

WOMEN for an Australian Republic

www.womenrep.org

The Hon Julia Gillard MP
Prime Minister
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Dear Prime Minister

AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO QUEEN OF AUSTRALIA'S DIAMOND JUBILEE – RENAMING PART OF PARKES PLACE AS QUEEN ELIZABETH TERRACE

We are writing about the letter of 19 April 2013 sent by Matthew Jose on your behalf (Ref C13/15130). We note that the response only deals with one issue of three raised in our letter of 5 March 2013, nor does it deal with the unanswered questions raised in our earlier correspondence of 24 October 2012 as requested.

We can only assume that some difficulty is being experienced responding to the issues that we have raised in relation to the decision to name part of Parkes Place as Queen Elizabeth Terrace. For instance, in relation to public consultation about the change, our present understanding is that there was none outside that directed to the Henry Parkes Foundation. We have already commented on the inadequacy of such minimal and narrow consultation given there were many other interested parties. If this assumption is incorrect, we would appreciate your advice to the contrary.

WfaAR is interested in the decision-making process set out in Mr Jose's letter. This can only refer to a second decision-making process for the formal gazettal of "a public place" carried out by the then Minister for Regional Australia under the National Memorials Ordinance 1928. Given your statement to the House on 7 February 2012, pre-dating the decision by Minister Crean on 26 July 2012 by more than five months, there must have been an earlier decision by the Government. We welcome your clarification about this matter and its relationship to the National Memorials Ordinance in place at the time of the first decision and identification of which Minister made the decision under which head of power.

In relation to the second decision, that is the one made by Minister Crean in July 2012, we would be particularly interested to know how Queen Elizabeth II met the criteria for the Minister to make a decision in her favour particularly in relation to the criterion, "contribution to Australia", under section 8C (2) (a) and/or (b).

Please note that we are not asking for a copy of the briefing or its contents so we do not expect to be told that advice to the Minister/Government is confidential. (We note that Ms Leon of PM&C referred to these criteria in her appearance before a Senate Estimates Committee in February 2012.) However, we now ask for a fresh

PO Box 3260 MANUKA ACT 2601
02 6288 5011 0419 246 468

explanation by the Government of its decision – or whoever/which Minister made the decision on its behalf - in the interests of transparency.

WfaAR would like to know how many representations objecting the Minister's decision were received by the Minister for Regional Australia, or the department or relevant statutory authorities, about "the renaming proposal" within 21 days of the gazettal, ie 26 September plus 21 days, as set out in section 8B (1) of the Ordinance. Were these representations referred to the CNMC as required by s 8B? We would be interested to know if there were any, how they were handled in accordance with the Ordinance. In fact, how many objections were received by the Government in total, either before or after the Minister for Regional Australia's decision?

Would you also please advise if the two ACT residents have been appointed to the CNMC as recommended in the "Etched in Stone" report from the parliamentary committee inquiry into the operations of the CNMC. If so, would you please provide their names.

We look forward to receiving your response to the matters raised above. We would also appreciate receiving your responses to the outstanding matters raised in our letters of 24 October 2012 and 5 March 2013.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Brasch
National Convenor
17 June 2013