



COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA

# Official Committee Hansard

JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON TREATIES

**Reference: Treaties tabled on 13 May and 25 June 2009**

MONDAY, 17 AUGUST 2009

CANBERRA

BY AUTHORITY OF THE PARLIAMENT



## **INTERNET**

Hansard transcripts of public hearings are made available on the internet when authorised by the committee.

The internet address is:

**<http://www.aph.gov.au/hansard>**

To search the parliamentary database, go to:

**<http://parlinfoweb.aph.gov.au>**

**JOINT STANDING  
COMMITTEE ON TREATIES**

**Monday, 17 August 2009**

**Members:** Mr Kelvin Thomson (*Chair*), Senator McGauran (*Deputy Chair*), Senators Birmingham, Cash, Farrell, Ludlam, Pratt and Wortley and Mr Briggs, Mr Forrest, Ms Hall, Mr Murphy, Ms Neal, Ms Parke, Mr Simpkins and Ms Vamvakinou

**Members in attendance:** Senators Cash, Farrell, McGauran, Pratt and Wortley and Mr Murphy, Ms Neal, Ms Parke, Mr Simpkins and Mr Kelvin Thomson

**Terms of reference for the inquiry:**

To inquire into and report on:

Treaties tabled on 13 May and 25 June 2009

**WITNESSES**

<b>BLAZEY, Mr Bassim, Acting First Assistant Secretary, International Organisations and Legal Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BURDON, Mr Benjamin James, Assistant Secretary, Americas, North and South Asia and Europe, Department of Defence.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>FITCH, Ms Catherine, Acting Assistant Secretary, Access to Justice Division, Attorney-General's Department .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>ROBERTSON, Ms Susan (Sue), Acting Director, International Law Section, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SEETO, Mr Andrei, Acting Director, United Nations and Commonwealth Section, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>SHEEHAN, Ms Anne Elissa, Principal Legal Officer, Office of International Law, Attorney-General's Department .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>THWAITE, Ms Julia, Acting Principal Legal Officer, Private International Law Section, Access to Justice Division, Attorney-General's Department .....</b>	<b>8</b>



---

**Committee met at 10.01 am**

**BLAZEY, Mr Bassim, Acting First Assistant Secretary, International Organisations and Legal Division, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

**BURDON, Mr Benjamin James, Assistant Secretary, Americas, North and South Asia and Europe, Department of Defence**

**ROBERTSON, Ms Susan (Sue), Acting Director, International Law Section, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

**SEETO, Mr Andrei, Acting Director, United Nations and Commonwealth Section, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**

**SHEEHAN, Ms Anne Elissa, Principal Legal Officer, Office of International Law, Attorney-General's Department**

**Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel**

**CHAIR (Mr Kelvin Thomson)**—I declare open this public hearing of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties ongoing review of Australia's international treaty obligations. The committee will take evidence on two treaty actions which were tabled in the parliament on 13 May and 25 June 2009.

I thank witnesses for being available for this hearing. The committee will now take evidence on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that this hearing is a legal proceeding of the parliament and warrants the same respect as proceedings of the House and the Senate. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of the parliament. I invite you to make some introductory remarks before we proceed to questions.

**Mr Blazey**—Thank you. We would like to make a brief opening statement. The United Nations General Assembly adopted the optional protocol on the safety of UN personnel in 2005. At that time, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon noted that the UN continues to face a security environment of unprecedented risk. That risk remains today. Just last month a veteran staff member, Zill-e Usman, of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, was shot by unidentified gunmen in a camp for displaced persons in Pakistan. Mr Usman was the third UNHCR staff member to die in Pakistan this year.

The Secretary-General has reported that from 1 July 2007 to 30 June 2008, 25 civilian UN personnel lost their lives as a result of malicious acts. This included staff from the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the UN Development Program, the World Food Program and the UN Relief and Works Agency. The losses over this period include 17 UN staff who died in the tragic bombings of the UN offices in Algiers on 11 December 2007. People delivering humanitarian or emergency assistance in the field are often at the front line of UN field operations and, as such, are frequently exposed to danger. Indeed, the UN community will mark

World Humanitarian Day on 19 August, which is this week. It was on that day in 2003 that the UN office in Iraq was bombed, killing 22 people. Among them was Sergio Vieira de Mello, the then UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The government recognises that for the UN to be effective its personnel need protection from security risks in a range of UN operations and not just in peacekeeping operations or operations declared to entail exceptional risk. The optional protocol fills a gap in the original convention on the safety of UN and associated personnel. The convention requires states to criminalise acts on UN and associated personnel and to either prosecute or extradite persons suspected of committing such acts. However, the convention has limited scope. It applies only to UN authorised peace and security operations or other UN operations specifically declared to be of exceptional risk by the UN Security Council or General Assembly. Despite marked escalation in the number of serious attacks against UN personnel since the 1990s, a declaration of exceptional risk has never been made. The optional protocol fills this gap by extending the scope of the legal protection of the convention to additional categories of UN operations, including those personnel involved in delivering humanitarian, political or development assistance in peace building or delivering emergency humanitarian assistance.

Australia believes UN personnel working on such missions should enjoy the same protection as their military or police colleagues. We therefore strongly support the optional protocol. Australians participate in a range of roles in the UN around the world. ADF and AFP personnel currently serve in UN missions in Sudan, the Middle East, Cyprus, East Timor, Afghanistan and Iraq. A number of Australians are also employed by the UN in field missions in areas of humanitarian aid and political or development assistance.

Once in force, the optional protocol will strengthen the protection of Australians working in UN missions. Moreover, crimes against the UN and associated personnel are crimes against people acting on behalf of the international community and are, therefore, of concern to all states, including Australia. Ratification of the optional protocol will demonstrate Australia's continuing support for UN operations and our concern for the safety of Australians on such operations. It will also strengthen international cooperation to ensure individuals are held accountable for crimes against persons involved in a broader range of UN activities. It is in our interest to enhance the security of such personnel and to ensure that perpetrators of crimes to which the convention applies are brought to justice. Thank you.

**CHAIR**—The national interest analysis indicates—and you have also indicated this in your remarks—that attacks on UN personnel are increasing. What do you think can be done to better secure United Nations personnel?

**Mr Blazey**—The principle responsibility for the security of UN personnel rests with the state in which those personnel are operating. It is important that the principles of that responsibility are well understood. Most states do wish to provide as much protection as they can. There is often a capacity issue which applies. But there is also a responsibility which applies to the UN as an organisation towards its own personnel. There has been quite a bit of work done by the UN internally, including through several reviews, to look at how it is best protecting its own personnel through a series, for example, of security alerts or UN security phases, which then trigger different arrangements for the safety of UN personnel. But, unfortunately, the days in which wearing a blue helmet or a blue beret does not in itself anymore give the sort of protection

it used to and, hence, the need for additional legal protections, which this optional protocol embody.

**CHAIR**—The optional protocol is not yet in force, so do you have any feel for how long it might take before the optional protocol does come into force?

**Mr Blazey**—The protocol requires an additional four states to ratify. I am not sure how soon that might occur. Maybe my colleagues have a better sense of it. Certainly if Australia ratifies that will be a further step forward, but there need to be another four. At this stage there are 34 signatories and 18 parties to the protocol.

**Senator CASH**—What is the hold-up with getting another four states to ratify the optional protocol?

**Mr Blazey**—There is no specific answer. Each state make its own decision based on its own interests and internal processes. Broadly speaking, there is very strong consensus support for the protocols, so it is a matter of states concluding their own internal processes and ratifying. But there is nothing specific which is stopping them from doing so.

**Senator CASH**—I note that in your opening statement you said that from 2005 onwards a lot of these personnel have been under unprecedented or heightened risk. But I note our background material states:

... no declaration of exceptional risk under the Convention has ever been made.

Why is that so, given the unprecedented risk that these people are facing? What would it take for a declaration of unprecedented risk to actually be made?

**Mr Blazey**—I am not sure why a statement has not been made. It is possible—and this is just speculation—that countries in which a UN operation is present may feel sensitive about being the subject of such a declaration. It would reflect badly on their ability to protect the UN operations in their own country and on their capabilities and seriousness in meeting their obligations, so getting that kind of a declaration through the UN Security Council of the General Assembly might be difficult. But, in recognition of the difficulty of getting those declarations, the protocol seeks to do away with that trigger, so there is an automaticity which would apply going forward.

**Senator CASH**—So the protocol would almost fill a gap, as you have already stated.

**Mr Blazey**—Exactly.

**Senator McGAURAN**—I see it is required that Australia amend its own Criminal Code Act. Prior to this, what protection did UN personnel have under our laws?

**Mr Blazey**—I might ask a colleague from Attorney-General's to respond to that.

**Ms Sheehan**—Division 71 of the Criminal Code provides for a range of offences in relation to UN or associated personnel engaged in a UN operation and implements the convention

obligations. The range of offences that are covered in division 71 include murder, manslaughter, intentionally or recklessly causing serious harm, unlawful sexual penetration, kidnapping, intentionally causing damage to the property of UN or associated personnel or threatening to commit any of the above offences.

**Senator McGAURAN**—So division 71 already existed as a protection of United Nations personnel?

**Ms Sheehan**—Division 71 implements the obligations in the convention.

**Senator McGAURAN**—What is there now, prior to the amendment, to protect?

**Ms Sheehan**—Division 71 would allow the prosecution of those offences that I have just listed. That implements the obligations that are in the convention.

**Senator McGAURAN**—Sorry; I am not making myself clear. If there is no convention, what protection is there for United Nations personnel under our laws?

**Ms Sheehan**—I am sorry; could you repeat that question.

**Senator McGAURAN**—If there is no convention, what existing protection, as it stands now, is there for the United Nations personnel under our laws?

**Ms Sheehan**—If there is no optional protocol?

**Senator McGAURAN**—Yes.

**Ms Sheehan**—Without the optional protocol what is currently in the criminal code implementing the convention applies.

**Ms Robertson**—Could I just assist there. I think it might be useful to distinguish between the convention and the optional protocols. Ms Sheehan was saying that once Australia ratified the original convention—which is not the subject of our discussions today, but it is the original instrument—Australia implemented that via section 71 of the Criminal Code. To implement the protocol, which is supplementary to the convention and builds upon it, small amendments will also be required, mainly to the definition of UN operation, not to the nature of the offences. If you are asking about what state and territory offences existed prior to any of that, there were some relevant state and territory offences as well, but they may not have had extraterritorial application.

**Ms PARKE**—As a former United Nations staff member, of course I am very, very happy to see this optional protocol on the table here, and I am very supportive of it. I understand that when I worked in peacekeeping in Kosovo my situation would have been covered under the existing convention, but I think that when I worked for UNRWA, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for the Palestine refugees in Gaza, the convention would not have applied to that situation. So my question is: does the optional protocol apply to staff of UNRWA, who deliver humanitarian assistance to the Palestine refugees in the Middle East? It covers the UNHCR, so I do not see any reason why it would not cover UNRWA, but I am asking about this specifically.

**Ms Robertson**—My view is that it would, with the caveat that the role people are playing there would certainly come under giving humanitarian political development assistance. There is a caveat in the optional protocol that the convention does not apply to situations of enforcement chapter 7 mandates.

**Ms PARKE**—That is not enforcement.

**Ms Robertson**—No, that is right. That is the only caveat. Even though at various times there may be an armed conflict going on in some of the areas you are talking about, my view is that that caveat would not apply to the UNRWA staff.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Thank you very much for everything you have provided for us so far. There is a thing that concerns me. I have no doubt I would like to see this additional protocol ratified, but what about the ratification of this additional protocol in cases such as in Africa—in the Sudan? Is the protection likely to be in the form of a deterrent if governments in Africa ratify the additional protocol? Do you see that as being a deterrent to criminal acts such as murders and these offences within those countries?

**Mr Blazey**—Yes, it is. It further reinforces the norm which is reflected in UN General Assembly resolutions and now crystallised in a legal instrument. So in that sense, yes, it would create an additional sense of obligation on those states, so it could be helpful.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Does this additional protocol obligate a nation to investigate and prosecute? Obviously there are some people out there who are not going to be swayed by whether or not there is a law but, in respect of the follow-up to make sure that offences are investigated and prosecuted, will the additional protocol guarantee that nations will investigate and prosecute?

**Ms Robertson**—Senator, I do not think there are any guarantees with these things, but I guess what we are trying to do is ensure that if a crime is committed in the host state and that host state is unable to prosecute or make the offender accountable then there is a need to rely on other states to do so. In a sense, the optional protocol is part of states forming a network of criminal justice laws which ensure that those gaps are filled. There are no guarantees in these things, but it is about strengthening the rule of law and ensuring that there are no gaps when these sorts of crimes are committed where, for example, there may be lack of capacity on the part of the host state.

**Senator McGAURAN**—Can I return to that point. It is only a clarification, so I do not have any secret agenda or want to pinpoint you on anything, but I have just had my colleague explain it to me. I understand that section 7.1 of the Criminal Code is there now and it covers certain aspects. You want to put humanitarian in there to tighten up the definitions et cetera. But, given that humanitarian is not part of amendment 71 at the present, what covers any offence in Australia under our legal system? Is there any cover or no cover? I suspect there is already cover.

**Ms Sheehan**—Are you asking what cover there is for the wider range of humanitarian—

**Senator CASH**—If Australia was providing humanitarian mission in a country and they were subjected to an incident—

**Senator McGAURAN**—No. Isn't it for if it were ever to occur in Australia? This is for Australian law, isn't it? All right. I had better go and do a bit more homework.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Do you mean that, once we ratify this, we have to change our laws to be fully compliant here? Obviously we are unlikely to have this sort of incident in Australia.

**Senator McGAURAN**—Yes, it is very unlikely, but we do have our own legal system which, even if we did not have a convention, would cover such offences.

**Ms Sheehan**—Depending on the nature of the offence, there may well be either state or territory laws that may apply. That may depend on a number of things such as where the offence took place and the nature of the offence. The amendments to implement the optional protocol will extend those to the wider range of situations that are noted in the optional protocol.

**Ms PARKE**—Is my understanding that staff of specialised agencies of the United Nations are not covered under this convention correct? The reason I ask is that, as the chair of the UNICEF parliamentary association, I would be concerned if UNICEF staff, who are often involved in delivering emergency humanitarian aid to women and children in emergency situations, were not covered under this convention or optional protocol.

**Ms Robertson**—Senator, my understanding is that UNICEF is not a specialised agency—it is a program or fund—and that it would be covered by this instrument.

**Ms PARKE**—What about other bodies such as UNESCO and the World Health Organisation?

**Ms Robertson**—My understanding is that the World Health Organisation would be characterised as a specialised agency and so would be excluded, but the World Food Program, for example, would not be excluded.

**Ms PARKE**—Because it is a program.

**Ms Robertson**—That is right.

**CHAIR**—Are there any other questions?

**Mr SIMPKINS**—I have one more question, going back to the inherent risk involved with operating in some of these countries. I have not seen it, but is there any intent within the additional protocol to impose some sort of obligation for protection on host nations? To me, in some of these countries these are great to prosecute and investigate after the event, but ultimately people need to be protected on the ground.

**Mr Blazey**—On that obligation, the protocol and the convention should be read in conjunction, and the convention itself is quite clear: that there is a responsibility of all states parties to protect and ensure the safety and security of UN and associated personnel. For example, in article 7 it says:

---

States Parties shall take all appropriate measures to ensure the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel. In particular, States Parties shall take all appropriate steps to protect United Nations and associated personnel who are deployed in their territory from the crimes set out in article 9—

which is the long list of offences against UN personnel. So there is a very clear obligation in the convention for states to protect UN personnel.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Is there a sanction if they do not? There will be incidents. Obviously people here are better informed than I on this matter, but people are out there trying to do their job and help people, and if they do not feel that protection is adequate or appropriate then they would obviously make a report back through the UN. Is there any room in the convention or the additional protocol for action to pressure the host nation?

**Mr Blazey**—This would be action not taken by a state to protect, rather than the actual commission of a crime?

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Yes.

**Mr Blazey**—I am not aware of any specific provision. I stand to be corrected, but I am not aware.

**Mr Seeto**—There is not a specific provision which would provide sanctions for a breach of that duty by states, but if a state did breach that provision of the convention then clearly it would be in breach of international law and it would be more likely to be a question of members of the United Nations community bringing political pressure upon that state once it had failed to meet its duty.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Okay.

**Ms Robertson**—I think it is important also to say that, in a situation where the host state has consented to UN support in that country, it is in its interest to protect the people who are assisting it. I think that is important too.

**CHAIR**—If there are no further questions, thank you very much for attending to give evidence today. I should point out that we are not all senators. Some of us are; one of us used to be. Perhaps we all secretly aspire to be, but that happy day has not arrived. If the committee has any further questions, the committee secretariat may seek further comment from you at a later date. Thank you again.

**Proceedings suspended from 10.28 am to 10.43 am**

**FITCH, Ms Catherine, Acting Assistant Secretary, Access to Justice Division, Attorney-General's Department**

**THWAITE, Ms Julia, Acting Principal Legal Officer, Private International Law Section, Access to Justice Division, Attorney-General's Department**

**Treaty on the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters**

**CHAIR**—We will now take evidence on the Treaty on the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters. I welcome representatives from the Attorney-General's Department. Although the committee does not require you to give evidence under oath, I should advise you that this hearing is a legal proceeding of the parliament and warrants the same respect as proceedings of the House and the Senate. The giving of false or misleading evidence is a serious matter and may be regarded as a contempt of parliament. At the conclusion of your evidence, would you please ensure that Hansard has had the opportunity to clarify any matters with you. If you nominate to take any questions on notice, could you please ensure that your written responses to questions reach the committee secretariat within seven working days of your receipt of the transcript of today's proceedings. I invite you to make any introductory remarks you wish to make before we proceed to questions.

**Ms Fitch**—I do not have an opening statement today.

**CHAIR**—We are interested in understanding the problem that the convention seeks to address, so can you tell us a bit about how many foreign civil or commercial legal disputes Australians are involved in; and, in terms of the issues and settlements involved, are they significant or are they trivial?

**Ms Fitch**—The convention addresses the problems that can sometimes arise with delays in transmitting documents between Australia and foreign countries for service. This covers civil and commercial matters only, so not criminal or tax matters. It is largely commercial and business disputes, consumer disputes and family disputes that are relevant to the convention. In essence, there is a significant problem at the moment, where these issues do arise, with transmitting documents between countries through the diplomatic channel, which is a process that is often used. It is not the only process that is available but it is frequently used. Because of the number of parties in stages of the process, delays of a number of months can be experienced which hold up the progress of litigation in those cases.

**CHAIR**—That goes to my next question, about the success of serving documents. How regularly do Australian courts attempt to serve documents overseas and how successful is that process? What problems are there with it?

**Ms Fitch**—We do not have exact figures but we do have qualitative data from both litigants and the courts in Australia, with whom we have been working on the model rules to implement this convention. So I do not have exact figures for you. But in certain cases the delays can be

quite significant—certainly, a period of months where the court may be seeking to proceed with a matter within that time, to address the next stages of directions hearing and so on.

**CHAIR**—Is there an upward trend in the frequency of Australian courts seeking to serve documents abroad? Is that tending to increase?

**Ms Fitch**—We think it is increasingly likely as globalisation continues and as businesses conduct more transactions across international borders, yes.

**CHAIR**—Australia has bilateral treaties on the service of documents with Korea and Thailand. Can you tell us why there was a bilateral process adopted in those cases.

**Ms Fitch**—The treaties that Australia negotiated with Korea and Thailand about a decade ago cover service and also other elements of international civil legal cooperation. They were negotiated with partners that Australia trades with regularly. Neither Korea nor Thailand is a party to the multilateral convention. They were seen as opportunities to strengthen and streamline legal arrangements on service as well as the taking of evidence and some other matters. At the time, neither Australia nor these other countries were contemplating signing up to the multilateral convention.

**CHAIR**—Okay. The attachment on consultation says that the ratification received ‘broad support’ from the states, territories and key stakeholders. Were there any objections to ratification or any qualifications in relation to that support?

**Ms Fitch**—No. The most recent issue that has been discussed between Australia and the states and territories has been around which body will be the authority that will act on requests arriving in each of the federal constituent units. There has been no significant dissent about actually signing up to the instrument.

**CHAIR**—Okay.

**Ms NEAL**—I am curious about why we have existing bilateral arrangements with those two countries, Korea and Thailand. Is there any particular reason for that? Do they have a large number of documents that are served?

**Ms Fitch**—Korea and Thailand are not necessarily the countries with the highest volume of requests going between borders. The opportunity was there to negotiate agreements. At the time those agreements were negotiated, diplomatic channel was the primary means of serving documents, so there was a perceived need to improve the time that it took. We would, priorities and workload allowing, entertain requests made by another country to commence such discussions if that country were not party to a multilateral arrangement that was considered by Australia to be satisfactory, and sometimes those approaches are made.

**Ms NEAL**—So it is really just coincidental that it was those two countries?

**Ms Fitch**—Largely.

**Ms NEAL**—Do we have any idea of what volume of papers or cases is likely to be served under this new arrangement?

**Ms Fitch**—Not at this stage. We think that the volume of relevant litigation to which it could apply will increase over time and continue to increase as business and globalisation increase and more international business is done. We have discussed with the jurisdictions their anticipated volume in respect of costs issues, and it is not likely to spike straightaway, but we expect an incremental increase over time.

**Ms NEAL**—You said before that there would be an increase—and that is self-evident—but do you have any idea of numbers? Are we talking hundreds, thousands or more than that?

**Ms Fitch**—Probably at the moment I would say the biggest volume jurisdictions, New South Wales and Victoria, have about a hundred or fewer than a hundred per year.

**Ms NEAL**—So it is relatively small?

**Ms Fitch**—Relatively small.

**Senator WORTLEY**—The NIA states:

Accession to the Convention will also provide a foundation for Australia to strengthen international legal cooperation in other areas, including the recognition and enforcement of Australian judgments abroad.

Is there a problem at the moment recognising and enforcing Australian judgments abroad?

**Ms Fitch**—It depends on the country. Generally speaking, countries have their own arrangements for what circumstances they will recognise and enforce Australian judgments under. Similarly, we have both a statutory and a common-law approach in Australia to what we would consider in respect of civil and commercial matters. In some cases litigants have written to the Attorney-General stating that they have had particular issues, but I am not aware of a significant current problem.

**Senator WORTLEY**—Has the frequency of attempts by Australian courts to serve documents abroad increased? You talked about the area of business. Is that also occurring in the area of family disputes?

**Ms Fitch**—We are not aware of a significant increase but, as international travel becomes cheaper and people move across transnational borders more frequently, an incremental increase is likely. It is not likely to reduce, I suppose.

**Mr MURPHY**—The convention also covers the service of extrajudicial documents. How are they defined?

**Ms Fitch**—They are defined as documents that are not directly related to a trial but which require the involvement of an authority or judicial officer—for example, demands for payment, notarial documents or testamentary documents. They are not simply anything.

**Senator CASH**—I note that the background documentation says that broad support was received from states and territories. Did any of the states or territories raise any objections to this?

**Ms Fitch**—No significant objections.

**Senator CASH**—So it has broad support across Australia?

**Ms Fitch**—Yes.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—Is there a need for any more bilaterals for people we normally deal with and who are not going to be covered by the convention?

**Ms Fitch**—Generally, where there are issues, we monitor in conjunction with the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, so we have some casework responsibility, as does DFAT. In other cases, those that deal with documents to be transmitted through diplomatic channels, we coordinate between ourselves if particular issues arise with a particular foreign country and, depending on the nature of those issues and the country concerned, we would consider starting discussions with, for example, a third person note to try to iron out any difficulties, and in some cases we would perhaps suggest to government that a bilateral arrangement would be beneficial.

**Mr SIMPKINS**—But, as it stands, there are currently no bilaterals planned?

**Ms Fitch**—That is right.

**Senator McGAURAN**—Just prior to that, can you give us a practical example of the problem with certain documents.

**Ms Fitch**—Take a civil or commercial dispute arising in the Supreme Court of Japan, involving an Australian litigant. If the litigant were the defendant, they would want to have a certain channel whereby they could be notified in a timely manner of proceedings that someone was attempting to commence against them. If the Japanese law operated as Australian law does, for those proceedings to continue they would need to establish the jurisdiction of the court over the defendant by proving valid service had occurred. So you would need to demonstrate that for the court to be able to continue with the litigation. If valid service could not be proved, and the court was unsure as whether it had jurisdiction over the defendant, they might not proceed to hear the applicant's claim. This is intended, essentially, to give the defendant proper and timely notice of the proceedings. If that were hampered by delays or if there were a less certain channel than we are proposing that Australia implement under this convention then it would be difficult for the defendant to have sufficient notice to prepare a defence in connection with the proceedings. They would possibly risk having a default judgment entered against them if the country in which court proceedings were commenced did not allow for that. It could also hamper certainty for litigants as to whether they could proceed with claims that they may validly hold.

**CHAIR**—Thank you for attending to give evidence today. If the committee has any further questions, the committee secretariat may seek further comment from you at a later date.

Resolved (on motion by **Mr Simpkins**):

That this committee authorises publication of the transcript of the evidence given before it at public hearing this day.

**Committee adjourned at 10.57 am**