltie St, Woden, ACT Cnr Pederson Rd &amp; Fenton Court, Marrara,</td>
<td>22,321</td>
<td>$ 8,258,918.00</td>
<td>$ 370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,123</td>
<td>$ 4,031,180.01</td>
<td>$ 441.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>$ 582,978.79</td>
<td>$ 490.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>$ 2,318,567.34</td>
<td>$ 377.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>$ 829,024.60</td>
<td>$ 344.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Street number/ building name</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area (m²)</td>
<td>Rent—Total ($/m²)</td>
<td>Rent Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,399,075.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>203 Channel Hwy, Kingston, TAS</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>$2,399,075.20</td>
<td>$356.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>37 St Georges Tce, Perth, WA</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>$295,691.16</td>
<td>$655.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Where actual cost per m² for office space is available it has been provided, otherwise the average cost per m² for the total net lettable area of the tenancy has been provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>APS 1/2/3</th>
<th>APS 4</th>
<th>APS 5</th>
<th>APS 6</th>
<th>EL 1</th>
<th>EL 2</th>
<th>SES 1</th>
<th>SES 2</th>
<th>SES 3</th>
<th>PEO/CEO/ SECRETARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** SEWPaC’s Australian Antarctic Division also has staff located at Macquarie Wharf in Hobart, the Kettering Watercraft training Facility, Antarctic research stations, Macquarie Island, the Antarctic Climate and Ecosystem Research Centre at the university of Tasmania and expeditioners not included in these figures. SEWPaC also has 25 staff hosted by FaHCSIA in offices around Australia. DSEWPaC’s Supervising Scientist Division also has a field station at Jabiru, NT. Figures exclude staff in Parks Australia Division reported under Director of National Parks.

**Director of National Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/ building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total $</th>
<th>Rent ($/m²)</th>
<th>Value $</th>
<th>Depreciation $</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>Australian National Botanic Gardens, Acton ACT</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>1,690,000.00</td>
<td>63,640.00</td>
<td>1,690,000.00</td>
<td>Delivery of Government policy and programs, research, horticulture and general administrative tasks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booderee</td>
<td>319</td>
<td></td>
<td>432,000.00</td>
<td>11,738.00</td>
<td>432,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Net Lettable Area (m²)</td>
<td>Rent—Total $</td>
<td>Rent ($/m²)</td>
<td>Value $</td>
<td>Depreciation $</td>
<td>Function/work undertaken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Island</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>10,690.00</td>
<td>85.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Island National Park</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>558,626.00</td>
<td>15,830.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>7,868,850.00</td>
<td>187,632.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakadu National Park</td>
<td>1712</td>
<td>10,028,000.00</td>
<td>264,526.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island National Park</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>80,044.00</td>
<td>4,259.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin National Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnr Pederson Rd &amp; Fenton Court, Marrara, NT</td>
<td>Hosted by DSEWPaC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Director of National Parks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>APS 1/2/3</th>
<th>APS 4</th>
<th>APS 5</th>
<th>APS 6</th>
<th>EL 1</th>
<th>EL 2</th>
<th>SES 1</th>
<th>SES 2</th>
<th>SES 3</th>
<th>PEO/CEO/SECRETARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booderee National Park</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Island National Park</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakadu National Park</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Island National Park</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocos (Keeling) Island</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**
Figures include staff employed by the Director of National Parks and staff employed by DSEWPaC in the Parks Australia Division.

### National Water Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total ($/m²)</th>
<th>Rent ($/m²)</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>95 Northbourne Ave, Civic, ACT</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>$ 465,786.68</td>
<td>$ 404.68</td>
<td>Delivery of Government policy and programs and general administrative tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total ($)</th>
<th>Value ($)</th>
<th>Depreciation ($)</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>Orchid Plaza, Lake St, Cairns, QLD</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>91,677.72</td>
<td>281.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marine park management including environmental assessments, compliance and field management; environment and sustainability policy development and implementation; communication, education and policy coordination; general administrative tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td>43 River St, Mackay, QLD</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>46,555.34</td>
<td>339.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton</td>
<td>130 Victoria Pde, Rockhampton, QLD</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26,264.40</td>
<td>305.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>2-68 Flinders</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>583,502.79</td>
<td>225.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total $</th>
<th>Rent ($/m2)</th>
<th>Value $</th>
<th>Depreciation $</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>Kelleher Pl, Townsville, QLD</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>140,000.40</td>
<td>234.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquarium</td>
<td>2-68 Flinders St, Townsville, QLD</td>
<td>4475</td>
<td>16,037,403.00</td>
<td>655,786.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>APS 1/2/3</th>
<th>APS 4</th>
<th>APS 5</th>
<th>APS 6</th>
<th>EL 1</th>
<th>EL 2</th>
<th>SES 1</th>
<th>SES 2</th>
<th>SES 3</th>
<th>PEO/CEO/SECRETARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockhampton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Murray-Darling Basin Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Rent—Total $</th>
<th>Rent ($/m2)</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>51 Allara St, Civic, ACT</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>$1,506,570.00</td>
<td>$390.00</td>
<td>Information and compliance services, policy and planning, environmental management, river management and general administrative tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>40 Allara St, Civic, ACT</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>$309,925.00</td>
<td>$385.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>213 Greenhill Rd, Eastwood, SA</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$25,500.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University, Albury, NSW</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>APS 1/2/3</th>
<th>APS 4</th>
<th>APS 5</th>
<th>APS 6</th>
<th>EL 1</th>
<th>EL 2</th>
<th>SES 1</th>
<th>SES 2</th>
<th>SES 3</th>
<th>PEO/CEO/SECRETARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adelaide</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

---
Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (SHFT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street number/building name</th>
<th>Net Lettable Area (m²)</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Depreciation</th>
<th>Function/work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Georges Heights, Mosman, NSW</td>
<td>1422</td>
<td>$2,543,800.00</td>
<td>$35,828.00</td>
<td>Rehabilitation, remediation, development, management of Commonwealth Trust land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>Cockatoo Island, Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$463,200.00</td>
<td>$6,345.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees in SHFT are employed under the Sydney Harbour Federation Trust Act 2001, and not the Public Service Act 1999, and as such are not Australian Public Service (APS) employees, or Senior Executive Service (SES) officers. SHFT may have 'SES-equivalent' employees, but they are not formally classified as SES officers.

Bureau of Meteorology

The Bureau of Meteorology were unable to provide a response at the time of this report.

Response to Question 2 – Senate Question on Notice 1750

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Non-Ongoing</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Work Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSEWPaC</td>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>4 x APS 4, 1 x APS 5, 11 x APS 6, 16 x EL1 and 7 x EL2</td>
<td>1 x APS 5 and 4 x EL1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Media liaison and monitoring, internal and external communications (including Ministerial and Parliamentary Secretary communications), social media, web content, management of events, sponsorships, publications and advertising and stakeholder engagement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Non-Ongoing</td>
<td>Contracted</td>
<td>Work Performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, Tasmania</td>
<td>3 x APS 6, 1 x EL1 and 1 x EL2</td>
<td>2 x APS 4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Internal and external communications and management of events, community outreach and education activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of National Parks</td>
<td>1 x SPAO, 3 x PAO and 1 x APS 6</td>
<td>1 x APS 6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Media liaison and monitoring, internal and external communications (including Ministerial and Parliamentary Secretary communications), social media, web content, management of events, sponsorships, publications and advertising and stakeholder engagement activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Water Commission</td>
<td>1 x APS 5 and 1 x EL2</td>
<td>1 x APS 6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Media support, internal and external communications (including Ministerial and Parliamentary Secretary communications), web content and management of events and publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray-Darling Basin Authority</td>
<td>2 x APS 5, 3 x APS 6, 5 x EL1 and 3 x EL2</td>
<td>2 x APS 6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Web content, internal and external communications, graphic design, media and publications support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority</td>
<td>1 x APS 2, 1 x APS 4, 2 x APS 5, 2 x APS 6, 1 x EL1 and 1 x EL2</td>
<td>1 x APS 3 and 2 x APS 5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Internal and external communications, media support, web content and Reef Guardians Communications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
### Questions on Notice

**Finance and Deregulation**  
(Question No. 1751)

**Senator Abetz** asked the Minister for Finance and Deregulation, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

1. Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   a. the department or agency;
   b. the location;
   c. the size;
   d. the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   e. if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   f. if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      i. value, and
      ii. depreciation, of the building; and
   g. the type of functions and work undertaken.

2. For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
   a. the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
      i. their classification,
      ii. the type of work they undertake, and
      iii. their location;
   b. the number of non-ongoing staff, specifying:
      i. their classification,
      ii. the type of work they undertake, and
      iii. their location; and
   c. the number of contracted staff, specifying:
      i. their classification,
      ii. the type of work they undertake, and
      iii. their location.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
<th>Non-Ongoing</th>
<th>Contracted</th>
<th>Work Performed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Harbour Federation Trust</td>
<td>Georges Heights</td>
<td>1 x SES 1</td>
<td>1 x APS 5, 1</td>
<td>2 x EL2</td>
<td>Management of publications including content design, social media, web content, mailing, marketing, events, merchandise, and wayfinder and visitor initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bureau of Meteorology were unable to provide a response at the time of this report.
Senator Wong: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:

(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Staff Nos.</th>
<th>Rented</th>
<th>Owned</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>See Attachment A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>General office work associated with the AEC core business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC</td>
<td>See Attachment B (available from the Senate Table Office)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComSuper</td>
<td>Cameron Offices, Belconnen ACT 2617</td>
<td>13,452.4 m²</td>
<td>APS1 to CEO</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>$316</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>ComSuper is a service delivery agency, undertaking superannuation administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Superannuation Corporation</td>
<td>Level 8, 121 Marcus Clarke St, Canberra Suite 41A, Level 41, 2 Park Street, Sydney</td>
<td>1,400 m² approx</td>
<td>Ranging from junior operations staff to CEO</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>$420</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Provision of superannuation services and products to present and former Australian Government employees and Defence Force superannuation schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>790 m² approx</td>
<td>Ranging from junior operations staff to Chief Investment Officer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Fund Management Agency</td>
<td>120 Collins Street, Melbourne</td>
<td>1,825 m²</td>
<td>FFMA 1 to FFMA 6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Management of the investment of the Future Fund, the Building Australia Fund, the Health and Hospitals Fund and the Education Investment Fund.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126 Phillip Street, Sydney</td>
<td>157.5 m²</td>
<td>FFMA 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,352</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Communications Officers</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Staff Nos.</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing Non-ongoing Contractor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>SES1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APS4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>APS3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Communications Officers</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Staff Nos.</td>
<td>Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Non-ongoing</td>
<td>Contractor s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>liaison and monitoring, marketing and communication activities, social media engagement and blog management, policy and operational advice on the campaign advertising framework; secretariat support and communications advice to the Independent Communications Committee and preparation of the biannual reports on campaign advertising. Staff also provide incidental support to the offices of the Minister for Finance and Deregulation and the Special Minister of State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComSuper</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Public awareness concerning federal elections, enrolment, internal communication, design and publishing management and public enquiries, media and public relations, and web services management – internet and intranet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Superannuation Corporation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ComSuper's communications officers provide print management and internal communications, internal and external communications advice, graphic design, media monitoring, publications, and web publishing as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranging from junior to middle management</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Member communications for members of the Australian Public Sector and Australian Defence Force Superannuation Schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Communications Officers</td>
<td>Classification</td>
<td>Staff Nos.</td>
<td>Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Fund Management Agency</td>
<td>Ongoing 1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>FFMA 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attachment A**

**Department of Finance and Deregulation – Office Accommodation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size (m²)*#^</th>
<th>Number of Staff incl. P/T &amp; casual (as at March 2012)</th>
<th>Office space and breakdown per square metre*#^</th>
<th>If department owned, (i) value and (ii) depreciation</th>
<th>Type of function and work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>Tourism House 40 Blackall Street  BARTON ACT 2600</td>
<td>2,371*</td>
<td>202 APS2 to SES2</td>
<td>$476/m² * $1,128,596 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Block Offices Queen Victoria Terrace Parkes ACT 2600</td>
<td>1,112*</td>
<td>Nil (lease expiry pending – used for staging space) 234 APS2 to SES3</td>
<td>$263.12/m² * $292,589.44 pa</td>
<td>(i)$12,500,000 (ii)$1,063,996</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minter Ellison Building 25 National Circuit FORREST ACT 2603</td>
<td>Lease (a) 1,956* Lease (b) 933 *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A Government Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Gorton Building 28 National Circuit FORREST ACT 2603</td>
<td>9,753*</td>
<td>612 APS2 to Secretary</td>
<td>$370/m² * $3,608,852 pa</td>
<td>(i)$122,000,000 (ii)$25,475,624</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Edward Terrace PARKES ACT 2600</td>
<td>5262*</td>
<td>421 APS2 to SES3</td>
<td>$390/m² * $2,052,180 pa</td>
<td>(i)$95,000,000 (ii)$18,995,783</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasury Building PARKES ACT 2600</td>
<td>1,500*</td>
<td>103 APS2 to SES2</td>
<td>$418/m² * $627,000 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burns Centre 29-31 Sheppard Street HUME ACT 2620</td>
<td>160 *</td>
<td>13 APS1 to EL1</td>
<td>$511.35/m² * $81,813.60 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hume Data Centre 98 Sheppard Street Hume ACT 2620</td>
<td>2,932*</td>
<td>43 APS1 to SES1</td>
<td>$69.26/m² * $203,011.68 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Deregulation</td>
<td>Building 5, Wetlands House FYSHWICK ACT 2609</td>
<td>726 *</td>
<td>37 APS4 to SES1</td>
<td>$278.53/m² * $202,213 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iron Mountain COMCAR DEPOT Building 6, Wetlands Foreshore, Dairy Rd, Fyshwick, ACT 2609</td>
<td>872 #</td>
<td>177 APS2 to APS6</td>
<td>$230,507.14 pa #</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size (m2)*#</td>
<td>Number of Staff incl. P/T &amp; casual (as at March 2012)</td>
<td>Office space rent amount and breakdown per square metre*#</td>
<td>If department owned, (i) value and (ii) depreciation</td>
<td>Type of function and work undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>Building 7, Wetlands Foreshore, Dairy Rd, Fyshwick, ACT 2609</td>
<td>453 #</td>
<td>46 APS2 to SES1</td>
<td>$119,747.40 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>Unit 2, 33 Maddox St, Alexandria, NSW 2015</td>
<td>1,832 #</td>
<td>56 APS2 to APS6</td>
<td>$313,542.78 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>Unit 3, 49 Links Avenue, Eagle Farm, QLD 4009</td>
<td>822 #</td>
<td>25 APS2 to APS5</td>
<td>$115,678 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>8 Marlow Rd, Keswick, SA 5035</td>
<td>872 #</td>
<td>14 APS2 to APS4</td>
<td>$110,745 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>34 Hood Street, Airport West, VIC 3042</td>
<td>1,000 #</td>
<td>39 APS2 to APS6</td>
<td>$74,305.35 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMCAR DEPOT</td>
<td>Unit 3, 127 Grandstand Road, Ascot, WA 6104</td>
<td>623 #</td>
<td>14 APS2 to APS6</td>
<td>$70,801.22 pa</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Transport operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Finance and Deregulation Parliamentary Offices</td>
<td>102 ^</td>
<td>7 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$548.55/m² ^</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Parliament Treasurer Place, Parliament House, ACT 2609</td>
<td>120 ^</td>
<td>6 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$363.87/m² ^</td>
<td>$43,664.40 pa</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Parliament House, Parliaments Place, WA 6000</td>
<td>106 ^</td>
<td>6 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$579.61/m² ^</td>
<td>$61,438.66 pa</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Parliament House, Parliament House, QLD 4009</td>
<td>127.4 ^</td>
<td>5 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$370.26/m² ^</td>
<td>$47,171.12 pa</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Parliament House, Parliament House, SA 5000</td>
<td>60 ^</td>
<td>5 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$996.24/m² ^</td>
<td>$59,774.00 pa</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth</td>
<td>Parliament House, Parliament House, WA 6000</td>
<td>97 ^</td>
<td>3 APS3 to EL1</td>
<td>$350.00/m² ^</td>
<td>$33,950.00 pa</td>
<td>Government Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Department** | **Location** | **Size (m²)*#^** | **Number of Staff incl. P/T & casual (as at March 2012)** | **Office space rent amount and breakdown per square metre*#^** | **If department owned, (i) value and (ii) depreciation** | **Type of function and work undertaken**  
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---  
Finance and Deregulation | Commonwealth Parliamentary Offices  
Level 9  
9-11 Cavenagh Street  
DARWIN NT 0800 | 36.83 ^ | 1 APS6 | $415.00/m² ^ | $15,282.38 pa | N/A | Government Administration  

* Square metres and rental costs are for office accommodation only (excludes costs relating to storage, car parks, non-office areas, as well as any operating expenses relating to the leases)  
# Square metres and rental costs relate to the whole depot and may include office space, storage areas, parking for COMCARS and non-office areas. The cost excludes any operating expenses related to the lease.  
^ For the Commonwealth Parliamentary Offices, only the office space and rental costs relating to departmental staff has been reported (not including visiting or resident Senators and Members Offices, associated visiting car parks or storage, or any operating expenses related to the leases.)

**Industry and Innovation**  
(Question No. 1757)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Industry and Innovation, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:

(a) the department or agency;
(b) the location;
(c) the size;
(d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
(e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
(f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
   (i) value, and
   (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:

(a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location;
(b) the number of non ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and
(iii) their location; and
(c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
(i) their classification,
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and
(iii) their location.

Senator Lundy: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:
Please refer to the answer provided to Senate Parliamentary Question on Notice 1738.

Health and Ageing: Staffing
(Question Nos 1759, 1763 and 1772)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   (a) the department or agency;
   (b) the location;
   (c) the size;
   (d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   (e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   (f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
      (i) value, and
      (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
   (g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:

   (a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location;
   (b) the number of non ongoing staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location; and
   (c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
      (i) their classification,
      (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
      (iii) their location.

Senator Ludwig: The Minister for Health has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

(1) (a) to (c) Please refer to Attachment A)
(d) The provision of details relating to the number of staff by classification level at each location at this time would involve an unreasonable diversion of resources.

(e) to (g) Please refer to Attachment A

(2) (a) to (c) Please refer to Attachment B

Attachment A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Rented Location rent per m²</th>
<th>Owned Location Breakdown</th>
<th>Functions &amp; Work types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Health and Ageing</td>
<td>Level 2, Jacobs House, 8-10 Hobart Place, Canberra City, ACT 2601</td>
<td>529.70</td>
<td>$471.49</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>The Department of Health and Ageing and Portfolio agencies wish to achieve better health and active ageing for all Australians through delivering key Australian Government health and ageing priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scarborough House, Atlantic Street, Woden, ACT 2602</td>
<td>16,499.00</td>
<td>$386.29</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sirius Building, 23 Furzer Street, Woden, ACT, 2606</td>
<td>45,967.00</td>
<td>$469.83</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4, 1 Bowes Place, Woden, ACT, 2606</td>
<td>584.70</td>
<td>$472.21</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5 &amp; Level 6, 1 Bowes Place, Woden, ACT, 2606</td>
<td>1,169.40</td>
<td>$472.21</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 8, 1 Bowes Place, Woden, ACT 2606</td>
<td>584.70</td>
<td>$360.08</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1, Canberra House, 40 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City, ACT 2600**</td>
<td>411.00</td>
<td>$505.49</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 1, 126-128 Gladstone Street, Fyshwick, ACT 2609</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
<td>$172.59</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, Anangu House, 44 Bath St, Alice Springs, NT 0870</td>
<td>253.00</td>
<td>$377.37</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 7, Jacana House, Woods Street, Darwin, NT, 0800</td>
<td>1,326.80</td>
<td>$513.17</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brussels Mission, Rue Guimardstraat 6-8, 1040 Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>$274.74</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1, Australian Consulate General, Chemin des Fins 2, Case Postale 172, 1211 Geneva 19, Switzerland</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>$991.50</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 1B, 155 Hugh Street, Townsville, QLD, 4810</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>$435.58</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Levels 15,16 and 17, 160 Ann St, Brisbane, QLD 4000</td>
<td>2,481.00</td>
<td>$596.46</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 13 &amp; part level 14, 11-29 Waymouth Street, Adelaide, SA, 5000</td>
<td>2,034.10</td>
<td>$607.35</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1, 100 Melville Street, Hobart, TAS 7000</td>
<td>844.00</td>
<td>$386.94</td>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size m²</td>
<td>Rented Location rent per m²</td>
<td>Owned Location Breakdown</td>
<td>Functions &amp; Work types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy 4, Level 4, 12 - 20 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>344.15</td>
<td>$421.69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 7, 8 and part level 9, 595 Collins Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>4,570.00</td>
<td>$430.60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 14 &amp; Part Level 15 Central Park, 152-158 St George's Terrace, Perth, WA 6000</td>
<td>2,482.40</td>
<td>$577.44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 8, 9 and 10, Centennial Plaza A, 260 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills, NSW 2010</td>
<td>4,035.20</td>
<td>$582.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenancy 4, Level 4, 12 - 20 Flinders Lane, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>344.15</td>
<td>$421.69</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 7, 8 and part level 9, 595 Collins Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>4,570.00</td>
<td>$430.60</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 14 &amp; Part Level 15 Central Park, 152-158 St George's Terrace, Perth, WA 6000</td>
<td>2,482.40</td>
<td>$577.44</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels 8, 9 and 10, Centennial Plaza A, 260 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills, NSW 2010</td>
<td>4,035.20</td>
<td>$582.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (ACSQHC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Rented Location rent per m²</th>
<th>Owned Location Breakdown</th>
<th>Functions &amp; Work types</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Depreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 Thynne Street, Fern Hill Park, Bruce, ACT, 2617</td>
<td>3,632.00</td>
<td>$351.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Thynne Street, Fern Hill Park, Bruce, ACT, 2617</td>
<td>2,034.00</td>
<td>$351.90</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Pearcey House, Units 1 and 2, Fern Hill Park, Bruce, ACT, 2617</td>
<td>506.00</td>
<td>$334.40</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Pearcey House, Unit 15, Fern Hill Park, Bruce, ACT, 2617</td>
<td>253.00</td>
<td>$350.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Rented Location rent per m²</th>
<th>Owned Location Breakdown</th>
<th>Functions &amp; Work types</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Depreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1, Canberra House, 40 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra City, ACT 2600**</td>
<td>601.00</td>
<td>$505.49</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5, 51 Allara Street, Civic, ACT, 2600</td>
<td>633.00</td>
<td>$369.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 6, 221 London Circuit, Civic, ACT, 2600</td>
<td>710.00</td>
<td>$355.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Australian National Preventive Health Agency (ANPHA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Rented Location rent per m²</th>
<th>Owned Location Breakdown</th>
<th>Functions &amp; Work types</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Depreciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38-40 Urunga Parade, Miranda, NSW 2228</td>
<td>1,009.10</td>
<td>$410.76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619 Lower Plenty Road, Yallambie, VIC 3085</td>
<td>8,243.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td>$789,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5, 7 London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>$297.56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1, 16 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra, ACT 2617</td>
<td>326.00</td>
<td>$984.15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size m²</td>
<td>Rented Location rent per m²</td>
<td>Owned Location Breakdown</td>
<td>Functions &amp; Work types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ)</strong></td>
<td>499 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC 3001</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>$929.95</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 14, 300 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>$40.35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of South Australia Playford Building, East Campus, Adelaide SA 5000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health Workforce Australia (HWA)</strong></td>
<td>55 Blackall Street, Barton, ACT 2600</td>
<td>2,408.00</td>
<td>$438.70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106 The Terrace, Wellington, New Zealand, 6011</td>
<td>476.1</td>
<td>$131.76</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Blood Authority (NBA)</strong></td>
<td>Level 6, 400 King William Street, Adelaide, SA 5000</td>
<td>3,176.00</td>
<td>$498.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 12, 120 Spencer St, Melbourne Vic 3000</td>
<td>520.00</td>
<td>$470.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Health and Medicine Research Council (NHMRC)</strong></td>
<td>Level 1, 19-23 Moore Street, Turner, ACT 2612</td>
<td>909.00</td>
<td>$388.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 3, 11 Queens Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>$820.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Office 20 Corporate House, Garden City Office Park, 2404 Logan Road, Eight Mile Plains, QLD 4113</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$811.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS)</strong></td>
<td>Levels 1-5, 16 Marcus Clarke Street, Canberra, ACT 2601</td>
<td>5,025.00</td>
<td>$602.65</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>499 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC 3001</td>
<td>495.00</td>
<td>$495.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 7, 260 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills, NSW 2010**</td>
<td>1,345.80</td>
<td>$582.13</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR)</strong></td>
<td>Part Level 1, Pharmacy Guild House, 15 National Circuit, Barton, ACT 2600</td>
<td>1,075.00</td>
<td>$478.46</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Services Review (PSR)</strong></td>
<td>Level 1, 18-20 Brindabella Circuit, Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport, ACT 2609</td>
<td>595.00</td>
<td>$582.99</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Therapeutic Goods</strong></td>
<td>136 Narrabundah Lane, Symonston, ACT, 2609</td>
<td>16,286.00</td>
<td>$422.23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Size m²</td>
<td>Rented Location rent per m²</td>
<td>Owned Location Breakdown</td>
<td>Functions &amp; Work types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration (TGA)</strong></td>
<td>Level 1, 50 Collie Street, Fyshwick, ACT 2609</td>
<td>758.00</td>
<td>$313.55</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 2, Level 2, 20 Smith Street, Parramatta, NSW 2150</td>
<td>263.50</td>
<td>$416.82</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 3, Level 2, 20 Smith Street, Parramatta, NSW 2150</td>
<td>319.00</td>
<td>$319.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 60 Waymouth Street, Adelaide, SA, 5000</td>
<td>129.00</td>
<td>$298.36</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 8, Casselden Place, 2 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>232.00</td>
<td>$486.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 10, Casselden Place, 2 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000</td>
<td>337.00</td>
<td>$486.72</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2, 200 Mary Street, Brisbane, QLD 4000</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>$565.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St Vincent's Hospital, NSW Medicines Information Centre, Paddington, Sydney, NSW 2010*</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>$2,416.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency (ACSAA)</strong></td>
<td>Level 9, 111 Phillip Street, Parramatta, NSW 2150</td>
<td>1,468.00</td>
<td>$451.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 991 Whitehorse Road, Box Hill, VIC 3128</td>
<td>694.00</td>
<td>$383.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5, 26 Flinders Street, Adelaide, SA 5000</td>
<td>353.00</td>
<td>$413.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Terrace Office Park, Level 2, South Tower, 527 Gregory Terrace, Bowen Hills, QLD 4006</td>
<td>574.00</td>
<td>$574.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building B, The Garden Office Park, 3555Scarborough Beach Road, Osborne Park, WA 6017</td>
<td>323.00</td>
<td>$675.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/67 Pakington Street, Geelong West, VIC 3218</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$241.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 3, 18 Elizabeth Street, Hobart, TAS 7000</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>$316.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 1, 260 Maitland Road, Mayfield, NSW 2034</td>
<td>154.00</td>
<td>$168.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 2, 2 Queen Street, Mittagong, NSW 2575</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>$408.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 5, Level 2, 10 Rudd Street, Canberra City, ACT 2601</td>
<td>188.00</td>
<td>491.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suite 6, Level 2, 10 Rudd Street, Canberra City, ACT 2601</td>
<td>138.00</td>
<td>536.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**
### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**Department/Agency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Size m²</th>
<th>Rented Location rent per m²</th>
<th>Owned Location Breakdown</th>
<th>Functions &amp; Work types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suite 1, Level 3, 10 Rudd Street, Canberra City, ACT 2601</td>
<td>502.00</td>
<td>528.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2, 10-12 Brisbane Avenue, Barton, ACT 2600</td>
<td>699.00</td>
<td>395.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Insurance Administration Council (PHIAC)</td>
<td>Suite 2, Level 22, 580 George Street, Sydney NSW</td>
<td>344.9</td>
<td>668.56</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Ombudsman (PHIO)</td>
<td>Level 7, 362 Kent Street, Sydney NSW</td>
<td>209.5</td>
<td>330.27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Serviced Office Tenancy Agreement - Shared facility with St Vincent's Hospital including all corporate and library overheads

** Properties with shared leasing arrangements between the Department and Portfolio Agencies

### Attachment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ongoing staff</th>
<th>Non ongoing staff</th>
<th>Contracted staff</th>
<th>Work Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Health and Ageing</strong></td>
<td>Central Office, Canberra, ACT &amp; State Offices NSW, SA, WA, NT, QLD, TAS Sydney, NSW</td>
<td>68 SES 1, EL2, PAO, APS 6, APS 5, APS 4</td>
<td>14 EL1, APS6, PAO, APS5 &amp; APS 4</td>
<td>2 EL1 &amp; APS 4</td>
<td>Researching, writing and developing externally focused communication materials including: Advertising campaigns Communication Strategies Publications Media releases Speeches Events Web Pages and Social Media content Manage Media Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care (ACSQHC)</strong></td>
<td>AHW Building precinct, Canberra</td>
<td>5 EL2, EL1 &amp; APS 5</td>
<td>1 APS4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW)</strong></td>
<td>Canberra City, ACT</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 EL1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian National Preventive Health Agency (ANPHA)</strong></td>
<td>Canberra City, ACT</td>
<td>1 EL2</td>
<td>1 APS 5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Australian Organ and Tissue Donor and Transplantation Authority (AOTDTA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Agency</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ongoing staff</td>
<td>Non ongoing staff</td>
<td>Contracted staff</td>
<td>Work Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Radiation Protection and Nuclear Safety Agency (ARPANSA)</td>
<td>Yallambie, VIC</td>
<td>1 EL1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Australia (CA)</td>
<td>Surry Hills NSW</td>
<td>2 EL2, EL1 &amp; APS 6</td>
<td>2 APS 6</td>
<td>3 APS 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Standards Australia New Zealand (FSANZ)</td>
<td>Barton, ACT</td>
<td>3 EL2 &amp; EL1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Workforce Australia (HWA)</td>
<td>Adelaide, SA &amp; Melbourne VIC</td>
<td>2 EL1 &amp; HWA6</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 HWAEL3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Blood Authority (NBA)</td>
<td>Turner, ACT</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>2 EL1</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health and Medicine Research Council (NHMRC)</td>
<td>Canberra, ACT</td>
<td>3 EL2, APS6 &amp; APS 5</td>
<td>1 EL1</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Industrial Chemicals Notification and Assessment Scheme (NICNAS)</td>
<td>Surry Hills NSW</td>
<td>3 EL2, EL1 &amp; APS4</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>1 EL1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Services Review (PSR)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
**Small Business**
*(Question No. 1764)*

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Small Business, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

1. Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
   - the department or agency;
   - the location;
   - the size;
   - the number of staff at each location and their classification;
   - if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
   - if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
     - value, and
     - depreciation, of the building; and
   - the type of functions and work undertaken.

2. For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
   - the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
     - their classification,
     - the type of work they undertake, and
     - their location;

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Agency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Ongoing staff</th>
<th>Non ongoing staff</th>
<th>Contracted staff</th>
<th>Work Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Staff</td>
<td>No. of Staff</td>
<td>No. of Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Care Standards and Accreditation Agency (ACSAA)</td>
<td>Parramatta, NSW</td>
<td>3 EL2, Senior Corporate Affairs Officers</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practice Education and Training Limited (GPET)</td>
<td>Canberra City, ACT 2601</td>
<td>1 EL2</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Insurance Administration Council (PHIAC)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Health Ombudsman (PHO)</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) the number of non ongoing staff, specifying:
(i) their classification,
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and
(iii) their location; and
(c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
(i) their classification,
(ii) the type of work they undertake, and
(iii) their location.

Senator Lundy: The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:
Please refer to the answer provided to Senate Parliamentary Question on Notice 1738.

Veterans' Affairs
(Question No. 1770)

Senator Abetz asked the Minister representing the Minister for Veterans' Affairs, upon notice, on 22 March 2012:

(1) Can a list be provided of all office locations for each department or agency within the Minister's portfolio, detailing:
(a) the department or agency;
(b) the location;
(c) the size;
(d) the number of staff at each location and their classification;
(e) if the office location is rented, the amount and breakdown of rent paid per square metre;
(f) if the location is owned by the department or agency, the:
   (i) value, and
   (ii) depreciation, of the building; and
(g) the type of functions and work undertaken.

(2) For each department and agency within the Minister's portfolio, can details be provided of all public relations, communications and media staff, listed by department or agency, including:
(a) the number of ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location;
(b) the number of non ongoing staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location; and
(c) the number of contracted staff, specifying:
   (i) their classification,
   (ii) the type of work they undertake, and
   (iii) their location.
**Senator Kim Carr:** The Minister for Veterans' Affairs has provided the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

Please see the following tables for (1) (a) (b), (c), (e), (f) and (g):

*The Department of Veterans’ Affairs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1(a) Who</th>
<th>1(b) Property Address</th>
<th>1(c) SQM</th>
<th>1(e) Rent *</th>
<th>1(f)(i) Value (If Owned)</th>
<th>1(f)(ii) Depreciation of Building (If Owned)</th>
<th>1(g) Types of Functions / Work Undertaken **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT DVA</td>
<td>Lvl Mezzanine—Lvl 9, Lovett Tower, 13 Keltie St, Woden 2606 ***</td>
<td>8,922</td>
<td>$376</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT DVA</td>
<td>Lvl 10-22 Lovett Tower, 13 Keltie St, Woden 2606</td>
<td>11,35 2</td>
<td>$376</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT VVCS</td>
<td>6-8 Champion St, Deakin ACT 2600</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>$339</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT Car</td>
<td>Car Parks Only—Centra Plaza</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$181</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT VAN</td>
<td>30 Corinna St, Woden (asa cnr 28-30 Brewer St)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>$457</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW DVA</td>
<td>Centennial Plaza, 280 Elizabeth St, Surry Hills 2010</td>
<td>7,904</td>
<td>$386</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW File Store</td>
<td>6 Epic Place, Chester Hill 2162</td>
<td>1,905</td>
<td>$103</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VAN</td>
<td>Ground Floor, 250 Mann Street, Gosford 2250</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$281</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>Suite 6, Conway Court, 17 Conway St, Lismore 2480</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>$308</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>Suite 1 &amp; 2 Grd Flr, 6 Auckland Street, Newcastle 2300</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>$252</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VAN</td>
<td>110 George St, Parramatta 2150</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>$383</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VVCS</td>
<td>Suite 1 &amp; 2, 88 Phillip St, Parramatta 2150</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>$364</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW File/Archive</td>
<td>120 Miller Road, Villawood 2163</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW VAN</td>
<td>Corporate Square, 43 Burelli Street, Wollongong 2500</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>Grnd Flr, 2 Chung Wah Terraces, Palmerston 0830</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>$401</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD DVA/VRB</td>
<td>259 Queen Street, Brisbane 4000</td>
<td>7,527</td>
<td>$678</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD VVCS</td>
<td>Suit G2/340 Ross River Rd, Aitkenvale 4817</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>$494</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD VVCS</td>
<td>15 Astor Terrace, Spring Hill 4000</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>$457</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD VAN</td>
<td>520 Flinders St, Townsville 4810</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>$351</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>12 Short Street, Southport 4215</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>Shop 2/129 Horton Parade, Maroochydore 4558</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>$397</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>l(a)</th>
<th>l(b)</th>
<th>l(c)</th>
<th>l(e)</th>
<th>l(f)(i)</th>
<th>l(f)(ii)</th>
<th>l(g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
<td>SQM</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>Value (If Owned)</td>
<td>Depreciation of Building (If Owned)</td>
<td>Types of Functions / Work Undertaken **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>99 Russell Street, Toowoomba 4350</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$333 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>File Store</td>
<td>996 Wynnnum Road, Cannon Hill 4170</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>$78 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Shop 45 Tweed Mall, Tweed Heads 2485</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>$857 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>DVA</td>
<td>199 Grenfell Street, Adelaide 5000</td>
<td>3,041</td>
<td>$340 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>Ground Floor, 99 Frome Street, Adelaide 5000</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>$333 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>DVA/VVCS</td>
<td>Barrack Place 254-256 Liverpool St, Hobart 7000</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>$377 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>29 Elphin Road, Launceston 7250</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>$149 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>RSC</td>
<td>8 Boland Street, Launceston 7250 (ASA Willis St)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>MOU N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>Loyd Lane, Glenorchy 7010</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>MOU N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>DVA</td>
<td>Lvl 11-15, 300 La Trobe Street, Melbourne 3000</td>
<td>4,749</td>
<td>$307 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>68a McLeod Street, Bairnsdale 3875</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$430 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>12 Dawson Street South, Ballarat 3350</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>$190 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>Shop 6 54-58 Wells St, Frankston</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>$186 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>U3 200 Malop Street, Geelong 3220</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$276 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>10 George Street, Morwell 3840</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$137 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>File Store</td>
<td>620 to 622 Lorimer Street, Port Melbourne 3207</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>$128 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN</td>
<td>715 Raglan Parade, Warnambool 3280</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$601 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VAN/VVCS</td>
<td>81 Hume Street, Wodonga 3690</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>$234 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>Level 4 / 440 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne 3000</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>$293 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>DVA</td>
<td>140 St Georges Terrace, Perth 6000</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>$560 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcomes 1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>VVCS</td>
<td>7 Kintail Road, Applecross 6153</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>$365 N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rent figures under l(e) are per SQM, per annum. Properties with 'MOU' listed under l(e) are paid under a Memorandum of Understanding licensing arrangement.

** Outcomes listed under l(g) are detailed in the 2011-12 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements, and descriptions are below:

**Outcome 1**: Maintain and enhance the financial wellbeing and self-sufficiency of eligible persons and their dependants through access to income support, compensation, and other support services, including advice and information about entitlements.

**Outcome 2**: Maintain and enhance the physical wellbeing and quality of life of eligible persons and their dependants through health and other care services that promote early intervention, prevention and treatment, including advice and information about health service entitlements.
Outcome 3: Acknowledgement and commemoration of those who served Australia and its allies in wars, conflicts and peace operations through promoting recognition of service and sacrifice, preservation of Australia's wartime heritage, and official commemorations.

*** Note: Floors Mezzanine to level 6 of Lovett Tower are sublet.

The Australian War Memorial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(e) Rent *</th>
<th>(f)(i) Value (If Owned)*</th>
<th>(f)(ii) Depreciation of Building (If Owned)**</th>
<th>(g) Types of Functions / Work Undertaken **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Main Building—Trelour Cres, Campbell</td>
<td>22,835</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$66,066,217</td>
<td>5,695,052</td>
<td>Exhibition display Visitor facilities Collection Storage Administration Administration 2 Collection Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Admin Building—Trelour Cres, Campbell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$7,359,697</td>
<td>$1,007,825</td>
<td>Administration 2 Collection Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>CEW Bean Building—Trelour Cres, Campbell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$8,609,904</td>
<td>$1,067,591</td>
<td>Administration 2 Collection Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Trelour A—Callan Street, Mitchell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$2,312,735</td>
<td>$494,935</td>
<td>Conservation Administration 1 Collection Storage 2 Collection Conservation 1 Collection Storage 2 Collection Conservation Collection Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Trelour B—Callan Street, Mitchell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,365,563</td>
<td>$332,437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Trelour C—Callan Street, Mitchell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$6,643,005</td>
<td>$1,184,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Trelour D—Vickers Street, Mitchell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$1,031,849</td>
<td>$59,525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>AWM</td>
<td>Trelour E—Callan Street, Mitchell</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Collection Storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Value as at 31st March

** Accumulated Depreciation as at 31st March

(1) (d) Both the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the Australian War Memorial's management systems do not group staff by office location. Below are tables showing the staff numbers by classification and/or state location as at 22 March 2012.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS4</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE
The Australian War Memorial

Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Tas</th>
<th>Vic</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MO4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAO 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAO 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAO 3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total*</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* full Time Statutory Office Holders

The following details are provided for all public relations, communications and media staff in:

The Department of Veterans’ Affairs:

(a) there are 16 ongoing staff:

(i) 3 are Public Affairs Officer Grade 1

4 are Public Affairs Officer Grade 2

8 are Public Affairs Officer Grade 3

1 is a Senior Public Affairs Officer

(ii) the work undertaken by public affairs officers is outlined in the 2010-11 Annual Report – see page 64

(iii) 15 are located in Canberra; 1 is located in Sydney.

(b) there are 4 non-ongoing staff:
(i) 2 are Public Affairs Officer Grade 1
2 are Public Affairs Officer Grade 3

(ii) the work undertaken by public affairs officers is outlined in the 2010-11 Annual Report – see page 64

(iii) 3 are located in Canberra; 1 is located in Brisbane.

(c) there are no contracted Public Affairs Officers.

***The Australian War Memorial***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Type of work undertaken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) 7 Ongoing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EL2</td>
<td>Head Communication and Marketing Section – Overall management and strategic direction of the marketing, media and communication of the Memorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all located at Admin Building – Treloar Cres, Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS6</td>
<td>1. Publication Officer – day to day management of the Memorial's brand focusing on historical, event and corporate publications (brochures, books, stationery etc). 2. Media Liaison Officer – day to day management of the Memorial's media and public relations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APS5</td>
<td>1. Friends of the Memorial Coordinator – day to day management of the Memorial's loyalty program 2. Web Assistant – day to day management of the Memorial's website.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 2 Non-Ongoing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>APS 5</td>
<td>Centenary Marketing—Preparation of communications plan in the lead up to the 2014-2018 Centenary of the First World War; development of communications strategy for the redevelopment of the First World War galleries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all located at Admin Building—Treloar Cres, Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>APS 4</td>
<td>1. Centenary Web – preparation of a web strategy for the Centenary the First World War</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(part-time 2 days per week)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Nil Contract</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>