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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holten, Hon. Rendle McNeilage</td>
<td>Indi (Vic.)</td>
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STANDING COMMITTEES

HOUSE—Mr Speaker, Mr Drury, Mr Hansen, Mr Jarman, Mr Jones, Mr Katter (to 2 March), Mr McIvor, Mr O'Keefe (from 2 March).

LIBRARY—Mr Speaker, Mr Bryant, Mr Cross, Mr Luchetti, Mr O'Keefe, Mr Turner, Mr Whitton.

PRIVILEGES—Mr Drury (Chairman), Mr Brown, Mr Donald Cameron, Mr Crean, Mr Allan Fraser, Mr Jarman, Mr McIvor, Sir Winton Turnbull, Mr Whitlam.

PUBLICATIONS—Mr Erwin (Chairman), Mr Corbett, Mr Foster, Mr Hamer, Mr Les Johnson, Mr Keogh, Dr Solomon.

STANDING ORDERS—Mr Speaker (Chairman), the Chairman of Committees, the Leader of the House, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr Anthony, Mr Bryant, Mr Drury, Mr Duthie, Mr McMahon, Mr Scholes, Mr Whitlam.

JOINT STATUTORY COMMITTEES

BROADCASTING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—Mr Speaker (Chairman), the President, Senator Douglas McClelland, Senator Sim, and Mr Donald Cameron, Mr Drury, Mr Grassby, Mr Sherry, Sir Winton Turnbull.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Mr Graham (Chairman), Senator Fitzgerald (to 17 May), Senator Guillefoyle, Senator Lawrie, Senator McAluliffe (from 17 May), and Mr Collard, Mr Cope, Mr Hurford, Mr Irwin, Mr Jarman, Mr Pettitt.

PUBLIC WORKS—Mr Kelly (Chairman), Senator Jessop, Senator Cant (to 22 February), Senator Poyser (from 23 February), Senator Webster, and Mr Corbett, Mr Fulton, Mr James, Mr Les Johnson, Mr Whitton.

JOINT COMMITTEES

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY—Senator Withers (Chairman), Senator Devitt, Senator Hannan, Senator Maunsell, Senator Milliner, and Mr Daly, Mr Enderby, Mr Fox, Mr Hallett.

DEFENCE FORCES RETIREMENT BENEFITS LEGISLATION—Mr Jess (Chairman), Senator Byrne, Senator Devitt, Senator Maunsell and Mr Barnard, Mr Bonnett, Mr Crean, Mr Hamer.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Mr Turner (Chairman), Senator Bishop, Senator Carrick, Senator Drury, Senator Hannan, Senator McManus, Senator Maunsell, Senator Sim, Senator Wheeldon, and Mr Bryant, Mr Bury, Mr Calder, Mr Donald Cameron, Mr Cohen, Sir John Cramer, Mr Cross, Mr Katter (to 7 March), Mr Kirwan, Mr Lloyd (from 7 March), Mr MacKellar, Mr Morrison, Mr Reynolds, Mr Staley.

NEW AND PERMANENT PARLIAMENT HOUSE—The President (Chairman), Mr Speaker (Deputy Chairman), the Prime Minister (in absence, Mr Snedden), the Leader of the Government in the Senate, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, the Leader of the Australian Democratic Labor Party, the Leader of the Australian Country Party in the House of Representatives (in absence, Mr Nixon), the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives, Senator Cavanagh, Senator Douglas McClelland, and Mr Barnard, Mr Birrell, Mr Bryant, Mr Drury, Mr Duthie, Mr Erwin, Mr Fox, Mr Giles, Mr McIvor.

SELECT COMMITTEES

ROAD SAFETY—Mr Fox (Chairman), Mr Calder, Mr Cohen, Dr Everingham, Mr Hamer, Mr Jones, Dr Solomon.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION—Mr Fox (Chairman), Mr Bonnett, Mr Calder, Mr Collard, Dr Jenkins, Mr Mackellar, Mr Sherry.
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Airline Equipment (Loan Guarantee) Act 1972 (Act No. 42 of 1972)—
An Act relating to the provision of certain Equipment for a Domestic Airline.

Appropriation Act (No. 4) 1971–72 (Act No. 40 of 1972)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, additional to the sum appropriated by the Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1971–72, for the service of the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and seventy-two.

Appropriation Act (No. 5) 1971–72 (Act No. 41 of 1972)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, additional to the sums appropriated by the Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1971–72 and the Appropriation Act (No. 3) 1971–72, for certain expenditure in respect of the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and seventy-two.


Australian Institute of Marine Science Act 1972 (Act No. 55 of 1972)—
An Act relating to the Australian Institute of Marine Science.

Banks (Shareholdings) Act 1972 (Act No. 2 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Shareholdings in certain Banks.

Broadcasting and Television Act 1972 (Act No. 49 of 1972)—
An Act relating to the Advertising of Cigarettes and Cigarette Tobacco by Commercial Broadcasting and Television Stations.

Butter Fat Levy Act 1972 (Act No. 34 of 1972)—

Commonwealth Teaching Service Act 1972 (Act No. 13 of 1972)—
An Act to establish a Commonwealth Teaching Service.

Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1972 (Act No. 37 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Conciliation and Arbitration.

Customs Tariff 1972 (Act No. 4 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Duties of Customs.

Customs Tariff (No. 2) 1972 (Act No. 18 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Duties of Customs.

Customs Tariff Validation Act 1972 (Act No. 51 of 1972)—
An Act to provide for the Validation of Collections of Duties of Customs under Customs Tariff Proposals.

Dairy Produce Export Control Act 1972 (Act No. 3 of 1972)—

Dairy Produce Sales Promotion Act 1972 (Act No. 33 of 1972)—

Dairying Industry Act 1972 (Act No. 35 of 1972)—

Dairying Research Act 1972 (Act No. 30 of 1972)—
An Act to establish a Dairying Research Trust Account, and for purposes connected therewith.

Dairying Research Levy Act 1972 (Act No. 31 of 1972)—
An Act to impose a Levy on certain Whole Milk, and certain Butter Fat, produced in Australia and sold by the Producer.

Dairying Research Levy Collection Act 1972 (Act No. 32 of 1972)—

Diesel Fuel Tax Act (No. 1) 1972 (Act No. 26 of 1972)—

Diesel Fuel Tax Act (No. 2) 1972 (Act No. 27 of 1972)—

Distillation Act 1972 (Act No. 24 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Distillation Act 1901–1968.

Excise Act 1972 (Act No. 23 of 1972)—

Excise Tariff 1972 (Act No. 22 of 1972)—

Gold-Mining Industry Assistance Act 1972 (Act No. 52 of 1972)—
The Acts of the Session

Honey Industry Act 1972 (Act No. 11 of 1972)—

Income Tax Assessment Act 1972 (Act No. 5 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Law relating to Income Tax in respect of a Special Deduction for Investment in Manufacturing Plant.

Income Tax Assessment Act (No. 2) 1972 (Act No. 46 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the law relating to Income Tax with respect to Income derived from the Sale of Shares.

Income Tax Assessment Act (No. 3) 1972 (Act No. 47 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Law relating to Income Tax in respect of Companies.

Income Tax (International Agreements) Act 1972 (Act No. 48 of 1972)—

Income Tax (Reduction of Additional Tax) Act 1972 (Act No. 12 of 1972)—

Loans (Australian National Airlines Commission) Act 1972 (Act No. 43 of 1972)—
An Act to authorize the Raising of a certain sum of Money and to authorize the Commonwealth to make certain Moneys available to the Australian National Airlines Commission, and for purposes connected therewith.

Loan (Australian Wheat Board) Act 1972 (Act No. 9 of 1972)—
An Act to Authorize the Borrowing of Moneys by the Commonwealth and the Lending of those Moneys to the Australian Wheat Board.

Navigation Act 1972 (Act No. 28 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Navigation Act 1912–1970 with respect to the Tonnage Measurement of Ships, and for other purposes.

Northern Territory (Administration) Act 1972 (Act No. 39 of 1972)—

An Act relating to a Loan to the Administration of Papua New Guinea by the Asian Development Bank.

Papua New Guinea Loan (International Bank) Act 1972 (Act No. 56 of 1972)—
An Act to approve the Guarantee by the Commonwealth of the Discharge of the Obligations of the Administration of Papua New Guinea under a Loan Agreement made with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and for purposes connected therewith.

Processed Milk Products Bounty Act 1972 (Act No. 36 of 1972)—

Public Service Act 1972 (Act No. 6 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Promotions Appeals in the Public Service of the Commonwealth.

Public Service Arbitration Act 1972 (Act No. 17 of 1972)—
An Act relating to the Settlement of Matters arising out of Employment in the Public Service.

Public Works Committee Act 1972 (Act No. 57 of 1972)—
An Act to amend section 36 of the Public Service Committee Act 1969.

Queensland Grant Act 1972 (Act No. 29 of 1972)—
An Act to grant Financial Assistance to the State of Queensland.

Repatriation Act 1972 (Act No. 15 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Repatriation Act 1920–1971 so as to provide for Increases in the Rates of certain Pensions payable to certain persons, and for purposes connected therewith, and to appropriate the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of certain payments resulting from those amendments.

Seamen’s War Pensions and Allowances Act 1972 (Act No. 16 of 1972)—
An Act to amend the Seamen’s War Pensions and Allowances Act 1940–1971 so as to provide for Increases in the Rates of certain Pensions.


Social Services Act 1972 (Act No. 1 of 1972)—
An Act to increase the Rate of Unemployment Benefit and of Sickness Benefit referred to in section 112 of the Social Services Act 1947–1971.

Social Services Act (No. 2) 1972 (Act No. 14 of 1972)—
An Act relating to Social Services.

Social Services Act (No. 3) 1972 (Act No. 53 of 1972)—
An Act relating to the Continuation of the Payment of Pensions and other Benefits to certain Persons after they cease to be Resident in Australia.
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Spirits Act 1972 (Act No. 25 of 1972)—  

States Grants Act 1972 (Act No. 20 of 1972)—  
An Act to amend the States Grants Act (No. 2) 1971.

States Grants (Advanced Education) Act 1972 (Act No. 58 of 1972)—  
An Act relating to the Grant of Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with Advanced Education.

States Grants (Capital Assistance) Act 1972 (Act No. 8 of 1972)—  
An Act to amend the States Grants (Capital Assistance) Act 1971.

States Grants (Capital Assistance) Act (No. 2) 1972 (Act No. 21 of 1972)—  

States Grants (Independent Schools) Act 1972 (Act No. 7 of 1972)—  
An Act relating to the Grant of Financial Assistance to the States in relation to Independent Schools.


Supply Act (No. 1) 1972–73 (Act No. 44 of 1972)—  
An Act to make interim provision for the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the service of the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

Supply Act (No. 2) 1972–73 (Act No. 45 of 1972)—  
An Act to make interim provision for the appropriation of moneys out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for certain expenditure in respect of the year ending on the thirtieth day of June, One thousand nine hundred and seventy-three.

Tariff Board Act 1972 (Act No. 50 of 1972)—  
An Act relating to the Membership of the Tariff Board.
THE BILLS OF THE SESSION
(SECOND SESSION—FIFTH PERIOD)

Adulthood Bill 1970—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Agricultural Tractors Bounty Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Asian Development Bank (Additional Subscription) Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Audit Bill 1970—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Australian Capital Territory Stamp Duty Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Commonwealth Electoral Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Commonwealth Electoral Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading. (Private Member’s Bill).

Commonwealth Electoral Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading. (Private Member’s Bill).

Consular Privileges and Immunities Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Continental Shelf (Living Natural Resources) Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Customs Tariff Bill (No. 3) 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Death Penalty Abolition Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the Senate. Second Reading.

Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Excise Tariff Bill (No. 2) 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Fisheries Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

House of Representatives (Quorum) Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Income Tax Assessment Bill (No. 4) 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Lighthouses Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Ministers of State Bill (No. 2) 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

National Service Bill 1971—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Parliamentary Allowances Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Parliamentary Allowances Tribunal Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Pay-roll Tax (Territories) Assessment Bill 1972—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.
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Tuesday, 9 May 1972

The House met at 2.30 p.m.

**ABSENCE OF MR SPEAKER**

The Clerk—I desire to inform the House of the unavoidable absence of the Speaker. In accordance with standing order 14, the Chairman of Committees will take the chair as Acting Speaker.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Lucock) thereupon took the chair, and read prayers.

**PETITIONS**

The Clerk—Petitions have been lodged for presentation as follows and copies will be referred to the appropriate Ministers—

**Postmaster-General's Department**

The Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That the Postmaster-General's Department, Central Office, policy of centralising Post Office affairs and activities under the various titles of Area Management, Area Mail Centres, Area Parcel Centres and similar titles is resulting in both loss of service and lowering of the standards of service to the public, directly resulting in the closing of Post Offices which is detrimental to the public interest.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled will take immediate steps to:

1. Call a halt to all closing of Post Offices and reorganising within the Post Office, until full details of the proposed savings and all details of alteration to the standards of service to the public are made available to Parliament, and
2. Initiate a joint Parliamentary inquiry into the Postmaster-General's Department, to assess the degree on which it should be run as a normal business undertaking and to what extent its unprofitable activities should be subsidised as a public service charged more correctly to National Development.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by Dr Forbes, Mr Peacock, Mr Allan Fraser, Mr Giles, Mr Jess and Mr Luchetti.

Petitions severally received.

**Social Services**

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned electors of the Commonwealth of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That on December 10 1948 Australia signed the 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights', Article 14211/72—R—[83]

25 reads: 'Everyone has the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age and other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.'

Yet, 23 years later, in our country of great national wealth and abundance it is to the nation's shame that many thousands of our people live in a state of being inconsistent with the dignity and worth of the human person—linguishing in poverty and want, neglect and the lack of proper care necessary for their health and well-being.

We, the undersigned, respectfully draw to your attention that the conscience of the nation is not at ease while the records of our country show that social services are not comparable with that of other advanced countries administering such services, therefore, we call upon the Commonwealth Government to immediately legislate for:

- Base pension rate—30 per cent of the average weekly male earnings, all states, plus supplementary assistance and allowances based on a percentage of such earnings. Unemployed benefits equal to the foregoing.
- Completely free health services to cover all needs of social service pensioners—hospitalisation, chronic and long-term illness, fractures, anaesthetics, specialist, pharmaceutical, hearing aids, dental, optical, physiotherapy, chiropody, surgical aids and any other appliances.
- Commonwealth Government to promote a comprehensive national scheme in cooperation with the States and make finance available to provide for the building of public hospitals, nursing and hostel-type homes necessary to effectively meet the special requirements of aged people, in conjunction with a comprehensive domiciliary care programme to enable aged people to stay in their homes.
- Mental illness placed in the same position as physical illness.
- Substantial Commonwealth increase in the $5 subsidy a day per public bed pensioner patient in general hospitals.
- Ten per cent of Commonwealth revenue to local government for general activities which now include social welfare, health, conservation and other community needs. Commonwealth subsidy for the waiving of rates for pensioners.
- Commonwealth Government to increase the non-repayable grant to the States for low rental home units for pensioners.
- Royal Commission or other form of public inquiry into Australia's social welfare structure that Australia may be brought into line with accepted world standards of the most advanced countries.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by Mr Calwell, Mr Erwin, Mr Hamer, Mr Jess, Mr Les Johnson, Mr McIvor, Mr Reynolds and Mr Whittorn.

Petitions severally received.
Petitions

Representatives

Questions

Richmond Airport

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition from certain residents of the western suburbs in the Sydney Metropolitan area and surrounding districts respectfully sheweth:

That due to an expanding passenger air travel business together with larger and more powerful jet aircraft, aircraft noise has already become a serious problem for people living in the vicinity of airports.

That jet aircraft operations have a detrimental effect by way of air and noise pollution on the environment and airports should be situated so as to preserve the environment of populated areas.

That protest should be made against the proposal to establish an international airport at Richmond owing to the detrimental effect it would have for the environment there and in surrounding districts.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that this House take appropriate steps to ensure that the Government does not proceed with the proposal to site the second, twenty four hour international airport for Sydney at Richmond or anywhere else in the far western suburbs of the metropolitan area.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by Mr Armitage and Dr Klugman.

Petitions severally received.

Education

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

(a) That the Australian Education Council's report on the needs of State education services has established serious deficiencies in education.

(b) That these can be summarised as lack of classroom accommodation, desperate teacher shortage, oversized classes and inadequate teaching aids.

(c) That the additional sum of one thousand million dollars is required over the next five years by the States for these needs.

(d) That without massive additional Federal finance the State school system will disintegrate.

(e) That the provisions of the Handicapped Children's Assistance Act 1970 should be amended to include all the country's physically and mentally handicapped children.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled will take immediate steps to

Ensure that emergency finance from the Commonwealth will be given to the States for their public education services which provide schooling for seventy-eight per cent of Australia's children.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by Mr Les Johnson.

Petition received.

Commonwealth Defence Departments

Mr McIVOR—My question is addressed to the Prime Minister. Further to a previous question I asked of him relating to inspectors employed in Commonwealth Government defence departments, I now ask: Is the Prime Minister aware that the Inspectorial Grades Review Committee completed its investigations early in October 1971? Can the Prime Minister inform the House of the reasons for delaying the implementation of this review? Does the Prime Minister realise that the 7 months delay has caused, and is causing, considerable unrest among these men who are suffering a considerable loss of salary due to this delay?

Mr McMAHON—I know that I have already answered a question and written to the honourable gentleman in regard to this problem. I think that the report of the inspectorial committee is well known to my Department and to myself. As soon as question time is over I will communicate with the Chairman of the Public Service Board and will see that a second letter is written to the honourable gentleman.

Tax Structure

Mr DRURY—I direct my question to the Treasurer. I ask him whether he can indicate when he expects to be in a position to announce the terms of reference and the personnel of the committee that is to examine and report on the tax structure.

Mr SNEDDEN—In answer to the first part of the question, I hope that the terms of reference will be ready to be announced within the next few days. The second part of the honourable member's question referred to the personnel of the committee. A longer time will elapse before this is decided because it will be necessary to ascertain from the people whom we would like to serve on the committee whether they are able to serve, bearing in mind that the inquiry will extend over a lengthy period.

Poverty Inquiry

Mr WHITLAM—I ask the Prime Minister a question without notice. In the House in the last sitting week, in answer to a question from one of his supporters, the
right honourable gentleman vouchsafed the view that the Anglican Archbishop of Sydney does not have a very great knowledge of the problems associated with inflation or, for that matter, unemployment, and that he would make certain that His Grace was informed of what the Government had done and had every opportunity to form a better view. I now ask: Does he also regard as ill-informed the 24 diocesan bishops who now support the Archbishop in his call for Government action against poverty? If so, will he help to dispel any misunderstandings which might exist by agreeing to hold the public inquiry into poverty for which the Archbishop and the diocesan bishops have asked?

Mr McMAHON—I have no comment to make relating to the Archbishop of Sydney, Dr Loane, other than that the man has my complete respect. I regard him as a man of integrity and, much more, I think that his activities in the social services field deserve commendation rather than an attempt to drag them into political debate on the floor of this House. As to the second part of the honourable gentleman's question, I have read the various objectives that are set out by the people concerned and I will ensure that each of those objectives is very carefully considered by my colleagues.

EXCHANGE RATE

Mr WHITTORN—I address a question to the Treasurer. With Australian reserves overseas at a record high level and because of a rash of takeovers within Australia and by overseas companies, will the Government revalue the Australian dollar or will we allow it to move freely to the limit to which it is entitled to move on the foreign exchange market?

Mr SNEDDEN—The Cabinet submitted the question of exchange rates to examination last December. This followed on the Smithsonian Institute's examination of the currencies of the Group of Ten when they made their own arrangement. It then followed for other countries to take their decisions, having regard to what happened at the Smithsonian Institute and also fundamentally acknowledging that the decisions as to the exchange rate is a matter for a country itself to determine. I will not go beyond that. I acknowledge that the reserves we have at present are very high, and the reasons for that would take some time for the telling. Question time is not appropriate for it. However, this other point must be made that any official, whether he be political or whether he be a member of the Public Service, who discusses the matter of the exchange rate is likely to find that the mere discussion of it creates speculation which would be counter-productive to the country's economy.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

Mr MORRISON—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Civil Aviation and it relates to the operations of the Concorde aircraft. In view of the justifiable concern and the differing views relating to the operation of the Concorde, will he take steps to revive the Select Committee on Aircraft Noise before the projected test flight of the Concorde, which is scheduled for the near future? At the same time will he refer to the Committee for inquiry and report the noise and associated aspects of the operation of the aircraft which could detrimentally affect people living in the vicinity of the projected route and the approach paths to Australian airports?

Mr SWARTZ—This is a matter that I would have to discuss with my colleague in another place, but the Committee to which the honourable member refers was one which I set up when I was Minister of Civil Aviation some years ago and I certainly appreciate the work that was done by the Committee at that time. The value of its report is still being appreciated by the Department of Civil Aviation despite the fact that the Committee submitted its final report some time ago. However, the Concorde and other supersonic commercial aircraft, when flying over built-up areas or approaching airports, do not operate supersonically. When the Concorde is on its trial flight to Australia, perhaps next month, the operations, as has been indicated, will be only in an approved area. If the feasibility study of the Department of Civil Aviation works out satisfactorily the aircraft will fly through a corridor over the northern part of Australia which I believe will be 70 to 100 miles wide. That feasibility study is still being
undertaken to determine whether that corridor would be suitable for supersonic operations. The approach of the aircraft to Sydney, which I think is the main concern of the honourable member, would be at subsonic speeds. The indications so far in relation to its operations, especially for trial purposes, when it is not operating at all up loading, are that the amount of perceived noise in decibels, which is how the sonic effect is recorded, close to airports would be no higher than that of the normal commercial jet operations. I do not know whether it would be necessary, with the knowledge that is available to the Department of Civil Aviation, to conduct any further investigation in relation to the sonic effect over built-up areas or areas adjacent to airports. Having said that, I will certainly refer the point that has been raised to my colleague in another place and I will let the honourable member have a reply at a later date.

NORTHERN TERRITORY NATIONAL PARK

Mr CALDER—I direct my question to the Minister for the Interior. I refer to his recent visit to the top end of the Northern Territory and ask whether, in view of the strong feelings on the subject, he visited the proposed northern area national park. Can he say whether the Government is taking any steps to ensure preservation of the special features in the area of the proposed park against detrimental actions by mining companies? Will the Government take steps to protect against the acts of vandalism that are currently occurring to wildlife and the irreplaceable Aboriginal art in the proposed northern national park area?

Mr HUNT—While I was in the Northern Territory at the end of last week I took the opportunity to visit the proposed Northern Territory national park. The Government, of course, recognises the need to protect the environment of this proposed park area and has already placed 2 areas of major ecological interest—Deaf Adder Valley and Jim Jim Falls—under a mining reserve, which means that no mining exploration shall take place in those 2 areas of special significance. The Government has also initiated 2 environmental impact studies of the area to provide information on ways to minimise damage from mining and other activities. We have also imposed very stringent conditions upon those companies that are carrying out mining exploration of the area, and the Government feels they should of necessity continue until the end of 1973, by which time the Government will be able to make an assessment of the importance of the park area to the nation from a mineral and economic point of view and the importance of the park in an environmental sense. I have also had discussions with my own officers as a result of having seen some of the damage that is being caused by vandals and others who are going into the area. I have decided that we should take steps to have the area protected under the Wildlife Conservation and Control Ordinance, thereby safeguarding the Aboriginal paintings and the sites of special significance. Steps will be taken immediately to protect these sites under the provisions of the Northern Territory native and historical objects and areas preservation ordinance. I am also taking steps to have additional staff and rangers appointed to protect the area from the vandalism to which the honourable member for the Northern Territory has referred.

IMMIGRATION

Mr GRASSBY—I direct a question to the Prime Minister. I refer in preface to his Press statement, No. 45 of 1972, relating to the Australian Labor Party's immigration policy. I ask: Why did the Prime Minister feel it necessary to state his opposition to a policy which he said favoured southern European migrants—I take it that he meant migrants from Italy, Malta, Spain, Greece, France and presumably southern Switzerland and Yugoslavia—bringing out their relatives and friends? I also ask the Prime Minister whether he is aware that the chain migration concept which he attacked has been hailed by most demographers and social scientists as the best and easiest system of migration and one which has been described as migration without tears. Finally, will he reconsider his announced opposition to a priority for friends and relatives to be sponsored here and to chain migration, in the interests of the migrants themselves and of the community at large?

Mr McMATH—The honourable gentleman is under a complete misapprehension as
to what was said. Consequently, I will ensure that my Press officer sends him a copy.

Mr Grassby—I have it.

Mr McMahon—Very well. We were dealing with one single problem in that, and that was the difference between the policies of the 2 parties. What I have said in that document illustrates those differences, and they are unbridgeable, no matter what people might say. As to people who have come here under our migration programme, of course we have welcomed them. But what I do insist upon is that the programme now being administered and the policy that we have enunciated is the policy of the Liberal Country Party Government and will remain that way.

POVERTY

Mr Reid—I ask the Minister for Social Services a question. It was reported in the 'Sydney Morning Herald' on 28th April that a spokesman from the Anglican Church stated that some members of Parliament did not seem to be aware of the hardship of many people in the community. One case mentioned was that of an invalid with 5 daughters and 2 sons, whose income was $42 a week out of which he was paying $20 a week rent. Can the Minister inform the House of the social service benefits available to such a family?

Mr Wentworth—Yes, my attention was drawn to this statement by the Anglican bishop, Bishop Hulme-Moir. It seemed to me that the statement did require some examination from me because I thought that a person in this circumstance should be drawing at least $70 a week. I thought that perhaps here was a pensioner who was not aware of his rights and was not getting what he was entitled to because he had not made the correct application. So I got in touch with the Bishop who was good enough to give me the name of the pensioner concerned. Of course, I will not reveal his name to the House. I had inquiries made and I found that he was actually receiving from my Department not $42 but $72.75 a week, which was to go up to $73.75 this week because of the pension rise.

I want to make it quite clear that I do not in any way consider Bishop Hulme-Moir responsible for this misinformation.

Also I want to make it clear that I am not complacent and I do not believe that there is no poverty. I just mention to the House that this particular case seems to have been brought forward under some kind of misconception. But I do commend the Church’s concern with poverty. I commend particularly such societies as the Brotherhood of St Laurence and the Society of St Vincent de Paul which I come across from time to time in the exercise of my responsibility as the Minister for Social Services. I suggest that we should look at the facts as they are brought forward and not exaggerate them, but I repeat that the Government is not complacent and understands that there are still cases of quite genuine poverty.

ELECTORAL

Mr Barnard—I take this opportunity of welcoming the Postmaster-General back to the House, and ask him whether the Solicitor-General, Mr Ellicott, stood unsuccessfully for Liberal Party pre-selection for the federal seat of Berowra. Was this done without prejudice to his high office and without recriminations from the Australian Labor Party? Has the Minister noticed a parallel case of an Australian Broadcasting Commission employee who stood unsuccessfully as an Australian Labor Party candidate in the Tasmanian State elections and who was subsequently restored to his former job? Is the Minister aware that attempts have been made to put pressure on the ABC to revoke its sensible and just decision to reinstate this employee? Will the Minister act to safeguard the political rights and right to reinstatement of public servants who unsuccessfully seek public office? In particular, will he ensure that these principles are applied fairly to members of all political parties?

Sir Alan Hulme—I know that within the Commonwealth Public Service, and I believe also in the State public services, a permanent officer desiring to stand for Parliament has the opportunity to stand down from his job for a period. If he is unsuccessful at the election, he is reinstated. I am sure that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will appreciate that some of the staff of the Australian Broadcasting Commission are permanent public servants, some are employed under contract and some are employed on a
casual basis. I am not certain of the category of the person to whom he refers but I shall have inquiries made. If he is a permanent public servant I would expect him to be reinstated.

Mr McMahon—He has been.

Sir ALAN HULME—The Prime Minister informs me that he has been reinstated. If there are difficulties in relation to his reinstatement, I do not understand why they should occur.

TRANSPORT FOR MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Mr JESS—in asking my question of the Minister for the Interior I assure him that I personally have no doubts as to the importance of backbench members of Parliament relative to ministerial typists and other staff. I ask: Is the Minister aware that backbench members of Parliament on arrival at Canberra airport this morning could not be provided with transport to Parliament House to attend important meetings until ministerial secretaries and typists had been so transported? Will the Minister please advise me or the House of the reason for this confusion and endeavour to see that it is not repeated?

Mr HUNT—The answer to the first question is no and the answer to the second question is yes.

PAPUA/QUEENSLAND BORDER

Mr WHITLAM—My question is directed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Eight months ago he said in a written answer that the recommendation of the United Nations Visiting Mission on the revision of the border between Papua and Queensland had not been drawn to the attention of the Queensland Government and that the Commonwealth Government was giving priority attention to the question of the revision of the border. I ask the Minister whether the United Nations recommendation has yet been brought to the attention of the Queensland Government and if so, with what result. Is it a fact, as reported, that an interdepartmental committee is studying the question? When does he expect that the committee will make a report and the Government make a decision on the revision of this archaic and unworkable border?

Mr N. H. BOWEN—I am not in a position to answer the detail of the honourable gentleman's question. However, I will inquire into the matter and advise him of the answer.

WOOL MARKETING

Mr CORBETT—My question is addressed to the Minister for Primary Industry. In view of the recent announcement by the Prime Minister, following the Government's consideration of the Australian Wool Industry Conference report, will the Minister advise what action is now intended to be taken on the industry-backed marketing changes recommended by the AWIC? Will the Minister also advise what is the position in regard to small bale lots now handled by the price averaging plan?

Mr SINCLAIR—The Australian Wool Industry Conference did submit fairly wide ranging proposals to the Government. These embodied quite significant changes in the present marketing system, some of which related to the handling of small bale lots and some to the handling and marketing of the whole clip. Those with respect to the small bale lots involved some technical problems in terms of the introduction of a new mechanism which is termed LBP or lot building plan and at this stage these have not been completely resolved. For that reason the Government has decided that the price averaging plan pool will continue to operate at least for the next pool period from 1st July to 31st December 1972. No decision has been taken on the balance of the AWIC recommendations but on receipt of the report from the committee constituted under the chairmanship of Sir Richard Randall, which is expected within about a fortnight, the Government will again consider the matter and when a decision is taken an announcement will be made.

TESTING OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

Mr FOSTER—My question is directed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. Does his Government oppose any further testing of atomic bombs in the Pacific region? Is he aware of reports which indicate that France will test a nuclear bomb during June this year? Will the Minister, in the interests of the health and safety of Australians and other peoples in the Pacific
area, show some real act of opposition to the French test firstly by denying port facilities to all French vessels and secondly, by refusing landing rights to the French Concorde on its proposed visit next month? Further would the Minister welcome support from the public and trade unions to bring about the desired non-testing of bombs in the Pacific area?

Mr N. H. BOWEN—I have had this matter under very careful consideration and I do not think I will adopt either of the 3 possible courses of action which the honourable gentleman has invited me to take. However, I should say to the House that we are deeply concerned at the prospect of tests taking place in the atmosphere. As the honourable member for Sturt will know, Australia is a party to the ban on nuclear testing which was adopted in 1963 and indeed, we have expressed our concern and protested officially to the French Government within the last month at the prospect of further tests taking place in the Pacific. In addition, we are conferring with our South Pacific neighbours with whom we have become so closely associated in the South Pacific forum, as to the possibility of some concerted action by us as a group.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Mr DONALD CAMERON—Is the Minister for Shipping and Transport able to tell the Parliament when the Tariff Board’s report on the shipbuilding industry is likely to be made available? Is he aware that the Chairman of Directors of Evans Deakin Industries Ltd is definitely not kidding when he says that the firm may soon be forced to abandon ship building? Is the Minister able to name any other industry which has such an important part to play in a time of war but which is allowed to run like an unheld headless rooster during times of peace? Is he aware that 1,500 Queenslander could soon be without work? Will the Minister assure the House that we may soon witness some decisiveness in relation to the needs of this industry, as I have advocated in various quarters for some time now?

Mr NIXON—In answer to the first part of the honourable member’s question, I would expect the Government to be dealing with the Tariff Board report within the next few weeks. In regard to the second part of the honourable member’s question, I should like to assure him, and also the proprietor of Evans Deakin Industries Ltd, that there have been several opportunities for tenders for shipbuilding to be submitted by Evans Deakin which of course, has had to compete with other shipbuilding yards. The competing company in Queensland, Walkers Ltd, much to that company’s satisfaction, no doubt, was successful in its tender for the construction of 2 offshore oil supply ships. I understand that Evans Deakin was unsuccessful on that occasion. Evans Deakin is presently building the ‘Robert Miller’ and is just completing the construction of the ‘Esso Gippsland’. Recently there were available opportunities to tender for an oil rig and one or two smaller ships. It may well be that Evans Deakin will tender successfully for those. I want to make it quite clear that despite the delay with the Tariff Board report, we have endeavoured, at all costs, to encourage the shipbuilding yards to proceed as normal. It is not really true to say in this case that failure to succeed to obtain a tender is due to the Government’s failure to deal with the Tariff Board report. It is quite a different circumstance entirely.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr MARTIN—My question, which is directed to you, Mr Acting Speaker, concerns the facilities for visitors to Canberra to inspect Parliament House. By way of explanation I would like to inform you that at about 10 o’clock this morning I was present at the entrance to Parliament House and watched as a large number of people were not allowed into Kings Hall due to the congestion already there. Their comments on not being allowed into their Parliament were most enlightening. I understand that the reason why these people were turned away was that there were only 2 guides on duty to cope with the visitors. I ask you to ensure that these conditions are not allowed to continue and that more guides are provided to allow our constituents to inspect their Parliament.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—I will refer the honourable member’s question to Mr Speaker and ask him to see that the honourable member receives a reply.
TESTING OF ATOMIC WEAPONS

Mr MacKellar—My question, which is directed to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, is supplementary to the question asked by the honourable member for Sturt. Has the Minister received any questions or representations with respect to the attitude of the Australian Labour Party or the Australian trade union movement concerning the testing of atomic weapons by the People's Republic of China?

Mr N. H. Bowen—No, I have not received any suggestions or representations from the Australian Labor Party that we should protest against the tests in China. As the House will know, there has been published recently by the Institute of Strategic Studies an assessment of the progress at present being made with the nuclear programme in the People's Republic of China, both as to the intercontinental ballistic missiles and the movement into nuclear submarines. No doubt honourable members will have an opportunity to get a copy of that study for themselves.

URANIUM

Mr Les Johnson—Is the Prime Minister aware that a spokesman for Peko-Wallsend Ltd recently announced his company's intention to secure overseas uranium markets by disposing of equity in Australian uranium mines to overseas interests? Would such a policy meet with Government approval? If not, will the Government act and say now what it will do to prevent even partial ownership of these valuable mineral resources from falling into foreign hands?

Mr Swartz—I have seen some public statements which have been attributed to Peko-Wallsend Ltd, which, of course, is associated with the Electrolytic Zinc Co. (A/Asia) Ltd in the field of uranium marketing and the problems associated with it. The Peko area in the uranium province in the Northern Territory is perhaps the most substantial uranium area in Australia. We expect that the undertaking will be producing partly processed material from about 1977 onwards and will be in a position to meet contractual arrangements which it is hoped will be signed before that date. But associated with developments of this particular type there is an enormous capital expenditure. In the whole of the province area Australian as well as overseas capital is involved.

At present all the companies that are concerned with uranium—the 3 companies in the Northern Territory, one in Western Australia and a possible one in South Australia—are examining the market situation. The position is fluid at the moment but as I stated recently, as a government we have been encouraging the producers to get together, in some cases in relation to infrastructure but particularly with respect to marketing arrangements. We feel that ultimately this will be of some advantage collectively to all the producers. My own Department is doing as much as possible to assist in these fields. As to the signing of contracts, there has been an indication that Queensland Mines Ltd has gained one contract which has now been submitted in the form of a letter of intent for consideration. There has not yet been any indication of other contracts or letters of intent signed or letters of intent that will become available in the near future. When this situation does arise and when any proposals are submitted to the Government of course all these matters will be taken into consideration to see that they completely conform to Government policy not only in respect of the points that the honourable member has mentioned but also the points that I have mentioned in this House previously.

POVERTY

Mr Berinson—Has the Prime Minister noted statements by spokesmen, including the shadow Minister in this Parliament responsible for industrial affairs the honourable member for Hindmarsh, and the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, that it is impossible for a family of a man, wife and 2 children to live at a decent level on the new Federal minimum wage of $51.10? Is the Prime Minister's reported pleasure at the new minimum wage level to be taken as indicating that he disagrees with this view and that he believes that a decent standard of life can be sustained on that income? If so, will he suggest how?

Mr McMahon—I have not seen the statements to which the honourable gentleman refers. What I believe in is a system
of arbitration in this country and the Government wants to sustain this system against
the anarchy that it feels would follow from the systems that are advocated on behalf of
the Labor Party, principally by the honourable member for Hindmarsh. So neither
I nor my colleagues, including the Minister for Labour and National Service, have
made any specific reference whatsoever to the minimum wage other than what we
wanted the minimum wage to be increased significantly by the Commonwealth Con-
ciliation and Arbitration Commission. We appreciate the action of the Commission in
paying particular attention to this needy section of the community.

WORLD TRADE CENTRE IN SYDNEY

Mr REYNOLDS—My question is addressed to the Minister for Trade and Industry. Is it a fact that the New South
Wales Government has been promoting the establishment of a world trade centre in
Sydney? Is such a concept identical with the concept of world trade centres which
have been established or which are being constructed in several major overseas
countries, that is, to enable Australia to maintain its competitive trade position? Did
New South Wales State Ministers confer with 3 Federal Ministers in September last
regarding this project in the belief that Commonwealth involvement was vital to
its success? Has the New South Wales State Government recently expressed concern that
the Commonwealth appears to be indifferent to the project? Will the Government give
an early indication of strong support for this vital venture?

Mr ANTHONY—The honourable member's remarks are correct. There were dis-
cussions with the New South Wales Government, which 3 Commonwealth Minis-
ters attended, on the possibility of setting up a world trade centre in Sydney.
The suggestion was that a centre should be developed in the Pyrmont area by private
developers. The New South Wales State Government wanted Commonwealth
officers of the Department of Trade and Industry, the Department of Customs and
Excise and the Department of the Interior to occupy the building so that all these
people would be within the one area. Unfortunately there has been some
difference of opinion about the project among Commonwealth departments.

Firstly, my own departmental officers who have had an opportunity to study these
types of centres throughout the world have some doubts as to whether such a centre
would be advantageous to the Department. They are not against the proposal, but
expense is involved. Secondly, at the moment we have a programme to build
new Commonwealth offices at Woolloomooloo to be occupied by officers of the
Department of Customs and Excise. If we were to have a change of programme the
construction of those offices would have to be deferred. There is some difference of
opinion about deferring that programme when we have been in dire need of addi-
tional Commonwealth office accommodation in Sydney. My own Department
does not want to move out of the central area of Sydney in which it does most of its
business with business people. At the same
time, although this has nothing to do with
the issue, there has been some talk of establishing a trade centre in Melbourne.
Basically trade centres have been run by private companies and other private con-
cerns, although they have had the support of governments in countries they represent.
I am afraid that I am not in a position to
give a firm answer about the Sydney pro-
ject because of the complications I have
mentioned, but if private enterprise wanted
to go ahead with such a proposal, using
computers to collect information from
other countries and making it available to
importers and exporters, I would be quite
happy to see this occur.

COAL EXPORTS TO JAPAN

Mr O'KEEFE—I address my question to
the Minister for National Development. I
ask: Is a representative of Japanese steel
mills to visit Australia in the near future?
Has the fall-off of steel production in Japan
affected Australian exports of coal to that
country? Can the Minister advise whether
discussions concerning our coal exports
will be thoroughly brought to the attention
of this Japanese visitor during his visit to
Australia?

Mr SWARTZ—It is correct that a senior
representative of Nippon Steel will be in
Australia for a short time. In fact we will
be having discussions with him tomorrow
morning. The position is as the honourable
member stated in his question, that the
downturn in the steel industry in Japan, as
in other countries, certainly has had some effect on the export from Australia of raw materials such as iron ore and coking coal. There have been discussions already between representatives of my Department, the industry and the State departments which are concerned with Japan in relation to this matter. The position is related to the plus and minus areas in the contractual arrangements. The point we want to clear with the representative of Nippon Steel, which is the collective buyer for the iron ore and coal resources, is in relation to the minus area of the various long term contracts. We hope that this matter will be clarified during the discussions which we will be holding this week.

JOHN LYSAGHT (AUSTRALIA) LTD

Mr GRIFFITHS—My question is directed to the Minister for Labour and National Service. Is it a fact that the site on which the John Lysaght (Australia) Ltd establishment at Newcastle is situated is one of the most valuable industrial sites in Australia? Did the firm obtain the site for a mere song compared with today's values? Was the Government consulted or informed in advance of the company's intention to close the Newcastle engineering building products section of its plant? Is the company's present development of plants away from Newcastle being made at the expense of its Newcastle employees, as well as those from subsidiary plants, involving thousands of people? Is the Minister aware that large areas of land are available on Koorangang Island, which is just across the Hunter River from where the present establishment is situated, for industrial development? In view of this, is the company justified in closing its already developed Newcastle plant and spending millions of dollars elsewhere in establishing other plants? Will the Government explore the possibility of ascertaining whether any other industrial enterprise either here or abroad would be available to take over at Newcastle where John Lysaght has left off?

Mr LYNCH—I cannot really speak off the cuff in relation to the question of the acquisition of the John Lysaght property. However, I will undertake to have that matter put to study and provide the honourable gentleman with an answer in writing. But can I say to the honourable member that I noted with some considerable interest that the last balance sheet published by this company showed a marked fall in profit. The honourable gentleman and others on the other side of the chamber might well be interested to observe that one of the basic factors as to why that company reported a reduced profitability for the past year was the very high level of industrial unrest which it has been suffering.

Mr Foster—Give us the second chapter. We know what it will be.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Sturt will cease interjecting.

Mr LYNCH—I would be very happy to talk to the honourable gentleman about the second chapter if he would be prepared to read the first because one of the facts of life at the present time in relation to industry throughout Australia has been the very heavy cost to industry, to the community and to the country at large of industrial unrest. If the honourable gentleman is to pose the question of the performance of the John Lysaght company let him reasonably recall the context against which recent announcements were made.

I now refer to the employment situation. I understand full well that some 600 workers at John Lysaghts in Newcastle recently were given notice of retrenchment. That matter has been the subject of consultation with officers of my Department who are, of course particularly active in relation to seeking means whereby these workers can be employed either in Newcastle itself or in adjoining areas. I understand that the company is working in accordance with a flexible manning plan which will provide for the staggered release of personnel over the course of the next 8 months. I have further information available. However, rather than weary the House I will be happy to provide a copy of the paper to the honourable gentleman.

AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION: CURRENT AFFAIRS PROGRAMMES

Dr SOLOMON—My question is directed to the Postmaster-General and is supplementary to that asked by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition earlier today. Is the Minister aware that the field of current
affairs is regarded as the most sensitive in the jurisdiction of the Australian Broadcasting Commission? Is he further aware that the ABC's own guidelines recognise this situation in laying down that the declared political bias of an operative destroys credibility? Does he agree that no area of public service is so closely concerned with the daily presentation of politics for mass consumption, and that failure to discriminate in such matters can stem only from opportunism or incompetence?

Sir ALAN HULME—I appreciate the sensitiveness of current affairs, particularly so far as the Australian Broadcasting Commission is concerned, because it is the national service which I believe concentrates more attention and greater expenditure on providing this type of programme for the Australian public. I know that from time to time accusations of bias are made against the Australian Broadcasting Commission one way or the other, and I have even known the Leader of the Opposition to present an argument against a particular programme from a political point of view. I know that honourable members on both sides of the House from time to time disagree with the programming arrangements made by the ABC, but I am still prepared, as the Act requires, to leave that section of its operations to the Commission itself.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr CALWELL (Melbourne)—I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Luceock)—Does the right honourable gentleman claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr CALWELL—Yes. Standing Order 64 provides that if I obtain leave from the Chair I might be given an opportunity to explain matters of a personal nature. Yesterday a letter appeared in the 'Canberra Times' under the heading 'Multi-racial Society'. We have heard a little about that lately. This letter was signed by 4 people, none of whom I know and none of whom I had ever heard of before. It was a wild, abusive letter, but they had the right to put their point of view. I did not disagree with that right. I did not even take the trouble to reply to the letter. However, in today's 'Sydney Morning Herald' this appeared:

Envoys attack claim by MP.

Mark the word 'envoys':

Canberra, Monday.—Four senior Australian diplomats today attacked statements made last week by the former Opposition Leader, Mr Calwell.

I am sure that the Department of Foreign Affairs gave no permission to 4 senior diplomats or to 4 junior diplomats to attack me, and to me it was a gross misuse of authority on the part of any member of the staff of the Department of Foreign Affairs to use his office to attack me in this way. I have found out that these so-called 4 senior Australian diplomats are 4 very junior employees in the Department.

Mr Jess—Like Bill Morrison.

Mr CALWELL—They cannot be senior because 2 of them are only 28 years of age. I have tremendous respect for the honourable member for St George, who is a very capable man and has served Australia very well. He has the distinction of having been expelled twice from Russia while he was in the service of Australia.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! I think that the right honourable member for Melbourne can tell us why he has been personally misrepresented without assistance from either side of the House.

Mr CALWELL—I think you are right, Mr Acting Speaker. The newspaper article goes on:

Their criticism—

meaning the criticism of these 4 middle-range employees of the Department of Foreign Affairs—

. . . in a letter to the 'Canberra Times' is known to reflect reaction in the Department to Mr Calwell's statements.

That is a grossly gratuitous insult and I am certain it is not true. I would like the Minister to have a look at that matter and I should like you, Sir, to summon the writer of this article, whom I think I can identify, and inquire about this performance. I think the writer was Mr 'Fetchit' Fitchett. The offending article goes on:

One very senior Foreign Affairs official—

I interrupt myself to say that he, too, is anonymous—

is reported to have said Mr Calwell's statements had 'put us back 10 years' in relations with Asia. Then followed a lot of other piffle and gross misrepresentation of my view and again a gross usurpation of the powers, responsibilities and duties of a Minister,
who in my view is the only person who has the right to be a spokesman for the Department of Foreign Affairs. No public servant, no matter how highly or lowly placed, has the right to attempt to usurp, let alone usurp, the authority of his Minister. If he does so, the door is open for him, and I know what would have happened in the days when the Curtin and Chifley governments were in power. I would have been in the leading role in that regard. Finally the article states:

'As genuine "red-blooded" Australians, we reject the attitudes of Mr Calwell and his ilk, and feel that all mature Australians with a sense of real national confidence and pride would do likewise.'

As an expression of opinion by citizens, I cannot object to it, nor would I want to object, but these public servants have no right to pretend that they are speaking on behalf of the Department in saying these things. I am entitled to my views, and other people are entitled to their views. In regard to the preservation of the homogeneity of our people and the preservation of our immigration restriction laws, my views are like the laws of the Medes and the Persians—they are unchanged and unchangeable.

AUSTRALIAN TOBACCO BOARD

Mr SINCLAIR—Pursuant to section 26 of the Tobacco Marketing Act 1965-1966, I present the sixth annual report of the Australian Tobacco Board regarding the operation of the Act for the year ended 31st December 1971, together with the financial statements and the Auditor-General's report on those statements.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DECISIONS ON VIETNAM

Ministerial Statement

Mr McMAHON (Lowe—Prime Minister)—by leave—I refer to the important decisions which President Nixon has been obliged to take in the present very serious situation in Vietnam. These decisions were taken because of the blatant invasion of South Vietnam by the North Vietnamese, supported by outside governments. Not only has there been this invasion of South Vietnam across the demilitarised zone, but the North Vietnamese forces have been carrying on offensive military operations in Laos and the Khmer Republic for a period of years. The Australian Government strongly condemns North Vietnam and its associates. It is they who must take the complete moral responsibility for these actions.

The United States has made—with full Australian support—every effort to bring about a negotiated settlement of the present conflict. These efforts have met with an absolute refusal by North Vietnam to negotiate seriously. The United States has also tried to de-escalate the fighting by progressively withdrawing its forces from Vietnam. The response from Hanoi has been the launching of a long and carefully planned invasion. The Australian Government understands and supports the decisions which the President has felt compelled to take. In our view, the United States had done everything in its power to ensure a negotiated settlement and to maintain the independence of South Vietnam and not to abandon the people of that country. The present decisions by the United States reflect its determination to stand by its international obligations and alliances. The United States must also avoid endangering the lives of its own forces in Vietnam. I present the following paper:


Mr WHITLAM (Werriwa—Leader of the Opposition)—I seek leave to make a statement.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Mr WHITLAM—The Prime Minister (Mr McMahon) apparently believes that President Nixon's announcement is merely another decision restricted to America's conduct of the war in Vietnam. The truth is that it takes the war to a new level altogether. It brings the war to the stage of direct confrontation with the Soviet Union. This has never happened in the war's long history. I would expect to have some more to say on this matter in the debate on the statement to be made by the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr N. H. Bowen) later today. At this stage I will content myself with reading to the House a statement which I made on this subject outside the House. I said:

President Nixon's decision is fraught with peril for the world's peace. The crucial reaction will come not from Hanoi but from Moscow. The effect of the blockade on North Vietnam's current
military operation will be marginal. She is close
to achieving her immediate objective—the detach-
ment of the northernmost provinces of South
Vietnam. She already has the equipment needed
to complete the operation. The operation does not
depend on new supplies arriving by sea.
Significantly President Nixon named Russia alone,
not China, as North Vietnam’s major supplier.
But the seaward interdiction can only mean total
reliance on the China route. The blockade there-
fore is almost certain to increase North Vietnam’s
dependence upon China and increase co-operation
between China and Russia in continuing the war.
The announcement proves dramatically and
tragically how the blunders of the past 20 years
have pushed the United States into a dead end.
The United States options have narrowed to noth-
ingess. The President himself has said that in
effect he has no options left. Those so-called
allies of the United States who helped to bring
the world’s greatest power to such an impasse
bear a heavy responsibility for this danger now
confronting the world.

I would recall that Governor Averell Harr-
iman has said on Vietnam that it is not
America’s will which is being questioning; it
is her judgment. In the next few hours and
days that judgment faces its severest test.

SALE OF COMMONWEALTH
EQUITY IN
COMMONWEALTH-NEW GUINEA
TIMBERS LTD

Ministerial Statement

Mr PEACOCK (Kooyong—Minister for
External Territories)—by leave—In 1952
the Commonwealth Government and a
Canadian company, Bulolo Gold Dredging
Ltd, formed a joint enterprise, Common-
wealth-New Guinea Timbers Ltd, to
establish a veneer and plywood industry at
Bulolo as a major pioneer industrial ven-
ture. The Commonwealth Government
subscribed $1,500,002 to the paid up capi-
tal of $3m. In 1966 Bulolo Gold Dredging
Ltd amalgamated with Placer Development
Ltd. The Commonwealth Government has
now approved the sale of the Common-
wealth's shareholding in Commonwealth-
New Guinea Timbers Ltd to the Invest-
ment Corporation of Papua New Guinea.
The Commonwealth would make provision
for long term loan finance on favourable
terms to enable the Investment Corpora-
tion to take up the Commonwealth’s share-
holding.
The Government’s policy is to encourage
overseas investment in Papua New Guinea
which will assist in developing the country
on a sound and balanced basis. It looks to
such investors to meet a number of condi-
tions including the provision of opportuni-
ties for a significant local share in owner-
ship. The Investment Corporation was set
up to enable this condition to be realised
in cases where the people of Papua New
Guinea lack the financial resources or the
knowledge to take advantage of such
opportunities individually. The Corporation
is empowered to obtain a share in the
ownership and control of selected major
overseas investment projects and hold this
share for future sale to individual Papuans
and New Guineans. The Corporation com-
enced operations at the beginning of the
year and this represents its first major
acquisition. It is fitting that with the pro-
gress of Papua New Guinea towards self
government the Commonwealth’s interest
in this highly successful partnership with
private enterprise should pass to the
Investment Corporation. In 1970-71 the
plywood factory of Commonwealth-New
Guinea Timbers Ltd produced 42 million
square feet of plywood of which 26 mil-
lion square feet valued at $2.5m were
exported. The company also produces sawn
and dressed timber as part of its Bulolo
operations.
The Government has also endorsed pro-
posals for subsequent consolidation of
Commonwealth-New Guinea Timbers Ltd
with other interests in Papua New Guinea
owned by Placer Development. This will
extend the range of business interests in
which there is local equity through the
Investment Corporation which will have a
substantial shareholding in the consolidated
company, one of Papua New Guinea’s
major industrial enterprises. In due course
a Bill to repeal the New Guinea Timber
Agreement Act, passed in 1952 to approve
the agreement between the Commonwealth
and Bulolo Gold Dredging Ltd with
respect to the formation of Commonwealth-
New Guinea Timbers Ltd, will be brought
before the House. The present arrange-
ments for duty free entry into Australia of
16 million square feet of Papua New
Guinea plywood annually, will be main-
tained.

Mr WHITLAM (Werriwa—Leader of
the Opposition)—I seek leave to make a
statement on the same subject.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Is leave
granted? There being no objection, leave is
granted.
Mr WHITLAM—The Opposition welcomes the Minister’s announcement. It was always been the Australian Labor Party’s attitude that if New Guineans were to have a fruitful part to play in the development of their natural resources that could be achieved only by government enterprise, whether it was a full government enterprise or a government enterprise in partnership with private enterprise. The resources to establish enterprises of sufficient skill and size to tackle the development of New Guinea’s resources are not available to individual New Guineans. They are available only to foreign companies or to the Australian Government. The Australian Government took the valuable initiative of entering into partnership with an established company in New Guinea in the development of this great natural resource—forestry. The time has now come when the Australian Government can hand over its assets in this national enterprise to the Papua New Guinea Government.

This enterprise would not have reached the present size but for the Australian Government’s partnership and initiative. It could not be a New Guinea enterprise but for that Commonwealth Government initiative. Of all forms of development in a developing country that undertaken by governments is basic and it is the most easily transferred to indigenous management.

I would take the opportunity also to refer to the fact that this enterprise has had the advantage of greater flexibility in its management than some other enterprises that governments solely have conducted in New Guinea. For that reason, as Professor Cochrane pointed out in his report in September 1970, it has not had the losses of equipment and turnover of employees that solely government enterprises have had. I am not to be taken to applaud or even condone all the industrial practices there. At all events they have worked more successfully through the greater flexibility of its management.

One might also note in this context that the Commonwealth on behalf of Papua New Guinea has promoted negotiations with Japan to develop the forestry resources of that country. Forestry is one of the country’s greatest resources. Australians can take some satisfaction in the fact that they have helped to develop those resources, that they have enabled the people of that country to make arrangements with other countries and that they are guaranteeing an outlet for those resources to some extent, at all events, in Australia herself. As with so many things that the Minister has done in his short term in his new portfolio, what he has done here has been beneficial and timely.

RECENT EVENTS IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Ministerial Statement

Mr PEACOCK (Kooyong—Minister for External Territories)—by leave—I wish to advise the House of recent events in Papua New Guinea which may be of interest to honourable members. Elections were held in February and March of this year for the third Papua New Guinea House of Assembly which will run until 1976. These elections were contested by 3 main political parties, namely, the United Party, the Pangu Party, the People’s Progress Party, a number of smaller parties such as the New Guinea National Party, and political associations such as the Mataungan Association and a number of independent candidates.

The results of the elections gave no one party a majority in the 100 elected member House of Assembly, but shortly before the opening of the House on 20th April the Pangu Party entered into a coalition with the People’s Progress Party, the New Guinea National Party, the Mataungan Association group and a group of independents led by the former Speaker, Dr John Guise, to form a governing coalition group. This group was successful in setting up a Ministerial Nominations Committee of the House of Assembly and, following agreement between the Committee and the Administrator, in having the House endorse its list of members to form the executive government of Papua New Guinea.

Following acceptance by the House of Assembly of the coalition’s list I formally created 17 Ministries and the Ministers then elected one of their number to be the Deputy Chairman of the Administrator’s Executive Council. The Ministers elected Mr Michael Somare, the parliamentary leader of the Pangu Party, to be the Deputy Chairman of the Administrator’s Executive Council and the House of Assembly in
turn endorsed that election. Following discussions between the Administrator and the Deputy Chairman of the Administrator's Executive Council, the Administrator recommended to me the allocation and distribution of portfolio responsibilities among the Ministry and those Ministers who should make up the elected membership of the Administrator's Executive Council. On 28th April I executed instruments under the Papua New Guinea Act giving effect to these recommendations. I am placing copies of these instruments in the Library for the information of honourable members.

May I say finally that I and the Government look forward to working closely with the newly elected members of the House of Assembly and, in particular, with members of the Administrator's Executive Council. Already I have had a number of discussions with them and I look forward to continuing those discussions. As honourable members are aware, the Deputy Chairman of the Administrator's Executive Council, who is in effect the Chief Minister, and 4 of his Ministers will arrive in Canberra tonight. Bearing in mind the distinctive role that the House of Assembly has in the move towards self-government we welcome their arrival in Canberra, albeit on this occasion it is primarily to discuss budgetary matters. We wish them well during their term of office.

Mr WHITLAM (Werriwa—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—My colleagues and I also look forward to meeting the Chief Minister and his colleagues, to having discussions with them and, in the near future, co-operating with them. On behalf of my Party I applaud the ready and graceful acceptance by the Minister for External Territories (Mr Peacock) of the great changes which the elections in Papua New Guinea have brought about in our neighbour. Honourable members should recall the apprehensions and misapprehensions with which such events were anticipated and debated in this House 2 years ago and even 1 year ago. Perhaps I might refresh the memories of honourable members with what I said in Port Moresby in January 1970. I said:

New Guineans will have home rule as soon as a Labor Government can make the necessary arrangements with the House of Assembly which will also be elected in 1972.

This means that laws made by the Assembly will no longer be subject to veto by the Australian Government; that all matters affecting the welfare of the New Guinean people except defence and foreign affairs will be subject to laws made by the Assembly alone; and that those laws will be administered by a public service responsible only to the House of Assembly.

Australians who remain in the service of the New Guinea government will equally be responsible to the House of Assembly, but the Australian Government will accept responsibility for their salaries and the welfare of their families.

The House of Assembly will decide the form of the constitution New Guinea is to have after independence.

It is certain that the assumption of an increasing measure of responsibility will accelerate the desire and ability to accept total responsibility. In this sense it is true that the people of New Guinea will decide their own time-table for independence.

Later on I said:

None of these problems require colonial rule for their solution or easing. In fact, many of them will worsen if foreign techniques, methods, laws and customs continue to exclude local custom, knowledge and experience. An outside administration cannot teach or impose unity. It can by errors unite a people against it. This is the very situation which Australians at home will not permit, and Australians in New Guinea must most avoid.

Political evolution in Papua New Guinea since then has been gratifying in its scope and speed. I must pay tribute to the excellent Administrator of the Territory, This Administrator will be the final one; the final one will have been the finest. I pay tribute to the ready and graceful acceptance by the new Minister for External Territories of the very great changes. Those who saw and heard Chief Minister Somare on 'Monday Conference' last night will have confidence in his Ministry and express congratulations to it.

INCOME TAX ASSESSMENT ACT
Ministerial Statement

Mr GARLAND (Curtin—Minister for Supply and Minister Assisting the Treasurer)—by leave—The Government has recently considered representations for an amendment of provisions of the income tax law which authorise the allowance of tax deductions for capital expenditure on facilities used for the transport of minerals. Under the provisions, capital expenditure on natural gas transmission pipelines and roads, railways or pipelines used for the transport of crude oil or other minerals is deductible for taxation purposes over a
period of 10 years. It has been put to the Government that, under the mandatory 10 year period of write-off, full deductions for the capital expenditure may not be available where income derived in the early years of operation of a transport facility is insufficient to absorb the deductions. In this situation, and given that the working life of a transport facility will generally be considerably longer than 10 years, it would be to the advantage of taxpayers to provide an option in the law under which the capital expenditure could be written off for tax purposes over a longer period.

The Government has agreed that taxpayers should have this option. Accordingly, it proposes that, at the next convenient opportunity, Parliament will be asked to amend the income tax law to permit a taxpayer to claim deductions for capital expenditure on natural gas transmission pipelines, or on other facilities for the transport of minerals which qualify under Division 10AAA, over a period longer than 10 years. Where taxpayers use this option the revenue cost of the Division 10AAA concession will be less in the early years of operation of a facility than under the existing provision. This follows from the fact that deductions will be spread over a longer period. However, as I have indicated, the purpose of the proposed option is to allow deductions which otherwise could not be made, because income within the 10-year period at present prescribed would not be sufficient to absorb them. Hence use of the option by taxpayers will result in an overall cost to revenue in the long run.

Mr STEWART (Lang)—by leave—The statement we have just heard from the Minister for Supply (Mr Garland) is another example of a carrot held out to the exploration industry of Australia to try to save this Government from defeat at the end of the year. It is another example of a piecemeal approach to an urgent national problem. The protection, preservation and control of our natural resources are far too important for this stop-gap approach. Time has long since passed when the introduction of a national energy and resources policy was required. State Ministers, academics and industrialists have repeatedly warned of the need for the encouragement and development of our natural gas, oil and mineral resources, as well as calling for the introduction of a national energy and resources policy and greater activity in exploration for minerals. The community generally is aware that our resources now are predominantly overseas owned and it is not sufficient for the needs of Australia for this Government to announce a few months before the introduction of a budget that is making this small taxation concession to the exploration industry in Australia. The Minister stated in his speech:

The Government has recently considered representations for an amendment of provisions of the income tax law which authorise the allowance of tax deductions for capital expenditure on facilities used for the transport of minerals. Under the provisions, capital expenditure on national gas transmission pipelines and roads, railways or pipelines used for the transport of crude oil or other minerals is deductible for taxation purposes over a period of 10 years.

This announced amendment is to allow those companies that have developed gas or oil pipelines or railways to depreciate their pipelines or their railways over a period longer than 10 years. It is interesting to read a speech made by the then president of the organisation, Mr Eric N. Avery, C.B.E., at the conference of the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association held on 10th April this year. Mr Avery spoke about the need for the Association to criticise this Government on two or three occasions for its lack of incentive to the oil and mineral exploration industries. He said that, after the 1971-72 Budget, the APEA had found it necessary to make a strong submission to the Government along the lines that it felt that the present policy of the Government was creating disincentive in the exploration industry. Mr Avery said:

Some of our members put it otherwise, namely that last year when presented with a logically argued case, Government took cover behind a Departmental Committee, who tendered advice which we have not seen, perhaps clothed in reasoning which we cannot rebut. A Senate inquiry has its critics, but it does have to publish a report and come into the open. Consideration by an interdepartmental committee we dislike because (a) you don't know who is on it, and (b) you cannot confront them face to face. Finally, you do not know what they have said and thus cannot comment on what Cabinet will deliberate in their final report.

The actual case submitted can be summarised as follows: Abolition of circles—granted; restoration of subsidy from 30 per cent to 50 per cent
on offshore drilling—refused; offshore geophysical—refused; onshore drilling—refused; onshore geophysical—granted; improvement of tax deductions—refused; cessation of tax harassment—ignored; depletion allowance—refused; and, proper price for crude—refused.

So, when the Minister for Supply talks about having received representations for amendments to the Income Tax Act, I take it that this was one of the representations which was made. That was made shortly after the 1971-72 Budget and it has taken this Government this long even to allow for the increases in the tax allowances on capital expenditure for these proposed pipelines and other capital works. It is not sufficient for the Government which, according to the Gallup polls and the various other reports, is in dire trouble, to introduce a piecemeal measure like this. As I said earlier, our resources are a national and important problem and the Opposition does not consider it nearly sufficient for the Government to handle the problem in this way.

I should now like to quote from another speech that was made at the conference of the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association. Mr L. W. Williams from the Bureau of Mineral Resources of the Department of National Development said:

Of the various indicators which may be used to measure the level of exploration activity, the only one which showed an increase in 1971 over 1970 was the number of active onshore drilling rigs. The others—number of wells, exploration footage drilled and number of seismic crews—all showed a decrease. Exploration expenditure figures for 1971 are not yet available, but figure 1 shows that expenditure in 1970, both onshore and offshore, was about the same as for 1969. There was, however, a levelling out in total expenditure which had been showing a steady increase for the previous 3 years. I expect that when the 1971 figures are available they will show the first decrease for many years.

Mr Williams was talking about oil exploration and the statement that the Minister has just made deals with oil pipelines. Mr Williams went on to say:

The total number of exploration wells fell by about 30 per cent, which was fairly evenly spread between offshore and onshore, and the exploration footage fell by about 20 per cent which was largely due to a drop of some 30 per cent in offshore footage.

He said also:

Exploration expenditure which I expect was down in 1971 compared with 1970 may rise again in 1972 but possibly not to the level of 1969 and 1970. When increases in the cost of exploration through increases in wages and cost of materials are taken into account, this level of expenditure does not give promise of a significant increase in activity.

That statement indicating that last year there would be a fall in the amount of expenditure on exploration for oil, at a time when our oil resources are being used up, was made by a member of the Department of National Development—a government department. It is anticipated that by the end of the 1980s our oil resources will be providing only a small portion of our total annual requirement yet in this statement the Government is to provide only a small taxation concession for capital expenditure on pipelines and the other capital works indicated. It is time the Government looked at this problem more fully and comprehensively and that it decided that our natural resources were things that should be preserved for the people of Australia.

As I said in my opening remarks, this promised amendment is merely a carrot. The only recommendation of APEA made after the last Budget which has been adopted is in relation to the taxation concession. I should like to give honourable members a quick summary of the oil and gas pipelines at the moment in Australia. This summary certainly is not complete because the Opposition received a copy of the Minister's statement only a couple of hours before the Minister made it. I am not in a position to give a full summary, but as far as I can recollect and, after having made one or two inquiries, there is the Roma gas pipeline in Queensland and the Moonie oil pipeline in Queensland, while in Bass Strait there are a number of pipelines which carry gas or oil. In South Australia there is the Cooper Basin and, perhaps the most important proposed pipeline at the moment is the one from Cooper Basin to Sydney, Newcastle and various other places in New South Wales. It is estimated that this pipeline will be in the vicinity of 820 miles long. I think that this proposed amendment to the taxation concessions provided is likely to do more in the near future for the encouragement of the building of gas pipelines than for any other type of capital work that is mentioned in Division 10AAA of the Income Tax Assessment Act. As natural gas seems to be the fuel that is coming into operation in Australia more extensively than other fuels
and as it seems to be the fuel that has much more to gain from the measures outlined in the Minister's statement, let me say a few words about it. Natural gas is coming much more into prominence. In fact, it is estimated that within the next decade about 10 per cent of Australia's energy requirements will be met from this source. In view of recent discoveries we may even reach the 30 per cent proportion of the United States.

In a paper which he presented to the Institute of Engineers in Australia in 1970 the late Mr W. H. Roberts, who was Secretary for Fuel and Power in Victoria, emphasised the need for overall planning both within his own State and on a national basis. The late Mr Roberts noted that there was a possibility of reducing the capital outlay on new electrical generating equipment if a definite portion of the energy market was allotted to natural gas. On the other hand, because of other factors, he stressed the need to make a very careful analysis before following such a course. The late Mr Roberts was not specific as to precisely how the various energy resources in Victoria should develop, but he was certain of the need for a co-ordinated approach.

If we consider natural gas from a national viewpoint, the interstate and Commonwealth wide nature of this new source of energy becomes quite apparent. South Australia will almost certainly supply gas to New South Wales in a pipeline 820 miles long, to be constructed from gas fields in the north-east of the State to the Sydney area. The Mereenie gas fields in the Northern Territory and new fields being discovered in the north-west continental shelf area of Western Australia could well require interstate co-operation and agreement for efficient exploitation.

In a paper presented to the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science dated 9th September 1971, Mr W. W. Pettingell, General Manager of the Australian Gas Light Co, and Mr L. A. Hokin, the Technical Sales Manager, put forward the proposition that as industry becomes more and more dependent upon natural gas it will be necessary to add flexibility to the supply system by linking the major capital cities in a grid pipeline system. There seems to be no consideration given to these aspects of the matter at all. One little concession is to be given to the exploration industry in Australia, and, more particularly, to the people connected with natural gas at the moment, in order to get them to put in pipelines. The Minister has given no indication of the amount of deductions claimed by the people who constructed the pipelines that are already in operation. He has given no indication as to whether the Government, in allowing taxation concessions on these sorts of capital works, intends to have any say in whether private companies or State governments will run the pipelines side by side, or a few miles apart, when one pipeline could satisfy the requirements of the district which it will serve.

Mr Pettingell and Mr Hokin have suggested that we may see the time when there will be a grid serving capital cities. It is time that this Government had a look at a national policy for our energy resources and mineral resources. It will be too late to consider these matters when these pipelines have been constructed—perhaps constructed uneconomically and unnecessarily or even too early, before the extent of the oil field or the gas field has been properly assessed.

In making this statement today the Government has shown, once again, its fear that at the election at the end of this year it will be defeated. Only a few days ago the Government made a statement on the establishment of an advisory committee on science and technology. The Labor Party espoused the establishment of such a committee back in 1965, and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Whitlam) has referred to it on a number of occasions. The Government has stolen that policy now. For heaven's sake, in the interests of Australia and our resources, I ask the Government to steal another Australian Labor Party policy and introduce, as quickly as possible, a national policy on energy and natural resources. When a Bill to introduce the proposals outlined in the Minister's statement is presented to the House a number of honourable members on the Opposition side will criticise it and will make constructive suggestions to aid the exploration and development of mineral and energy resources in Australia. The Opposition accepts the statement, but certainly does not applaud it.
HOURS OF MEETING

Mr SWARTZ (Darling Downs — Minister for National Development) (4.6) — I move:

That for the remainder of this period of sittings, unless otherwise ordered, the House shall meet for the dispatch of business on each Tuesday and Wednesday at 2 p.m. and on each Thursday at 10 a.m.

As honourable members know, this is the concluding 3 weeks of the sittings that have been previously listed. On the indication of sittings which I gave to the House at the commencement of this sitting it was expected that we would rise on the 25th of this month. We have a reasonable number of Bills to consider in the intervening period, but I still believe that we will be able to get them through by 25th May. There is no reason why we should not extend the sittings if we are unable to complete the business by that time. I am sure that having given the terminating date as 25th May, most honourable members would want to adhere to that date. However, a reasonable number of Bills have to be considered.

I am sure we can conclude our business without unduly extending the hours of sitting. By sitting an additional half an hour a day, I think that we will be able to overcome the necessity to move for the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule. I have no desire to move for the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule to bring in Government business, and I am sure all honourable members would heartily agree with that. One of the principal reasons for moving this motion is to have an extra half an hour for each day of sitting, during this 3-week period. This will assist in achieving the objective of not introducing new Government business after 11 o'clock each night, and we will have the adjournment debate on 2 nights a week, as we normally do. I may say, in conclusion, that I did discuss this matter with my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Barnard), and he concurs with the proposal that I have put forward.

Mr STEWART (Lang) (4.8) — The Leader of the House (Mr Swartz) has announced that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Barnard) has agreed with his suggestion. I also agree with it. As the Parliament heads towards the end of a session I think there is a need to extend the hours of sitting. Although on previous occasions the Leader of the House has given an assurance that we will not sit through till 2 or 3 a.m., on most occasions it has happened. The Minister has stated that it will not happen on this occasion.

Mr Swartz — We hope not.

Mr STEWART — The Minister qualifies it by saying that he hopes not. I am prepared to bet London to a brick — to use a well-known saying — that it will happen. I do not like the Parliament sitting into the early hours of the morning. Whilst it can be said that perhaps many of us have made arrangements after 25th May, the business of this place is more important than a lot of the arrangements that we have made.

Mr Swartz — You have noted I am not moving for the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule.

Mr STEWART — I suggest that it is appropriate that we should sit for a few extra days rather than sit until the early hours of the morning. The Minister points out to me that he has not moved for the suspension of the 11 o'clock rule. The Minister knows as well as I do that that is only a matter of putting a motion on the notice paper and it can be done. It is not a difficult task to abolish the 11 o'clock rule and allow new business to commence after that hour. The Opposition agrees with the extension of the sittings on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday in order to try to get through Government business. But I would suggest to the Minister that as Leader of the House and as the person controlling the list of speakers on the Government side he should suggest to such speakers that they restrict themselves to debates on legislation before the House and not raise any red herrings because it is an election year. Supporters of the Government are prone to introduce motions that create a furore in the House and take up the debating time which should be devoted to matters of national importance.

I think that the Opposition is prepared to co-operate with the Leader of the House but if co-operation is not forthcoming from Government supporters I am afraid that we will have no course but to withdraw the cooperation that we are now prepared to extend.
Mr BRYANT (Wills) (4.12)—What a way to run the House! Three weeks ago the Parliament examined the Standing Orders procedures. The Minister for National Development (Mr Swartz), the soul of discretion and sensitive to the needs of the House, promised that everything that was discussed would be brought before the Standing Orders Committee as soon as possible. Today the Minister asks the House to alter its times of meeting. But when members of the Labor Party want to move for the adjournment of the House at a reasonable hour all sorts of reasons are put as to why we cannot do it. We are told that we ought to refer such a proposal to the Standing Orders Committee, that we ought to consider the Government’s position, and that it will shorten the day too much and so on. Three weeks after discussing the Standing Orders the Minister has to juggle the affairs of this Parliament like some juggler’s aide so that he can make up for whatever ministerial incompetence has produced the legislative log jam or whatever it is. I know perfectly well that for the Ministers and the Government in particular the meetings of this Parliament are a continual embarrassment. From the way the Minister speaks one would think that the principal function of members of this Parliament is to get away from Parliament House as fast as possible. It does not matter to me if we sit beyond 25th May.

Mr Giles—You live at Canberra.

Mr BRYANT—I make this point, which I made to one of the honourable member’s ministerial friends once when he interjected similarly: You do not live anywhere; you just take up space. It so happens that my family live in Melbourne and it so happens that I have a base in Canberra. I believe that it is a serious reflection on the way this country regards the Parliament that in the 45 years since this Parliament was established in Canberra nothing has been done for the families of members. It is a reflection on the spirit in which these matters are handled.

Today we are getting around to adjusting the meetings of the Parliament. I regret it. I am not going to oppose this motion but it also is a reflection on the way we run this place. The Minister says it is important that we should knock off on 25th May. Perhaps it is. But it is worth while the House remembering and the people noting that in the 925 days—almost 1,000 days—I think it is, since the last Federal election we have met on 170 days. Yet, suddenly the Minister has moved this motion to change the system so that we will be able to pick up another half hour a day. I do not agree with the motion but I will not vote against it. As we have this spirit of co-operation I will move an amendment in these terms:

That the following words be added to the motion: ‘and that the motion for the adjournment of the House shall be moved no later than 10 p.m.’

If we are to extend the meetings at the beginning of the day it is fitting to fix a reasonable time to finish at the end of the day. I believe it is time we realised that we are not the only people involved. I consider that the way in which this House functions is one of the most selfish and inconsiderate operations anywhere in the country.

Mr Cope—Outside that it is all right.

Mr BRYANT—It is all right for the Government. It is all right for the people who can go home and, if they do not feel like being back here at 9 o’clock in the morning, can come in at quarter past or half past 10 or buzz off somewhere else. But members of the staffs of this place—there are between 600 and 800 people involved in the machinery of this place—including Press representatives should be considered. What about the people in the refreshment rooms? What about the people in Hansard? What about the people in the Library? I have known times when we have sat through the night and met again at such a time that these people could not go home at all. What manner of behaviour is that? Therefore, on behalf of the staffs, ourselves, common sense and the reasonable operation of a national Parliament, as an amendment to the motion put by the Minister I move:

That the following words be added to the motion: ‘and that the motion for the adjournment of the House shall be moved no later than 10 p.m.’

I make the point that this is not in accordance with the terminology of the Standing Orders but this is not an amendment to the Standing Orders.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—The motion moved by the Leader of the House refers
only to the times at which the House shall meet. The amendment proposed by the honourable member for Wills deals with arrangements for the adjournment of the House each night. In my opinion, therefore, the amendment is not relevant to the motion and I am obliged to rule it out of order.

Mr Bryant—Speaking to your ruling, Mr Acting Speaker, in the Standing Orders the sitting and the adjournment of the House are dealt with in the same chapter.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Wills can dissent from my ruling but he cannot speak to it.

Mr Bryant—Can I not speak about your ruling?

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—No. The honourable member can move dissent from my ruling.

Mr Bryant—Mr Acting Speaker, I am not anxious to hold up the operations of the House. I could move dissent from your ruling. I could move for the suspension of Standing Orders. But I make the point that I believe that your ruling is incorrect and you ought to reconsider it. We are dealing not with an amendment to Standing Orders, but with an adjustment to the way in which this House meets. Both the commencement time and the finishing time are relevant. I believe it is an incorrect use of the English language to say that the amendment I have moved is irrelevant. Therefore, Mr Acting Speaker, you ought to reconsider it and allow the House to make a decision on it.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—I still stand by what I said previously, namely, that in my opinion the amendment is irrelevant and therefore I rule it out of order.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

DAIRYING RESEARCH LEVY COLLECTION BILL 1972

In Committee

Consideration resumed from 27 April (vide page 2162).

Clauses 1 to 5—by leave—taken together, and agreed to.

Clause 6 (Liability of purchaser from producer).

Dr Patterson (Dawson) (4.19)—Clause 6 deals with the liability of the purchaser from the producer. The Dairying Research Levy Collection Bill follows the same principles as do other research levy collection Bills. The incidence of the levy falls on the producer and the responsibility in most part falls on the purchaser to collect that levy and pay it to the Commonwealth. Sub-clause (1.) makes it quite clear that a person who purchases whole milk or butter fat from the producer of the whole milk or butter fat is liable to pay to the Commonwealth an amount equal to any levy on the whole milk or butter fat, as the case may be. The Opposition has a query with respect to clause 6 (3.) which, as I understand it, deals with the protection of the purchaser against the non-payment of the levy by the producer. This sub-clause seems to me to be vital. If some type of contract is entered into between a factory and a producer before this clause becomes law, notwithstanding that contract or any law of a State or a Commonwealth Territory the producer is still liable to pay the levy and the purchaser is still liable to collect it and pay it to the Commonwealth.

This sub-clause, if I understand it correctly, protects the liability of the purchaser in the event of the producer refusing to take part in the scheme or to pay the levy. I question the meaning of the words ‘first provides’ in sub-clause (3.) because one could assume that a producer must pay to the purchaser, whether it is a factory or some other person, money or its equivalent before he takes delivery of the butter fat or the whole milk. I presume that the words ‘first provides’ have a more flexible meaning than that in a situation where an arrangement is entered into between the purchaser and producer and that when the final account sale is rendered there will be a deduction to cover the levy. This would protect the purchaser in the event of the producer refusing to pay the levy. If there were some arrangement whereby the producer still refused to pay the levy, and through some mistake the purchaser had not deducted the amount of the levy, from the account sales, for example, under clause 6 (1.) the purchaser would be liable to pay it to the Commonwealth.
I turn now to clause 6(8.), which applies strictly to the purchaser’s responsibility to pay the levy. If there were a mistake or if a purchaser were fraudulently affected, perhaps by a producer putting something over him, the Minister, under sub-clause (1.) would have the power to discharge the purchaser’s liability. I am seeking clarification of clause 6(3.) from the Minister because it would appear from a reading of this sub-clause that it is the key in regard to the protection of the purchaser when the incidence of the levy falls on the producer himself. Will the Minister clarify also the meaning of the words ‘first provides’ in sub-clause (3.)? Is it correct, as I have said, that it is not strictly ‘first provides’, although it could be interpreted that way, but rather it is flexible in the sense that if an arrangement is made between the producer and the purchaser that arrangement is in fact legal?

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Minister for Primary Industry) (4.25)—It is true as the honourable member for Dawson (Dr Patterson) has surmised that the words ‘first provides’ in sub-clause (3.) are intended only as a protection for the purchaser of milk products. The producer himself is liable to pay the levy. At the same time the producer is not directly in contact with the proceeds from the sale of milk products until the purchaser has paid him for the goods. In order to facilitate the process the arrangement set out in clause 6 is provided to enable an arrangement to be entered into—I understand that normally there is an arrangement—whereby the purchaser of the milk product deducts the levy from the proceeds. Therefore, the producer is paid only after a deduction of that research levy. But if for some reason there should be a breakdown in the arrangement or if the purchaser of the milk product has some difficulty with a producer, in order to ensure that the producer does in fact pay the levy the producer himself can be required to pay the levy before the milk product is accepted.

I understand that the provisions in this clause have been used before and that it is customary so as to protect the purchaser of milk products. It is a procedure which I doubt would be used at all in practice. It is intended only to protect the purchaser of the milk product. Because of difficulties in translating that protection into legal form it might perhaps seem to be more complex than is intended to be the case.

It is true also that sub-clause (8.) provides discretionary power to the Minister in the special circumstances which are described in that sub-clause, which special circumstances in the opinion of the Minister justify the release of a person from his obligation to pay an amount payable under the provisions of clause 6(1.), that is to say the levy, and that this discretion may be exercised to exempt a person’s liability to pay part of the amount or the amount in full. The purpose of clause 6 is simple. I assure the honourable member for Dawson that normally the producer could and would give to the purchaser of milk products authority to deduct the levy payment or moneys due. So the fairly complex legal procedures would not be availed of. Those procedures are there to ensure that a producer remains liable for the levy, which is extracted from him rather than from anybody else along the chain of supply.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 7 (Penalty for non-payment.)

Dr PATTerson (Dawson) (4.28)—I refer to sub-clause (3.) which deals with a penalty as distinct from a levy. This provision is flexible enough to allow for some misunderstanding or anomaly. Obviously one could think of some anomalies that would arise in dealing with very small producers of butterfat. It is not the intention of the Government or the authority to penalise the people who obviously are innocent within the meaning of the common law. I assume that this sub-clause simply gives to the Minister discretionary power to carefully examine certain cases and where there is some injustice, to allow for the remission of whole or part of an amount payable under clause 7.

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Minister for Primary Industry) (4.30)—It is true that the operation of any levy scheme which is essentially beneficial by nature is designed to enable producers, as a result of research which is financed with levy collections, to sell their products a little more favourably than might otherwise have been the case.
In order to ensure that payment is made by all those who are in the industry, it is necessary that a penalty be applied to those who do not meet their payments in accordance with their obligation. However, in order to ensure that there shall not be any unduly inequitable application of a penalty—after all, it is a beneficial piece of legislation and not a penal one—provision is made for this discretion which is designed in such a way that the Minister may in certain circumstances where it is apparent that a person has not been able to meet the levy for a number of reasons, or a reason that is not specified, exempt him from that liability.

The whole purpose of the series of Bills which were debated collectively is to try to ensure that everyone in the dairy industry henceforth will jointly contribute to research. Obviously, if any one category is to be exempted it will to that degree affect the overall effectiveness of the scheme. Unfortunately, in most of these schemes unless penalties of some sort are provided it is difficult to ensure a uniform application of the levy. Therefore penalties are applied. However, I think that this exemption will enable a government to ensure that there is no inequitable application of penalties for the reasons that I have given.

Mr DUTHIE (Wilmot) (4.32)—I am grateful to the Minister for Primary Industry for his explanation of sub-clause (3) of clause 7, the last part of which reads:

... remit the whole or a part of an amount payable under this section.

Clause 7 (4.) states:

A remission granted under the last preceding sub-section by an authorised person shall not exceed Ten dollars.

Is the Minister serious in putting a clause like that in a Bill? I thought that sub-clause (3.) put the Minister in the category of Father Christmas, but when I read sub-clause (4.) I realised that he was not Father Christmas in any shape or form because the only remission permitted is an amount not exceeding $10. Would the Minister explain why such an amount was put into the Bill? If the Minister were to provide for any remission at all I would have assumed it would be far more generous than that amount. The size of this remission is just ridiculous. To my mind the remission of $10 makes the whole thing appear perfectly ridiculous.

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Minister for Primary Industry) (4.34)—I think that the honourable gentleman has not read the preceding clause. If he looks at sub-clause (3.) he will see that it states in part:

The Minister or, subject to the next succeeding sub-section, an authorised person . . .

In fact the discretion is exercisable by the Minister to any amount, but, as I read the clause and understand its purport, he is not permitted to delegate the right to exempt a person from the payment of a penalty other than up to the amount of $10. In other words, a remission by the authorised person is permitted, but only up to the amount of $10. If there were a suggestion that a remission should be in excess of $10 it would be necessary for the Minister himself, and not the authorised person, to make the remission.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 8.

8.—(1.) The following amounts may be recovered by the Commonwealth as debts due to the Commonwealth:

(a) levy that is payable;
(b) an amount that is payable to the Commonwealth under section 6 of this Act; and
(c) an amount that is payable by way of penalty under the last preceding section.

(2.) In proceedings for the recovery of an amount referred to in the last preceding sub-section, an averment or statement in the complaint, claim or declaration of the plaintiff is evidence of the matter so averred or stated.

Dr PATTERSON (Dawson) (4.35)—I move:

That sub-clause (2.) be omitted.

Sub-clause (2.) is one which is well known to the House; it is one which the Australian Labor Party always has opposed and will continue to oppose. I do not intend again to go into the reasons why we oppose such a clause because they are well known to the Minister for Primary Industry and members of the Government parties. However, the principal objection of the Opposition is with respect to a statement in the complaint of the plaintiff and this statement being evidence of a matter so averred. In other words, whatever the particular person lodging the complaint says is, virtually, evidence of the matter.

We have always objected to this sort of provision. We believe that such a matter must be proved. We believe it should be proved to the satisfaction of the Minister
himself or at least to some very responsible people before any action is taken. This clause is too rigorous in every respect of the word. We oppose it as we have opposed it in all other Bills in which it has been included.

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Minister for Primary Industry) (4.37)—As the honourable member for Dawson (Dr Patterson) has explained, the reason for the inclusion of this sub-clause is not new. In fact, on each occasion a levy collection Bill has been before the Parliament the question of whether an averment or statement of the complaint should be taken as evidence or whether proof of the matter should be offered by the Commonwealth comes up for debate. The reason for its inclusion is that, when someone seeks to avoid payment of a levy, the information is always in his hands. The Commonwealth does not have access either to the individual’s records or in many instances to the details of his actual production records and the factory through which he has sold. Indeed, the processes of sale are something which, peculiarly, can be known only by the individual affected.

The basis on which an averment in this instance works is that the Commonwealth, having seen through its agents that a levy has not been paid, is able to state that, with respect to such and such a milk supply, the appropriate payment has not been made to the collecting authority. That is in fact what constitutes the averment. Because the individual has access to his own records, his cheque book, his cash book and the factory records he is able to show from where the proceeds come and he is able to say whether the levy was paid. It is a very simple process for the person, who is himself a supplier, to demonstrate that the charge by the Commonwealth is wrong, if it is wrong. But it would be extremely difficult—in many cases it would require an unnecessary proliferation of inspecting personnel and often excessive scrutinising of the proceedings of individuals in their dealings with factories—to keep a check sufficient for the Commonwealth to be able to act under this proposed section if the averment provision were deleted. In other words, the reasons are, firstly, simplicity of administration; secondly, the practical purport and the ease with which the individual affected can demonstrate that he has been wrongfully accused means that it is a lot simpler for this requirement to be worded in this form; and, thirdly, I think that there is no injustice in terms of the person affected. Indeed, it is rather a format which enables him in a fairly simple way to meet with all others in the industry the responsibilities which he and they enjoy as a result of their obligation to pay the levy from which they gain the fruits of research. It is true that wherever there is a levy there are always some who seek to avoid their obligations. But it is not intended—nor is this the case in any primary industry—to set up a major policing staff in order to operate this sort of mechanism.

The consequences of the omission of this sub-clause would be the proliferation of policing staff which I do not think would be in the interests of the industry and certainly would be seen by producers in the industry as being detrimental to their own interests. For that reason the Government does not accept the proposal that sub-clause (2.) be omitted. In other words, it believes that the Opposition’s amendment should be rejected.

Question put:
That the sub-clause proposed to be omitted (Dr Patterson’s amendment) stand part of the clause.

The Committee divided.
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 Lynch, P. R.
Mackay, M. G.
Maclaren, M. J. R.
Maisey, D. W.
Macleay, E.
Nixon, P. J.
O’Keefe, F. L.
Peacock, A. S.
Pettilt, J. A.
Reid, L. S.
Robinson, I. L.
Sprague, J. McC.
Snedden, B. M.
Sismon, R. J.
Staley, A. A.
Street, A. A.
Swarz, R. C.
Turner, H. B.
Wentworth, W. C.
Whitburn, R. H.

Tellers:
Fox, E. M. C.
Turnbull, Sir Winton
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Armitage, J. L. 
Bennett, A. F. 
Berriman, J. M. 
Birrell, F. R. 
Bowen, Lionel 
Cameron, Clyde 
Cass, M. H. 
Cohen, B. 
Connor, R. F. X. 
Cope, J. F. 
Cres, F. 
Cross, M. D. 
Dalv, F. M. 
Davies, R. 
Enderby, K. E. 
Eveingham, D. N. 
FitzPatrick, J. 
Foster, N. K. 
Fraser, Allan 
Fulton, W. J. 
Garrick, H. J. 
Graetby, A. J. 
Griffiths, C. E. 
Gun, R. T. 
Hansen, B. P. 
Hayden, W. G. 

NOES
Hurford, C. J. 
Jacobi, R. 
Jenkins, H. A. 
Johnson, Keith 
Johnston, Les 
Jones, Charles 
Keating, P. J. 
Kennedy, A. D. 
Keogh, L. J. 
Kirwan, F. McL. 
Klugman, R. E. 
Luchetti, A. S. 
Martin, V. J. 
Morrison, W. L. 
Nicholls, M. H. 
Paterson, R. A. 
Reynolds, L. J. 
Sherry, R. H. 
Sewart, F. E. 
Uren, T. 
Walits, L. G. 
Webb, C. H. 

Tellers:
Duthie, G. W. A. 
James, A. W. 

PAIRS
Hughes, T. E. F. 
Katter, R. C. 
Kelly, C. R. 
McMahou, W. 

Calwell, A. A. 
McKenzie, H. 
Bearley, K. E. 
Whitlam, E. G. 

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Clause agreed to.

Remainder of the Bill—by leave—taken as a whole, and agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill (on motion by Mr Sinclaire)—by leave—read a third time.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 4) 1971-72

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 13 April (vide page 1616), on motion by Mr Snedden:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr CHIPP (Hotham—Minister for Customs and Excise)—May I have the indulgence of the House to raise a point of procedure in relation to this measure before debate is resumed on the Bill. I would like to suggest, if it suits the convenience of the House, that we have a general debate covering this Bill and Appropriation Bill (No. 5) 1971-72, as they are associated measures. Separate questions may, of course, be put on each of the Bills at the conclusion of the debate. I suggest therefore that both Bills be discussed in this debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Luceok)—Is it the wish of the House to debate both measures together? There being no objection, that course will be followed.

Mr CREAN (Melbourne Ports) (4.50)—These Bills are what are described as Supplementary Estimates. They relate to amounts not provided for in the original Budget arrangements for expenditures in 1971-72. They concern matters that have emerged during the year and, of course, like any other parliamentary appropriation, have to be sanctioned in this House before they can be authorised. I ask for leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN FOREIGN POLICY

Ministerial Statement

Mr N. H. BOWEN (Parramatta—Minister for Foreign Affairs)—by leave—I propose in this statement to outline the changing environment in which the Australian Government is formulating its foreign policies. I will also report on some of the initiatives taken in recent months, and on the Government's policies in some situations of current importance to us.

THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE

This decade will be one of change. It will be a time of challenge and of danger. Already in the 1970s war on a substantial scale has been unleashed in our own region—first on the Indian sub-continent and now with greater intensity in South Vietnam. The Middle East is at risk. If true peace and national integrity are to be secured on the world scene, the countries constituting the European Communities, the United States, the Soviet Union, Japan and the People's Republic of China will need to arrive at some balance. Particularly is this so in the Asian and Pacific region. Each will have to learn to live with an understanding of the different systems, fears and aspirations of the others; and with respect for the wish of the less powerful countries in the region to preserve and strengthen their own independent societies.

The European Communities are shortly to be enlarged by the entry of Britain and others. It is difficult to overrate the importance to us of the trading position of the countries of the enlarged Communities and their influence for the security of the world including South East Asia. We will need to keep clearly before the individual countries of the Communities, before the
Commission in Brussels, and before such influential bodies as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, the growing strength and potential of Australia and our wish to maintain and expand our close and traditional ties with the countries concerned. The United States, while maintaining its treaty obligations to its allies, including Australia, is adopting more flexible policies; it is looking to its allies for a greater measure of self-reliance in security matters and is seeking to reduce its land forces overseas. Its trading and financial policies, as well as its security stance, continue to be of paramount importance to us. Japan has advanced rapidly to the position of a major economic power. Its trading and financial policies and its growing political influence constitute a major factor in our situation.

The Soviet Union is significantly enlarging its great power role. It is now very active in the Middle East and also in 2 areas of proximity and special interest to us, namely, the Indian Ocean and sub-continent and South East Asia itself. The People's Republic of China has taken the China seat in the United Nations and is beginning to play a part in the international community. It continues to devote a massive effort to the development of its nuclear capacity. It has made it clear on many occasions, including the occasion of its entry to the United Nations, that it will continue to give support to revolutionary and subversive movements in other countries. Where these movements are designed to overthrow non-communist governments they are designated by China as movements of 'national liberation'. Strong competitive tensions between the Soviet Union and China are evident at present in the Asian region. Because of our resources, our stability and our potential role in the region we cannot rule out that both China and the Soviet Union may seek in the future to improve their relations with us in support of their respective positions in the region. On the other hand we cannot ignore the possibility that in the longer term the Soviet Union and China, both pledged to a common ideology, may develop a less hostile relationship and may find wider areas of co-partnership, as in North Vietnam.

South East Asia is, of course, the region to which, for reasons of proximity and as a conscious act of policy, we must continue to devote a great part of our attention and effort. Most of the countries in this region have achieved independence only in the last 25 years. They are embarked on a course, each in its own way, leading to self-reliance in the field of security, economic viability and the capacity to achieve higher standards for their peoples. Promising steps are being taken by them towards greater regional cooperation in associations such as the Association of South East Asian Nations. They are soon to be joined in the region by Papua New Guinea when it achieves nationhood. We look with close attention and some hope to the working out of the relationships among the great powers, to the balance of forces within our area and to the movement towards a possible future United States of Europe. These adjustments among the mighty may well be accompanied by consequences which will at times be difficult and even dangerous— for themselves and perhaps even more for the less powerful countries which are or may become involved. At the same time they will open up to those countries, including Australia, opportunities for greater freedom of action. The challenge of our time is not confined to problems of security. It is clear that this decade also presents us all with great issues affecting the way in which man is to live and prosper in his environment. Included in these issues are the preservation of the environment itself; the development of its resources, particularly those of the sea and the sea-bed; the solution of the problem of population growth; the reform of the international monetary system and the liberalisation of world trade.

**MAJOR AREAS OF FOREIGN POLICY**

The European Communities with Britain included, the United States and Japan are the major sources of foreign capital for investment in our resources development; with New Zealand they are our major trading partners, accounting for some 60 per cent of the world's trade and about 70 per cent of Australian trade; and they are countries which have open forms of society, with free speech and a free Press and
where there is the possibility at all times of ready communication at all levels with their peoples. They are countries whose current foreign policies do not contain significant elements hostile or inimical to us—on the contrary they share most of our hopes for a stable and peaceful world order. I say this in order to place matters in some perspective. Our relationships with them—dynamic, not static—are of great and abiding concern to Australian foreign policy. To them must be added, of course, our friends and neighbours in the Asian and Pacific region. Together they constitute our major areas of foreign policy.

The Enlarged European Communities

On the basis of traditional trade patterns, the enlarged European Economic Community will be our largest trading partner. The group will be a dominant force in international trade and finance. The individual member states will, of course, continue to develop their own individual foreign policies. However, it is probable that in the longer term we shall see an increasing movement towards a Communities' foreign policy. Already the Communities have their own Commission member, Dr Dahrendorf, with special responsibilities for external relations. Already some countries accredit a separate ambassador to the Communities as well as an ambassador to each member country. Already the Communities have their own unofficial mission at the United Nations in New York. Already the ambassadors of the member countries in capitals such as Canberra meet on an informal basis and with a chairman from one of their number chosen in rotation to discuss, and perhaps to concert, their approach to foreign policy matters.

With the enlargement of the Communities following Britain's entry, the great strength of the group may well lead to increasingly liberal and outward-looking policies, which could be of great importance to the stability of world trade and finance and to the future security of other countries throughout the world. It is our firm policy to develop a close and harmonious relationship with the group. The Government has already taken steps in this direction. It has decided to strengthen our missions in the capitals of the enlarged Communities, especially in Brussels, the headquarters of the Communities, so that Australia will be more adequately equipped to influence and to follow developments in this vast new economic grouping. We have recently had a visit from Dr Dahrendorf, the member of the Commission with special responsibilities for external relations. He has welcomed our intention of developing closer links with both the Commission and the individual members of the enlarged Communities. The Secretary-General of the OECD, Mr Van Lennep, recently visited Australia for wide-ranging discussions with senior Ministers and officials. Our experience since June last year, when Australia became a full member, has confirmed the Government's assessment that Australia stands to benefit in many ways from full membership of the OECD.

None of this involves any weakening of our close ties with Britain. On the contrary, with Britain in the Communities and an influential member of the group, it is more than ever necessary that we strengthen and develop our relationship. We have decided that overall responsibility for the Australian High Commission in London will be transferred to the Department of Foreign Affairs. Planning for the transfer has already reached an advanced stage and the initial practical steps have already been placed in train to bring it about smoothly and efficiently.

United States

A partnership with the United States, based on friendship, trust, self reliance and a close similarity of interests and objectives, remains a central element of our foreign policy. The relationship, which had its origin in the Second World War, is underpinned by common interests, one reflection of which is the ANZUS Treaty. The 2 countries, despite the occasional difference of viewpoint, which are an inevitable and healthy part of any developed and complex relationship, have been stable and dependable allies on all important occasions during the post-war period. Although this intimate relationship now goes back more than a quarter of a century, it is continually evolving and developing as international circumstances change. The United States Administration is endeavouring to shape a new foreign policy to meet the requirements of a
new era and to lay the groundwork for a new structure of international peace. Although it is withdrawing ground forces from Asia, the United States still regards the Pacific and, to an extent, the Indian Ocean areas as vital to its own ultimate security. Australia, as the largest land mass in the area, as a technologically advanced people controlling a country of enormous potential and as a trusted ally, has importance for the United States. The Australian Prime Minister was among the first of a series of leaders of friendly countries to whom President Nixon expounded his plans and hopes before embarking on this historic year in United States foreign policy.

It is in this setting that ANZUS is seen to be of such importance to Australia, New Zealand and the United States. In the words of the report of the Secretary of State to Congress on 'United States Foreign Policy, 1971', published on 7th March, 1972, 'the alliance of Australia, New Zealand and the United States (ANZUS), 20 years old on 1st September 1971, is as vital to the 3 partners in the changing circumstances of the seventies as it was during the Cold War of former years.' This, of course, refers to ANZUS with its military content. Without its military content, ANZUS would be irrelevant to any discussion on defence or security. The Australian Government, during my own experience in government, has always made its own independent assessment of its interests and its own independent decisions on its policies. Australia is presently endeavouiring to evolve its foreign policy to meet changed international circumstances as they affect us. The range of choices open to us is necessarily different from that open to the United States, and our respective assessments of international developments may in some cases differ. The United States is a nuclear super-power with world-wide interests and involvement. It has, in terms of military involvement and of civil aid, shouldered an immense burden and adopted a most responsible role in world affairs in the interests of world peace. Australia is less powerful. It is not a nuclear power. It has a more limited area of direct involvement and opportunity for significant influence. It is more closely involved regionally in the future of South East Asia and the South Pacific. It is the policy of the Government to maintain a close, friendly and reliable relationship with the United States. This we believe will be a valuable and continuing element in the changing environment.

New Zealand

It is no exaggeration to say that with New Zealand we have closer and more intimate ties than with any other country. Proximity, kinship and common interests bind the future of our two countries. There is a regular exchange with New Zealand of ministerial and official visits and an annual two-way flow of visitors of approximately 100,000 in each direction. It is one country of which I can say I have found it convenient and mutually useful for me to lift the telephone and speak to my opposite number, as I believe it is for other Ministers. Since the signing of the New Zealand Australia Free Trade Agreement in 1965 there has been a marked increase in trade between our two countries. There is a close understanding and co-operation in defence and matters affecting security. We fought together in Korea and in South Vietnam. We are partners in ANZUS, SEATO and the recently concluded Five Power Defence Arrangements. In our common interest as members of the South Pacific Forum we have worked together on Pacific problems. It is our policy to nurture our relationship with this nation; our ties are fraternal and not simply those of friends. We welcome the visit of the new Prime Minister, Mr John Marshall, to Australia, which will take place in the middle of June.

Japan

Close co-operation has been maintained with Japan through frequent consultation at ministerial, official and non-governmental levels. In addition to my own visit, a number of Australian Ministers travelled to Japan during 1971. In February this year a parliamentary delegation, led by the Minister for the Navy (Dr Mackay), visited Japan. The Treasurer (Mr Snedden) has just returned from an official visit to Tokyo. The Japanese Minister for International Trade and Industry visited Australia in April last year. Japan is the one country in respect of which we have a Standing Interdepartmental Committee to
co-ordinate matters affecting the relationship. The recently established Japan-Australia Ministerial Committee will provide an annual forum for a high-level review of all aspects of the bilateral economic relationship and of multilateral economic issues of concern to both parties. Meetings will be held alternately in each country and will be presided over by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of either country. The first meeting is to be held in Canberra later this year.

There has been further substantial growth in bilateral trade relations. In the 1970-71 financial year, Australian exports to Japan were valued at $1,191m, a 16.6 per cent rise on the 1969-70 figure. This represented 27 per cent of Australia's total exports. Imports from Japan were worth $574m, a 19 per cent increase over the 1969-70 figure, and representing 14 per cent of Australia's total imports. In parallel with the growing trade between the two countries, both Australia and Japan are pursuing policies of widening their avenues of trade throughout the world. We find increasingly that we have a common interest in problems arising in international affairs. For example, our stand on the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations was similar; our approach to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty has been broadly on similar lines. Last year the announcement by President Nixon of his visit to China and the subsequent announcement of the 10 per cent surcharge on imports to America raised for both countries broadly similar problems of great anxiety. Our two countries find they have common interests in wishing to help the developing countries of the Asia-Pacific region to sustain and expand their economic growth in conditions of peace and stability. We are already co-operating in regional organisations. We will continue to develop this valuable pattern of frank consultation on international and regional questions of mutual interest.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Of major importance to us are our relationships with the countries of the Asian and Pacific region. I cannot deal with all these countries in this statement. However, I want to say a word now about recent development affecting Indonesia, the countries on the Indian sub-continent, and the South Pacific. I shall deal in an annex to this statement with developments affecting Thailand and the Philippines, with whom we are so closely associated in SEATO, and Malaysia and Singapore, with whom we have so recently concluded the Five Power Defence Arrangements. Our policy is to help our friends in the region to ensure their own stability and security, and by our aid programmes to assist the development of their own strength and resources and their own ability to improve the lot of their peoples. As part of our process of maintaining contact with the region, the Prime Minister will be visiting Malaysia, Singapore and Indonesia in June. I shall join him in Indonesia, following my own visit to India, Pakistan and Bangladesh in late May-early June.

**Indonesia**

The stability and economic progress of Indonesia, a country of about 125 million people and our nearest neighbour, is of direct importance to Australia and, indeed, to all countries of our region. Already this year there have been developments in our relations with Indonesia which deserve special mention. At our invitation, President Suharto, accompanied by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Malik, and other senior members of the administration and armed forces, recently made a most successful visit to Australia. The communiqué made clear the special relationship that exists between Australia and Indonesia across a broad range of political, economic and security interests.

During the course of President Suharto's visit I was able to reach agreement with Mr Malik on proposals which I had initiated earlier with him for the establishment of annual consultations between senior Australian and Indonesian officials about foreign policy matters. These consultations will be held alternatively in Canberra and Djakarta; they will cover a wide range of subjects, and will formally confirm the habit of frequent contact on matters of mutual interest which we have developed over the years with Indonesia. Another consultative arrangement made during the President's visit was for regular meetings on trade policy matters, initially, at ministerial level.

The 2 governments have also decided that negotiations for an agreement to
delineate the sea-bed boundary between our 2 countries, carried to a first stage in May 1971, should be resumed in the near future. I expect the second round of discussions to begin soon, extending to discussions on the exact definition of the land boundary between Papua New Guinea and West Irian. The continuing recovery and progress of the Indonesian economy has been a matter of close concern to us. Indonesia has, in fact, occupied a dominant position in our bilateral aid programmes since 1967-68. We respect the fact that Indonesia wishes to remain non-aligned. There is no thought on either side of a defence pact. We look towards increasing co-operation in specific instances when there is something useful to be achieved. This co-operation, going back many years, has taken the form of exchanges of personnel, exchanges between staff colleges, provision by Australia of mapping assistance including both the Royal Australian Air Force and the Army, training at Australian military establishments and, most recently, the offer by Australia to provide 16 Sabre aircraft to assist Indonesia in bridging a gap in its air force equipment programme. It will be our aim to maintain the steady development of the close relationship we now enjoy with Indonesia.

Indian Sub-continent

I turn now to the events of recent months on the Indian sub-continent—the flight of millions of refugees from East Pakistan into India and their subsequent return, the brief war between India and Pakistan, the emergence of Bangladesh, and the new shape of relations between these 3 countries. This is another area in which Australia has taken not simply an active interest but also a positive role, and in some aspects a leading role. The Government's policy throughout has been that, if we thought we could make a useful contribution towards reducing tensions and working towards the establishment of peaceful conditions, we should do so. In this we reflected not only our regard for the significance of India, Pakistan and, now, Bangladesh to the future course of events in our region, but also the close and continuing interest of the Australian people in the welfare and future of the people of the countries involved.

Throughout the crisis 2 considerations were uppermost in our minds—firstly, that there should be a political settlement, acceptable to the people of the region and, secondly, that we should make a substantial contribution towards relieving widespread human suffering and distress. When the fighting ended, the Government began to consider the problem of its relations with Pakistan and what clearly would shortly be the new state of Bangladesh. Precipitate action by us to recognise Bangladesh could have compromised Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's future, made things more difficult for Mr Bhutto, and led to a break in our relations with Pakistan. Two developments fundamentally changed the situation: Firstly, in a statesmanlike action President Bhutto released Sheikh Mujibur Rahman unconditionally and, secondly, the reception given to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman on his return to Dacca left no doubt that the people of Bangladesh were set on independence and wanted an acknowledgement of their sovereignty.

In these circumstances we felt we could best meet the aspirations of the people of Bangladesh, while at the same time easing President Bhutto's path, if we could recognise Bangladesh in company with a representative group of states. We were mindful, too, of India's problems. From the time when the Prime Minister in Washington last year had frank and useful discussions with Mrs Gandhi and I had talks with Indian Foreign Minister Swaran Singh in New York, we were conscious and, I believe, understanding of their difficulties and their idea of solutions which might be appropriate. In the event, we decided to take the initiative and recognise Bangladesh ahead of most of those whom we had consulted. Before doing so, however, the Prime Minister wrote twice to President Bhutto explaining our attitude and giving him prior notification of our decision.

In the result Bangladesh received wide international recognition and has now become a member of the Commonwealth. Pakistan left the Commonwealth but did not break off diplomatic relations with Commonwealth countries recognising Bangladesh. A lasting settlement on the sub-continent will require restraint on all sides, and sympathetic understanding from the friends of the countries concerned. The Australian Government will give every encouragement to genuine initiatives to
secure a peaceful settlement. In particular it hopes for an early solution to the problem of the Pakistani prisoners-of-war held in India and Bangladesh. Meetings have already taken place between senior Indian and Pakistani officials, which have laid down the framework for a meeting soon between Mrs Gandhi and President Bhutto.

We recognise that the possible role for any third party is limited in view of the known attitudes of the parties. They feel that they must resolve their own outstanding differences, and we acknowledge this position. In looking at the new situation we acknowledge too that the power balance has changed. Instead of 2 states, not so dissimilar in capacity, we now have 3 of which India is clearly the pre-eminent in terms of population, economic strength and military capability. This is not necessarily a disrupting factor. It may in fact lead to a more settled situation; but it is an important change. During my forthcoming visit to India, Pakistan and Bangladesh it will be my endeavour to increase our mutual understanding and further to develop our position as a helpful neighbour.

South Pacific

Yet another area in which we are developing special initiatives and to which we are paying increasing attention is the South Pacific. We have long had substantial economic interests there and our air, sea and telecommunications links with North America and beyond to Europe lie across it. My first visit overseas as Foreign Minister was to Fiji. We have, in response to a request from Fiji, provided an Australian judge to serve as their Chief Justice. We look forward to a visit later this month by the Prime Minister of Fiji, Ratu Sir Kamisse Mara. Our commitment to the support of South Pacific regionalism is well-established. We took the initiative in the founding of the South Pacific Commission which, in the 25 years it has been established, has done much to promote the economic and social welfare of the peoples of the region.

By its constitution, the SPC and its important organ, the South Pacific Conference, are non-political. So, when last year the leaders of the independent and self-governing island territories sought a meeting which could discuss political issues, the Pacific Forum was established with the full support of Australia and New Zealand. The second meeting of the Pacific Forum was held on 23rd to 25th February this year in Canberra. It was attended by the President of Nauru, the Prime Ministers of the Cook Islands, Fiji, Tonga and Western Samoa and the Foreign Ministers of New Zealand and Australia.

This second meeting strengthened the process of mutual consultation between island leaders and served to reinforce a sense of regional identity. I believe that the Forum, offering as it does an opportunity for frank discussion of the widest range of common problems, has in 2 years made much progress towards becoming a significant and influential regional body. In the actual sessions of the Forum the sense of equality among the members and what I can describe only as a sense of brotherhood, has been a notable feature. The Forum’s decision, already put into effect, to establish a South Pacific Bureau for Economic Co-operation is an indication of the important, practical role the Forum can be expected to play in regional affairs.

So far I have made only passing reference to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and to the People’s Republic of China. Each of these countries has a special importance to us and is also of major concern to us in formulating our foreign policy, but in a somewhat different way from the countries I have so far discussed. We believe in the rights of people and of nations to secure and maintain their peace and freedom, free from any form or manner of interference by outside powers. In the past Australia has expressed its opposition to many policies followed by the Soviet Union, notably where they have resulted in the curbing of the freedom of peoples and nations around them, and to policies of the People’s Republic of China, where they have disturbed the peace in the Asian region.

Nevertheless, we believe this is an era characterised, to use President Nixon’s phrase, as one of ‘negotiation, not confrontation’. In that spirit we have increasingly in recent times adopted and pursued policies directed towards the increase of exchanges of all types between the Australian people and the peoples of the Soviet
Union and China. We have sought to normalise the relations between our countries with a view not only to their progressive improvement but also as a step towards improvement in the stability of the world order.

The importance of the USSR to Australia goes beyond any developments which may occur in our purely bilateral relationship. The maintenance of a world order within which countries such as Australia can maintain their independence and prosperity still depends to a great extent on the evolution of a stable relationship between Washington and Moscow.

In the aftermath of the Soviet Union's actions in Hungary and Czechoslovakia a kind of Russian Communist hegemony has been established in Eastern Europe and at all events a period of relative stability in this area has ensued. With the negotiation of treaties between West Germany, the Soviet Union and Poland in 1970, the subsequent negotiation of the Four Power Berlin Agreement and the entry of Britain into the enlarged economic communities, it seemed that a period of relative stability and security would be assured in Europe as a whole. It seemed, too, that the limited settlement of the Berlin situation would be sufficient to enable a course to be followed which would bring both the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic as separate states into the United Nations. This would have been an application of the principle of universality with promising implications for North and South Korea and North and South Vietnam. However, the West German Government has not yet secured parliamentary ratification of its treaties with the Soviet Union and Poland, which the Soviet Union has linked to its signature of the Berlin Agreement.

The Soviet Union's great increase in naval strength in the Mediterranean, its role in the Middle East crisis and its increasing presence in the Indian Ocean carry serious implications for Australian foreign policy which cannot be ignored. The Russian-Indian Treaty of Friendship and the subsequent role of the Soviet Union in the recent conflict on the Indian sub-continent are of direct concern to us. Indeed, the Soviet Union's relations with China, India and Japan, its increasing interest and influence in the Indian Ocean, its show of military might on the northern border of China and its massive support of North Vietnam to the extent of thousands of millions of dollars of military aid over recent years, constitute one of the most important and disturbing and one of the least manageable elements in our foreign policy situation. At the same time there has been a change in the Soviet Union's relations with Japan. Previously the question of the northern islands was held by the Soviet Union to be a closed subject, whereas at the conclusion of Mr Gromyko's recent visit to Tokyo it seems that this question was left as one which might still be open to discussion. No change and no solution to the dispute between the Soviet Union and Japan, however, has so far emerged.

I have mentioned the increasing Russian presence in the Indian Ocean. The importance to Australia of this fact needs no amplification. As an island continent with a vast external trade Australia is extremely vulnerable to any possibility of interference with its sea and air routes. A substantial section of our sea and air routes lies across the Indian Ocean. The significance for us of the Russian presence in the Indian Ocean lies not so much in the actual number and power of Russian naval vessels there at any one time, as in the rapidly increasing capacity of the Soviet Union to place and sustain large naval forces of considerable power in the area very quickly. This capacity would, of course, be considerably augmented by the opening of the Suez Canal.

While the Australian Government would not wish to see any competition develop between the larger powers in the stationing of naval forces in the area—a policy view reflected in the decisions of the last ANZUS meeting of Ministers in November 1971—the situation is one which has been sufficiently significant to be the subject of consultation between Australia and the United States and Australia and Britain. We believe these 2 friends and allies share our concern and our view that the position requires close attention. We note that France similarly views the position with some concern. For our own part, we believe it is more than ever necessary for us
to proceed with our plans for the establishment of our naval base at Cockburn Sound and our air force base at Learmonth.

By what I have said I do not wish it to be inferred, least of all by the Soviet Union, that I am saying we feel that the Soviet Union is threatening an attack on mainland Australia. This is not my point. What I am emphasising, and what I believe I would be failing in my duty to the Australian people if I did not emphasise, is the growing military capacity and influence of the Soviet Union in areas of vital concern to Australia.

We have in fact been increasing our friendly contacts with Russia and its people over recent years. I believe both Russia and Australia recognise and accept the sharp divergences in our social and political systems, our attitudes to freedom of thought and communication and our approach to many international problems. But we both equally recognise common ground on which we can engaged in fruitful and friendly exchanges. As I have indicated, it has been part of our foreign policy to nurture and develop these opportunities for positive development of relations between our 2 countries.

In May 1971 the Prime Minister announced that the Government, after considering the stated desire of the Soviet Government for an improved relationship with Australia, had agreed to certain Soviet proposals in which it recognised mutual advantages. Specifically, the Government agreed that the Soviet Union could open a consulate in Sydney, station in Sydney a representative of the Baltic Steamship Co., which is a member of the Australia-Europe Shipping conference, and appoint an Agricultural Attaché to its Embassy in Canberra. The Government also announced that it favoured exchanges of visits by Ministers and senior Officials between the 2 countries. Since these announcements, useful contacts on bilateral questions have been developed and progress has been made towards placing our relations on a practical working basis. It is because the Government sees value in exchanging views with the Soviet authorities on questions of bilateral and international interest that it has invited the Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr S. P. Kosyrev, to visit Australia this year. A senior officer of my Department will visit Moscow for consultations in June.

The Government places particular value on the development of mutually beneficial trade relations with the USSR, and has invited the Soviet Foreign Trade Minister, Mr N. F. Patolichev, to visit Australia this year also. It is also ready to explore the prospects of mutually advantageous cooperation with the USSR in other fields, for example, scientific and technical exchanges. On a wider scale, we welcome the recent evidence of a spirit of reciprocity which the Soviet leadership has given in response to United States approaches on disarmament.

China has, of course, been much in the news. There have been 2 major developments since I last spoke to the House on this subject—firstly, the seating of representatives of the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations and, secondly, President Nixon's visit to China. As I said in the House immediately after the United Nations vote, we were pleased that the People's Republic of China would be represented in the United Nations and would take the Security Council seat. By our speeches and in the resolutions we co-sponsored we had actively supported that outcome, while seeking to maintain the membership of the Republic of China on Taiwan.

As for President Nixon's visit to China, it will be recalled that the Prime Minister issued a very full statement on this subject on 28th February, the day after the joint communiqué was released in Shanghai. I will not repeat now what the Prime Minister said then, but I should like to emphasise 2 points. Firstly, we all stand to gain from the establishment by the United States and China of some working relationship with each other. But it is important to recognise that President Nixon's visit is only the beginning of a beginning. It was not a settlement of matters at issue even between the 2 powers themselves, let alone of wider issues in which they are involved. Further efforts are required to reduce immediate tensions and to eliminate the basic causes of conflict.

Secondly, the very fact of the visit having been sought, agreed, and successfully made, marked a significant point of
departure in the policies of both the
United States and China. In particular, it
represented the breaking of the set pattern
of hostility in which Sino-American poli-
cies have been immured for a generation. I
do not mean that the United States—or
indeed China, for that matter—is about to
abandon old friends. Far from it. The
United States, for example, has made it
abundantly clear that its security treaty
with the Republic of China on Taiwan will
continue. The People's Republic of China
has made clear its continued support of
North Vietnam.

I turn to the question of Australia's own
relations with the People's Republic of
China. The Government has recently been
in touch with the Chinese Government
through diplomatic channels. It would not
be proper to discuss the details of these
and past exchanges. However, the
exchanges have been useful and correct,
and each of us has a clearer idea of where
the other stands. We, for our part, are
considering carefully the implications of
the Chinese position. We intend to pursue
our objectives in a continuing dialogue,
appreciating that these things necessarily
take time, patience and care.

Countries can, of course, in practice,
have dealings with each other in a whole
variety of ways without formal recognition
and diplomatic relations. Negotiations
can be carried on through ambassadors in third
countries. Countries can sit and work
together in the United Nations and its
various agencies. Trade can be conducted.
Visits can take place. Working relations-
ships can be established in international
bodies. All these contacts in fact exist as
between Australia and China. Moreover,
lack of formal recognition will not detract
in the future, any more than it has in the
past, from our perception of the important
place of China in the world and our re-
spect for the individual people of China, and
from the framing of our policies accord-
ingly.

The size and population of China sug-
gest that its external trade could well
increase substantially beyond its present
modest level. However, we should keep in
mind that it would require a great change
in the nature of the Chinese economy
before this could occur, and that this may
well take a long time. So far as informa-
tion is concerned, it seems to be the expe-
rience of many countries with ambassadors
in Peking that, because of the rigidly
'closed' nature of the Chinese society at
the present time and the restrictions placed
upon them, the amount of solid informa-
tion which they are able to secure or trans-
mits to their governments is severely
limited.

It is a fact to be noted that although
countries far removed geographically from
the region have hastened to join the recent
movement towards 'recognising' the
People's Republic of China, our friends
and neighbours who are actually in the
region have not so far exchanged diplo-
matic representatives with them. The fact
that China has provided massive support
for North Vietnam, assisting to bring that
country to a position where it could launch
an invasion of South Vietnam, Laos and
the Khmer Republic, cannot be ignored.
Furthermore, China still maintains its pol-
icy of supporting national liberation fronts
within the borders of countries in our
region.

In saying these things I am not seeking
to underrate the importance which we
attach to developing and formalising our
relations with the People's Republic of
China and to expanding our mutual trade.
I am seeking merely to place matters in
perspective against the quite exaggerated
ideas which are sometimes put forward
about the benefits which might flow from
'recognition'.

Australia's position is that we are willing
to 'recognise' the People's Republic of
China and to exchange diplomatic represen-
tatives in accordance with normal
international practice. In normal inter-
national practice, by extending recogni-
tion and establishing diplomatic relations ne-
ither party is required—or to be assumed—
to approve or disapprove the policies of
the other; neither party is required—or to
be assumed—to pass judgment upon
disputed territorial claims of the other
party. But, as we understand it, the
People's Republic of China insists as a
condition of establishing diplomatic rela-
tions that we acknowledge it as the sole
legal government of China and as having
sovereignty over Taiwan.
The Australian Government notes the claim made on either side of the Straits of Taiwan that there is only one China and that it includes Taiwan. History shows how rapidly circumstances may change. We hope that this matter will be resolved by the respective peoples concerned and in a peaceful manner. As matters now stand, Peking's stipulation that we acknowledge its sovereignty over Taiwan creates difficulties for Australia. Australia has the reputation in the Asian region of being a staunch friend and a country which does not readily yield to pressure to change policies which it believes to be right, whatever others may do. No country should lightly throw away this reputation and this goodwill.

In view of our long-standing relations with the Government on Taiwan, which has been not only a friend but also a responsible member of the Asian community and, indeed, the wider world community, Australia is naturally and quite properly reluctant and indeed unwilling to submit to Peking's stipulation that it should abandon its friend. For our own part, we will continue our present policy of seeking the progressive normalisation of bilateral relations with the People's Republic of China, moving at all times with prudent caution and being guided by a careful assessment of Australia's national interests, including the need to bear in mind the interests and concerns of our friends and neighbours.

Indo-China

I turn to Indo-China. The Prime Minister has made a statement on President Nixon's decision to take new measures to deny war supplies to North Vietnam. I do not propose here to repeat what the Prime Minister has said but to outline in the course of this statement the circumstances which have led to the present situation in Vietnam and the Australian Government's response. The troubled and tragic states of Indo-China—the Republic of Vietnam in particular—are struggling to cope with enormously difficult problems. They face a North Vietnam which remains determined to impose by force on the South a government of the North's choosing. North Vietnam has launched its regular forces in attacks in great strength outside its own borders into the Khmer Republic and Laos as well as into South Vietnam. North Vietnam is supported in this by extensive aid from the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries, and from China. The bulk of this aid, much of it in the form of the most modern weapons, now comes from the Soviet Union.

I emphasise that what we are watching now is not a 'people's uprising'. It is not a civil war. It is an invasion of one country by another. The great bulk of North Vietnam's regular army is now deployed in the South. Why has North Vietnam persisted in this war policy? It is not for lack of alternatives. The peace proposals put forward by President Thieu and President Nixon on 25th January this year offered the opportunity for the people of South Vietnam, on whose behalf the North Vietnamese claim to be acting, to determine their own future through elections conducted by an independent commission and under international supervision. President Thieu offered to resign prior to these elections. But the Communists are still not prepared to face the test of elections.

A statement jointly signed by the President of North Vietnam and Prince Sihanouk on 5th March said that the 2 parties 'categorically reject Nixon's so-called "Eight Point Proposal for Peace".' This statement, as did the earlier Seven Point Proposal of North Vietnam of 1st July 1971, called, in effect, for the dismantling of the administration of the Republic of Vietnam as a pre-condition for negotiations and the handing over to the 'Provisional Revolutionary Government' of the task of establishing a 'government of national concord' and the holding of elections.

Why did the North act when it did? No doubt a number of factors were involved in the timing. There is some evidence that Hanoi wanted to attack earlier, in the region of the Central Highlands, but that its plans were disrupted by South Vietnamese and United States pre-emptive operations. Another factor was probably the weather—suitable for campaigning while providing some cover from air attack. Another may have been a wish to demonstrate, at a time of increasing contacts between the United States and the Soviet
Union and the United States and China, that it is Hanoi which determines events in Indo-China. Yet another factor, which was evident at the time of the unsuccessful Tet offensive in 1968, appears to be a deliberate attempt to exert pressure on United States opinion, and through it on the United States Administration. They are mindful that this is a presidential election year.

It also seems clear that a compelling reason for the invasion at this time was an assessment on the part of the North Vietnamese leadership that South Vietnam was doing too well. Hanoi needed to disrupt the consolidation that has been going on in the Republic of Vietnam, both within its armed forces—the Army of the Republic of Vietnam—and in its society generally, and to act before South Vietnam became too tough a nut to crack. Their offensive had been foreseen; but it is one thing to foresee events and another to live through them, preserve one's balance and, in circumstances where the aggressor naturally has the initiative, to withstand them.

The South Vietnamese forces have suffered reverses. There may be further setbacks before the situation clarifies. But it is worth remembering the experience of the offensive of Tet 1968, which showed the importance of reserving judgment on the outcome of the fighting. In 1968 hasty judgments allowed the communists to make great propaganda gains, although subsequent events showed that Tet 1968 had, in fact, been a major setback for the communists, in terms of both military casualties and of damage to their organisation and infrastructure in the South.

On behalf of the Government, I condemn the invasion of the Republic of Vietnam by North Vietnamese regular army units. It has been launched, and could only have been launched, with massive support from the Soviet Union and China. I believe the overwhelming majority of Australians have deep sympathy for the people of the Republic of Vietnam. They were fighting courageously in defence of their country even before their allies came to their assistance with ground troops. They have continued to fight with great courage notwithstanding that the ground troops of their allies are being withdrawn.

Australia is continuing with its civil aid. We are despatching urgently needed supplies to assist them in coping with the flood of men, women and children fleeing as refugees before the advance of the invading armies. If the South Vietnamese fall before this onslaught not only will it be a sad day for all who believe small countries and their peoples should be free to determine their own Government, but the repercussions of their fall will reverberate in the South East Asian region for years to come.

AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

Africa

I turn to Africa and the Middle East. It is impracticable in a statement of this type to discuss our relations with each of the countries of this great continent. Although the countries of our own region must necessarily be our primary concern, I would not wish it to be thought that we do not greatly value our relations with the many and diverse countries of Africa. We have especially close relations with those African countries which are members of the Commonwealth of Nations. In particular, we appreciate the resentment which is felt at the continued implementation of policies of racial discrimination and minority rule in southern Africa. Race and racism are prominent moral and international issues on which governments more and more have to take a position. The Government's position is clear. It has been stated many times. Policies of apartheid, racial discrimination and severely restricted franchises, which the minority governments of southern Africa pursue, have no support in Australia. At the same time, it is not our policy to encourage or support calls for the use of force to change the racial policies applied in southern Africa.

The Middle East

The unresolved dispute between Israel and the Arab states remains the main cause of continuing tension in the Middle East. Negotiations on an overall settlement on the basis of the principles contained in Security Council Resolution 242 were halted in March 1971, with the suspension of the mission of Dr Jarring, the special representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Since then, both Egypt and Israel have separately continued to
explore the possibility of an interim accommodation related to the re-opening of the Suez Canal. The differences between the two sides, however, on the extent and form of such an accommodation and its connection with a comprehensive Arab-Israeli settlement are still considerable.

A promising aspect of the situation last year was that the ceasefire was generally observed, even though it formally expired, after 2 extensions, on 7th March 1971. In late February, however, armed clashes occurred between Palestinian guerrillas and Israeli armed forces on both sides of the Lebanese-Israeli border, resulting in a further deplorable loss of life. The Australian Government's attitude towards the Arab-Israeli dispute remains as stated in Parliament in April last year. Our policy is one of neutrality and sympathetic interest in a settlement of the conflict. We are friends of both the Arab States and Israel and wish to remain so. Accordingly the Australian Government has supported United Nations resolutions which were concerned with the welfare of those who have suffered from the dispute, but has abstained on those which tended politically to favour one side or the other. We hope that it will not be long before substantive negotiations are resumed on the basis of Security Council Resolution 242 and we remain concerned that, unless diplomatic initiatives on an Arab-Israeli settlement can be maintained, the risk of a renewal of hostilities must correspondingly increase.

UNITED NATIONS

Before I close I wish to refer to the United Nations. Australia has always taken an active part in United Nations affairs. The Government has decided that we should seek membership of the United Nations Security Council, for service on the Council in the 2 years 1973-74. The Western European and other States group in the United Nations has already endorsed Australia as one of its candidates for 2 WEO seats on the Council. Even at this early stage—the elections for the Council will not be held until the end of this year—we have received promises of support from a number of countries in addition to WEO group members. Under Article 24 of the Charter the members of the Security Council are 'primarily responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security'. We have served on the Council on 2 occasions in the past—in 1946-47 and 10 years later in 1956-57. It is mainly because of the great and rapid increase in the membership of the United Nations itself that we have not sought membership of the Council for the last 15 years. I know that in the eyes of many people and many governments the United Nations has failed to fulfil the hopes held by so many for its peace-keeping role. But in assessing its performance we must ask not whether its member governments have given it the moral and financial support it must have if it is to function properly. My own conviction is that this support has not been given.

The Australian Government is committed to the principles of the United Nations Charter, and has played a significant part in its many fields of activity. We have consistently supported the peacekeeping operations of the United Nations. At present, Australia is a member of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and is represented in the United Nations Truce Supervision Organisation in Palestine, the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan and in the United Nations Force in Cyprus.

Australia has tried to adopt a constructive approach to the numerous questions raised in debates in the United Nations General Assembly and its other bodies. We have deplored its use for propaganda and as a forum for controversy and mutual recrimination. We have built up a reputation as an interested and responsible member of the organisation. It is because of this that I believe that many members of the United Nations would expect Australia to accept its obligations and stand for election to the principal organs of the United Nations, including the Security Council itself.

CONCLUSION

I have outlined the Government's attitude to some of the most pressing problems of the day and have described our major policy areas and some of the initiatives taken. I have referred to the good relations we have developed, and will continue to foster, with our friends and neighbours in Asia and the Pacific. There are, of course, other developments and areas of the world of significance to us. I have prepared an
Annex to this statement which I table by leave. This Annex deals with a large number of important aspects of our foreign policy, which it was simply impracticable to cover in my statement. Nor have I dealt with our foreign aid programmes. Later, perhaps during the debate on the Estimates, I hope to make a special report on this aspect of our foreign policy.

Our basic national objective is to establish and maintain conditions in which Australia is secure, free and prosperous. Beyond this objective of national well-being we have a broad regional objective, in the Asian and Pacific area, to play as helpful a role as we can in the promotion of a peaceful, stable region, a region of security, economic growth, political stability and peaceful social change, in which we will be accepted as a staunch and reliable friend and a welcome and helpful member. Beyond this, we have a wider role, to play our part in the world as a trusted, responsible and respected member of the community of nations, to heed and respond to the 'responsible common opinion of mankind' while not hesitating to maintain and express our own firmly held convictions. At these 3 levels—national, regional and international—we are playing, in the changing international environment of the seventies, a proper and effective part and a distinctively Australian part. I present the following papers.

Australian Foreign Policy—Ministerial Statement, 9th May 1972, and Annex to the statement.

Ordered that the papers be printed.

Motion (by Dr Mackay) proposed.
That the House take note of the papers.

Sitting suspended from 5.52 to 8 p.m.

Suspension of Standing Orders

Motion (by Mr Swartz) — by leave — agreed to:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Whitlam) speaking for a period not exceeding 40 minutes.

Mr WHITLAM (Werriwa — Leader of the Opposition) (8.0) — Nine hours ago the focus of international affairs narrowed dramatically and perilously. The eyes of the world are upon the sea-roads to Haiphong. The ears of the world wait upon Moscow. The long statement made by the Foreign Minister (Mr N. H. Bowen) encompasses the world. For the most part, it was a statement of optimism. Up till 9 hours ago no-one could have questioned that optimism. We are now brought to the appalling situation where a mistake, a rash reaction, could bring the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of war. The minefields around Haiphong are the world's minefields. Unquestionably we are at the point of greatest danger since the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. Indeed, because the level of possible responses and reactions are not so finely calibrated as they were in 1962, the danger may be even greater. On that occasion nuclear war was averted by the restraint and ultimate commonsense of both sides. The world's hope must be that they are exercised once again.

But what the world is entitled to know and what Australians want to know is how it has come about that a civil war—a civil war of 27 years duration should now have become the area of confrontation between the 2 super powers. Essentially it is because in 1954, after the Geneva agreements which recognised Vietnam as a single country, the United States chose Indo-China as the place where China was to be stopped and where the ideological war between China and the United States was to be fought out to the bitter end. This was the rationale. This was the justification. The hollowness, the mistaken assumptions, the blunders and crimes of 20 years culminated in the statement that President Nixon found himself forced to make today, and that statement itself contained a clear acknowledgement of these blunders. For the President conceded that China was not the main outside adversary. He named Russia alone as the principal supplier of North Vietnam—a fact never admitted by any American Administration or any Australian government until a year ago. And the reason for this silence about Russia's role is plain: The war in Vietnam could never have been sold to the Australian people or to the American people except on the basis that it was essentially a Chinese war.

The tragedy of today's announcement is that if nothing worse happens, if our worst fears prove unfounded, the war in Indo-China will involve China more heavily and directly than it has hitherto. There can be
no doubt that the Soviet Union and China will co-operate in a way they have not been able to do before to supply North Vietnam and to make good the loss of supplies by President Nixon's interdiction of the sea-lane. The very thing that the war was originally supposed to avert may now at last become reality.

The Foreign Minister spoke about the current operation by North Vietnam. He spoke as if the object of that operation was to over-run Saigon. The fact is that the current operation—the last full-scale operation possible before the monsoon season next month and the last before the United States Presidential elections—is much more limited in its targets and quite specific in its scope. Its object is to detach the 2 northernmost provinces. This objective is in sight of being achieved. The Foreign Affairs Department spokesman—an authorised one—told the Press today that Kontum would be seized though Hue might hold out. Quang Tri is already fully controlled by Hanoi. Not only is the operation near completion and success but the means to complete it, the means to make it succeed, are already in the hands of Hanoi's armies. The operation is not dependent upon new supplies coming from the sea. Therefore the blockade will not be an effective counter any more than the massive bombing of North Vietnam has been. In the longer term the blockade can only have a marginal effect on Hanoi's ability to fight at least as far as arms and material are concerned.

The most authoritative estimate—one I believe accepted by the United States—is that less than one-third of the Soviet equipment being supplied to North Vietnam has come by sea. Even the 300 tanks collected by General Giap for the present offensive came by rail, overland through China. Therefore the ability of Russia and China to supply Hanoi will not be drastically reduced in the long run by the interdiction. So what we have to ask ourselves is whether the very limited military impact of the blockade provides sufficient justification for it. Will it save the 2 northernmost provinces, Hanoi's current target? It will not. Will it decisively affect the impending battle for Hue? It will not. Will it force North Vietnam's armies to withdraw beyond the DMZ? It will not. Will it deter the Soviet from supplying North Vietnam? It will not. Will it help release American prisoners of war? It will not. Will it encourage North Vietnam to negotiate? Decidedly, it will not. For such a limited result, is it worth jeopardising the detente already reached between the United States and China? It is not. Is it worth throwing away the fruits of the better understanding between Russia and the United States so laboriously built up since the last great confrontation of 1962? It is not. Is it worth risking war between Russia and America? It is not.

Surely the saddest part of the President's statement was his opinion that he had no option. This, surely, is the ultimate failure of this war—that the world's greatest power has been pushed into this dead end of futility. And this has been Australia's tragedy too. Our role towards the United States over Vietnam has been utterly malignant. We have not been a good ally. We have used our influence again and again to deepen American involvement and prolong the war and it will be that part of our role, the pernicious part, that will be remembered by the people of the United States.

I have already pointed out the crucial reason behind our original commitment of troops to Vietnam—the false rationale that it was really a Chinese war. There has been one other force always at work in the conduct of our foreign policy. Overwhelmingly the foreign affairs debate in Australia has been conducted in terms of domestic politics. The proof of this is made strikingly clear by the recent publication of Lord Casey's diaries. On a wide range of great matters, but particularly Vietnam and China, he defines a yawning gap between public policies and private knowledge. As long ago as 12th April 1954 Lord Casey wrote in his diary:

Where does the menace come from in Indo-China. My answer is—the Viet Minh, not Communist China. . . . It seems to be an exaggeration for Dulles to say that the Communist Chinese are 'mighty close' to open aggression.

On 16th April 1954 Lord Casey wrote in his diary:

It is generally believed that parliamentary elections in Vietnam would result in a sweeping political victory for the Viet Minh even in Saigon.
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On 18th April 1954 Lord Casey wrote in his diary:

A prominent Frenchman said to me a year ago that there was no military solution to the Indo-China problem but that the only solution was a political one. This visit to Saigon has revived this statement in my mind and I tend to believe it is largely true ... there seems little doubt that the majority of Vietnamese tend to be pro-Viet Minh when they have any political views one way or another.

Yet I recall to the House an amazing contrast. A matter of days before Lord Casey wrote those entries in his diary there was a debate on the adjournment in this House. It was the first significant debate ever to occur in this House on Indo-China. It came on a matter raised by the honourable member for Mackellar, the present Minister for Social Services (Mr Wentworth). He made a violent attack on Bishop Burgmann, then Bishop of Canberra-Goulburn—and the Minister for Defence sniggers.

Mr Fairbairn—I did not snigger.

Mr Whitlam—He sniggers at the reference to Bishop Burgmann, who was one of the signatories to a letter seeking a United Nations settlement of the war then being waged between France and the Viet Minh. Why is it that these Liberals must always attack Anglican bishops when they speak for peace or for the poor? I spoke in that debate. I defended the Bishop and his right to speak. I said:

The majority of Australian people believe that before Australia becomes involved in Indo-China the whole matter should be thrashed out not between the American and the French on one hand and the Viet Minh and Chinese People's Republic on the other, but by the United Nations.

Mr Clyde Cameron—Whom are you quoting now?

Mr Whitlam—Myself. I further said:

There is a threat to the peace of the world in Indo-China. It is a matter for the United Nations.

And I said:

If the United Nations does not intervene we should keep out of the matter.

So stung was the then Minister for External Affairs, now Lord Casey, that he came into the House specifically to reply to me, and he said:

The belief that the Viet Minh movement is nationalist and not communist is wholly and absolutely untrue.

He said:

We shall soon have to stand before the people and show where we stand in the great struggle that is dividing the world between democracy and international communism. The honourable member for Werriwa I hope will be man enough to stand forward and be counted.

And yet, as I have said, at the very same time Lord Casey was confiding to his diary and, one must assume to Prime Minister Menzies at least, his real view about the nature of the Viet Minh and the impossibility of a military solution in Indo-China. And now, 18 years later, a million or more lives later, the United States and the Soviet Union confront each other across the minefields of Haiphong Harbour.

Similarly Lord Casey reveals his hopes—more than 20 years ago—for early recognition of China. On 1st December 1951 he wrote in Ottawa in his diary:

As regards recognition of Communist China, I said that the matter had to remain on ice while the Korean affair lasted, but that at some appropriate time after the fighting ended, recognition of Communist China and her admission into the United Nations seemed a necessary and logical step.

And then, a week later in Washington he confided to his diary:

It seems impossible to believe that any State Department man of consequence (from Dean Acheson down) still believes in Nationalist China. But they are all bound up in the toils of domestic politics.

The point arises as to whether 'ole' (i.e. democratic) sponsoring of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations (whether or not we specifically recognise Red China diplomatically) would ease the acid attitude of Peking. I think that it probably would.

Twenty years after that entry by Lord Casey in his diary the present Prime Minister could say:

China has served the Liberal Party well, and will continue to do so for a long time to come.

And in the statement by the Minister for Foreign Affairs this evening we have the full acknowledgement of where 20 years of China as a domestic political issue has brought the Liberal Government. In effect, the Minister said that the Australian Government was now prepared to accept the Canadian formula—begrudgingly maybe, but nevertheless substantially—but it was in doubt whether we could now achieve recognition on those terms. Yet less than a year ago the present Prime Minister denounced the Canadian formula as a sell-out.
On 12th July last, 3 days before President Nixon announced his intention to visit Peking—and 2 days after I left there—the Prime Minister said:

Now let us look for a moment at the question of Taiwan, because this is the crux of the matter so far as Mr Whitlam's recognition plans are concerned.

He had declared bluntly that a Labor government would recognise the People's Republic on the lines of the Canadian formula. He goes on further. He would take the initiative in severing relations with Taiwan and he would visit Peking as the sole capital of China.

By accepting Peking as the sole capital he is abandoning Taiwan, whatever he says about the Canadian formula.

Eight months ago the Prime Minister was prepared to denounce the Canadian formula as a sell-out. The fact is that the President of the United States has conceded more than the Canadian formula.

In his communiqué at the end of his visit the President said:

The United States acknowledges that all Chinese on either side of the Taiwan Straits maintain there is but one China and that Taiwan is part of China. The United States does not challenge that position. It reaffirms its interest in a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves.

When the governments of Canada and China announced on 13th October 1970 that they would exchange diplomatic representatives, their joint communiqué stated:

The Chinese Government reaffirms that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China. The Canadian Government takes note of this position of the Chinese Government. The Canadian Government recognises the Government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China.

Mr Howson—What is your policy?

Mr WHITLAM—It is the same as the Canadian policy. At the same time the Canadian Government issued a unilateral statement which included these words:

The Canadian Government does not consider it appropriate either to endorse or to challenge the Chinese Government's position on the status of Taiwan. This has been our position and continues to be our position.

It will be seen therefore that the Canadian Government was not required even to endorse Peking's claim. The Italian Government in negotiating recognition on 6th November 1970 was able to take a similar position in stating:

The Italian side took note in the joint communiqué of the statement of the Chinese Government about the status of Taiwan and understands the importance that the Peking Government attaches to its statement. The Italian Government reiterates that it is not up to it to express any opinion on this subject.

Whereas Canada did not endorse or challenge Peking's position and Italy was not required to express a view upon it, the United States does not challenge the assertion that there is only one government of China and that Taiwan is a province of China. There are 2 questions for Australia. Do we challenge the assertion made by both the Government in Peking and the Government in Taipei? If we do not, which Government do we recognise—Peking or Taipei? This is the choice and the only choice. It is a choice imposed on us by Taipei every bit as much as it is imposed on us by Peking. No amount of twisting or turning about 2 Chinas, about one China and one Taiwan, about one and a half Chinas or any of the other newfangled propositions invented over the past year to escape the inevitable will provide escape from this choice. The choice has to be made sooner or later. When the President of the United States concedes that there must be, in the words of the communiqué, 'a peaceful settlement of the Taiwan question by the Chinese themselves' does anyone doubt that this is a concession that the question will ultimately be settled in favour of Peking?

Why should Australia make its choice sooner rather than later? For this reason: It is plain that with every month that passes the terms on which Peking will accept recognition grow firmer. She will not concede to any nation less than has already been granted by a majority of the members of the United Nations. There is no choice about the terms on which we shall have to recognise China. There is only the choice whether or not we shall recognise her at all. Eight months ago I was confident that an Australian government—the present Government as much as a Labor government—could achieve full diplomatic relations with China on terms as favourable as Canada's or Italy's. I doubt whether Peking would now concede so much. The longer we delay, the more difficult we make Australia's task.

Much is made of the diplomatic consequences about Taiwan. The fact is that here again the choice is not really up to us. If we recognise the People's Republic as the government of China, we automatically
Mr N. H. Bowen—What I said was that the statement about advice from my Department on Rhodesia was a lie.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! As the Leader of the Opposition was making his speech I heard him say to the Minister for Foreign Affairs: 'I beg your pardon?' The Minister for Foreign Affairs then answered him. I did not hear whether the Minister for Foreign Affairs used the word 'lie'. I ask that the Minister for Foreign Affairs, if he used the word 'lie' in regard to the Leader of the Opposition, withdraw it. I also asked the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw the remark that he made and the reflection he made upon the Minister.

Mr WHITLAM—I withdraw it. I apologise for having used it, but I was the second to use it.

Mr N. H. Bowen—Mr Acting Speaker, let us make the position quite clear. Assertions are constantly made about what advice my Department gives me. The Leader of the Opposition has told me what advice I received.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—The Leader of the Opposition made a statement in regard to the Minister for Foreign Affairs. If the Minister for Foreign Affairs used the words referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, I ask him to withdraw them. I think it is proper that the Minister for Foreign Affairs should have the right to explain whether he did use the words.

Mr N. H. Bowen—I said that these assertions which had been made about the advice I received were lies. I will withdraw that remark and substitute the word 'incorrect'.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! I suggest that interjections cease from both sides of the House. I remind the House that the Minister for Foreign Affairs was heard in a degree of silence this afternoon when he made his statement.

Mr WHITLAM—What I said was correct. The Minister knows it, the media know it, and everybody who knows his officers knows it too. I said before I went to China, while I was in China and have repeated again and again since that it is open to any Australian government, Liberal or Labor, to achieve recognition of China. The condition is not the political colour of the Australian Government but the terms which cease to recognise the Republic of China—the regime of Chiang Kai-shek—as the government of China. The withdrawal of recognition of Taipei is automatically consequential upon the recognition of Peking. Taipei itself is adamant upon this point. Whenever a nation recognises Peking, Taipei withdraws its ambassador. Therefore because of the position taken by both sides, Taipei and Peking—a position not challenged by the President of the United States—you cannot have an ambassador in Taipei if you have an ambassador in Peking; you cannot have an ambassador in Peking if you have an ambassador in Taipei. You cannot have a Chinese ambassador in Canberra if you have a Taiwanese ambassador and the Taiwanese will not allow that ambassador to remain if you have an ambassador in Peking and wish to have a Chinese ambassador in Canberra. It is deplorable that after all these years no Minister is prepared to tell the House and the public the plain fact, the plain choice before us. The Minister's Department knows it. There are scores of able, clear headed men in that Department. They put this point. They have understood it for years. They have been emboldened in the last few months to put it, and as in so many things their advice is disregarded or distorted.

Mr N. H. Bowen—That is the usual lie on that subject.

Mr WHITLAM—I beg your pardon?

Mr N. H. Bowen—Someone made a lie on that subject on Rhodesia and you are repeating that type of thing. You are telling me what my Department advises me. How you know this I do not know, but certainly you are not correct.

Mr WHITLAM—This Minister, who practises lies in the House and in public, is too loose with his assertions.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Order! I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition withdraw that remark and reflection upon the Minister.

Mr WHITLAM—I shall withdraw it when the Minister, who first used the term, withdraws it too. I ask the Minister whether he is withdrawing the term 'lie'.

Mr N. H. Bowen—What I said was

Mr WHITLAM—You used the word 'lie'.

Mr N. H. Bowen—What I said was that the statement about advice from my Department on Rhodesia was a lie.
an Australian government may gain. A year ago it was certainly possible for the Australian Government, this Government, to secure recognition on terms at least as favourable as Canada achieved or on terms not less favourable than those the Minister said this evening were acceptable. But as every month goes by, as more and more nations reach agreement with China, the terms for bargaining are narrowed. A Labor Government will recognise China, but it would be in Australia's interests if the present Government did so now.

The third example of how great matters have been manipulated for domestic political reasons is found in the Minister's references to the Soviet presence in the Indian Ocean. In substance and purport the Minister's statement this evening did not differ from that made in 1969 by a predecessor, Mr Gordon Freeth, now our Ambassador in Tokyo. Yet Ambassador Freeth's step towards reality was sabotaged. In his article in the latest issue of 'Australian Outlook' Mr Andrew Farran, then on the former Minister's staff, now on the staff of Monash, tells the whole story. The initiative was sabotaged not because it was incorrect or dangerous but because it was politically unacceptable to Senator Gair and therefore politically embarrassing for the -Liberals in an election year. Yet I noticed that the Minister tonight could not allow the opportunity to pass altogether without some political inflation. He certainly deflated the alleged threat, but he rather inflated Australia's response by his references to the 'base' at Cockburn Sound. My Party has been committed to this project since 1961—but 'naval facilities' are not quite the same as a 'base'.

The main point however is how political opportunism has obscured or stultified some of the best insights by some of the best men—by Lord Casey, by Ambassador Freeth. How much better would be our situation and our record today if Lord Casey's insights on Indo-China and China had been followed through. The President's visit to China was one of those events which, in his own words, 'changed the face of the world'. It opened up a new era of cooperation for our region. The Australian Government seems barely to have grasped the rate at which events are changing our region. The great potential tragedy of today's events is that the change and the progress towards sanity and normality will be brought to a full stop.

On the other side of the world, in Europe, another great chance for peace stands in jeopardy not least because of events in Vietnam in recent weeks. Tomorrow will be a day of decision for the world in Asia and in Europe because tomorrow in Germany it will be decided whether or not Herr Brandt's grand design—his ostpolitik—will be ratified. It will determine whether hope and progress on the one hand or fear and bitterness shall prevail in Europe. Herr Brandt's great initiative is an indication of what can be achieved by a government willing to break free of the past. Because Herr Brandt was not committed to the shibboleths of the cold war he was able to break free, and Europe and the United States are grateful to him, Canada in the Pacific and Herr Brandt in the Atlantic community have been true friends of the United States because they have eased the United States' path to sane relations, in the one case with China and in the other case with the Soviet Union.

Events today with their portent bring home what I believe is now the most pressing need in our region. It is this: Our region must not become the area of confrontation between the 2 super-powers. Japan, with her very special difficulties in reaching normal relations with China, cannot hold the ring between these 2 great powers. We need a third force, and that force can only be Europe. The paradox of the Common Market is that as it grows to maturity, particularly with the adhesion of Britain, it is growing more outward-looking. There is a new interest about Asia and South East Asia in Europe. It is new in 2 senses: It is new-found and utterly different in kind and aims from Europe's past colonial preoccupations. A Europe revitalised, and one might almost say cleansed, can make an immense social and economic contribution to our region. Canning said: 'I have called the new world into existence to redress the balance of the old'. We might well say today that it is time to recall the old world to the new to redress the balance of Asia. The new spark of European concern for our region should not be allowed to fade.
Australia, with New Zealand alone of all the nations in the region, has links equally close with Europe and Asia. We, this European nation in Asia for all time, have an immense responsibility in this regard and could play an immense role—not as Europe's outpost or frontier or even bridge to Asia but as a partner with Europe, with the United States, in Asia. Anything which can prevent a confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union here must be tried and Australians are the people incomparably well placed to try it. It may be our last chance. We must not lose the opportunity in 1972 that we lost in 1954—the opportunity for sane relations with China, the opportunity for a settlement of the war in Vietnam, the opportunity to institute an era of peace and progress in our region. The time is short. But nothing worthwhile can be done unless we have a government that is willing to break out from and beyond its own path, its own inhibitions, its own failures. Above all, it is a time for a government which will base its foreign policy on Australia's true national interests and on Australia's true international obligations, not on the shifts and deceptions of domestic political need.

Debate (on motion by Mr Fox) adjourned.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 4) 1971-72
Second Reading
Debate resumed (vide page 2213).

Mr CREAN (Melbourne Ports) (8.35)—The two measures before the House come in the category of what are called supplementary estimates. They are amounts that were not foreseen when the Budget was drawn, or expenditures that have been incurred because of a change of circumstance. I want to cite one or two examples to indicate the differing reasons why these things have happened. On this occasion the Treasurer (Mr Snedden) has given the House a new document which is called 'Treasury Information Paper'. It shows some savings that have occurred in the original appropriations made. One or two of them are savings as a result of a change of circumstance rather than savings in the sense of some economies.

At page 19 the document deals with migration. It shows that there will be a saving of $1,736,000 in the special passage assisted programme. Instead of spending $7,835,000, apparently we will spend only about $6m. The item 'Non-British Migration Under Agreements and Arrangements with European Countries' shows a saving of $1,076,000 against an original estimated expenditure of $6,652,000. The savings have occurred simply because migrants are not coming to these shores as freely as was expected at the beginning of the year. One reason for this is the change in economic circumstances that has taken place in Australia since the Budget was drawn.

As I have said on another occasion, if ever a Budget was out of date almost as soon as it was written, it was the Budget that was introduced in August of last year. Almost simultaneously with the announcement of the Budget there was an announcement in the United States of America about international monetary arrangements. As events have worked out since, what happened there had serious repercussions on Australia's exchange rate with the United States dollar. That is one changed circumstance. The other item to which I would like to draw attention appears on page 29 of the Appropriation Bill (No. 4). This item of additional expenditure was apparently not anticipated when the Budget was drawn. It is a sum of $25,900—small by comparison with the lower migration costs I have just cited—incurred with the visit of the South African Rugby Union team. The cost incurred in bringing New South Wales police to Canberra was $25,900. That must be the dearest game of football—I think it is called football—which has ever been played. Again, that expenditure was not anticipated at the time that the Budget was drawn.

Another item, which appears on page 46 of the statement of savings, is for the sum of $3.6m which was set aside in the Budget for drought assistance in Queensland. Now we are told that $2.2m of that is to be saved. I would like a little explanation of why, instead of spending $3.6m on drought assistance for Queensland, apparently we are to spend only $1.4m. Is it because the drought was not as bad as was expected or is there something wrong with the
mechanism by which drought assistance is made available to those who should receive it? I hope that later in the debate the Minister for Supply (Mr Garland) who is the Minister assisting the Treasurer, will give the House some details about that. To my way of thinking it is a rather curious saving to spend less on what was regarded as an urgent objective. There are other items to which I have directed my attention. Queensland certainly had a bad year because page 7 of the other document shows under the heading 'Payments to or for the States' an amount for Queensland of $200,000 for flood relief and $3.5m for cyclone relief. This simply shows the diverse ways in which nature can wreak destruction, particularly so far as Queensland is concerned. The cyclone in Townsville earlier in the year pretty well flattened substantial areas of that city. Quick relief had to be given and certainly it was given.

I want to say something this evening about certain figures revealed in the most recent 'Treasury Information Bulletin' because of a number of events that have happened since. They are very summarily described on pages V and VI of the Bulletin. It shows the various measures that have been taken since the Budget was drawn that have had the substantial effect of varying the Budget or re-writing what has been called the strategy of the Budget. A further step was announced the other evening when the Treasurer indicated that he was not going to seek any money on the loan market in May. I want to look at some figures which are contained on page 32 of this 'Treasury Information Bulletin' because they demand more explanation than is given in the rather scanty text of the Bulletin. They deal with the holdings of government securities classified by holder as at December 1970, March 1971, June 1971, September 1971 and, finally, December 1971. I want to compare the figures in December 1970 with the figures in December 1971. The figures show that in December 1970 the banking system held $5,540m in government securities and that in December 1971 its holdings had dropped by $200m to $5,336m. But there are 2 interesting components of that figure—the holdings of government securities by the Reserve Bank of Australia and the holdings of government securities by the trading banks. In December 1970 the Reserve Bank held $1,387m in government securities and in December 1971 the holding had fallen to $873m, a drop of $514m. On the other hand, the trading banks in December 1970 held $1,566m in government securities but in December 1971 they held $2,106m, an increase of $540m. So there was a drop of $514m in the holdings by the Reserve Bank of government securities and an increase of $540m in the holdings by the trading banks. There seems to be somewhat of a coincidence in these figures.

What have been the effects on the economy generally of the fact that the Reserve Bank sold government securities of the order of $500m in the 12 months period while the trading banks increased their holdings by $540m? According to the Bulletin that is not the end of it because, whilst figures are not yet available for March 1972, it says:

A comprehensive classification of government securities by holder as at March 1972 is not yet available. However, the trading banks are estimated to have increased their holdings of government securities by $392m over the March quarter, increasing their holdings in January and February and running down their portfolios slightly in March.

In other words, the trading banks would have increased their holdings by something like $800m between December 1970 and March 1972. They have almost half as many government securities again in March 1972 as they had in December 1970. Does that mean that the trading banks as providers of credit have lost their audacity and prefer to put their funds into the safe security of government bonds yielding, as a minimum, something over 5 per cent? I suppose they would not tend to have their funds in very long term securities but they are certainly getting something over 5 per cent for virtually no risk at all. After all, the trading banks are supposed to be bodies that lend to industry. It seems indicative that because of the lack of confidence in the business community there just is not so much investment taking place and not so much recourse to the trading banks for loans as there was previously. There is always some difficulty in Australia in assessing these sorts of things.

We were talking earlier this evening in a committee about the level of savings
bank deposits. One can become a little over-obsessed with the fact that the figure keeps rising. Of course the figure keeps rising—because saving is being done by more people than ever. The rates of interest payable on savings accounts are higher than they have ever been and, because we have had an aggregate inflation over the last 12 months to 2 years of nearly 10 per cent, money is not worth as much in March 1972 as it was in March 1970. These are factors that help to account for these savings. But we seem to be proposing rather strange theories as to why the savings are taking place. Presumably people are saving because they have fear about the future or for some other reason.

All these kinds of things require much more examination and analysis by Government sources and authorities than seems to be the case. The Treasurer seemed to have a fear that there would suddenly be a great unleashing of these savings and he took that into account when he wrote his Budget—the disastrous Budget of August last year. All that remains of that Budget is the document itself. All the assumptions have gone, one by one, the last of which was the one that has been rather broadly described as the Budget surplus. The surplus or the deficit—whichever year one might be looking at—no longer means what it used to mean. In the days when my colleague, the former Treasurer, studied the subject called public finance, the deficit was simply the difference between the money which the Government raised in taxes and what it spent as expenditure. Now we add to it capital items as well as annual items and we add borrowings as well as taxing to the assessment of the overall picture.

The Budget surplus virtually is the sum that the Government takes out of the economy as against what becomes available to it in other ways. I think this year the Government was positing a surplus of something of the order of $500m. If one looked at the Budget itself in the traditional sense, I think it would be seen that it had a deficit of some small quantity—$15m or $20m; the figure escapes my mind—but certainly the assumption was that something like $400m to $500m would be taken out of the private spending pool and put into the Government spending pool by reason of recourse to the loan market. The Treasurer told us a week ago of the loan that he would have sought. I do not think there would have been any difficulty in filling the loan if what the banks had been doing in January, February and March had continued into April or May.

I think these kinds of things need much more analysis and I hope that we will get more of these Treasury information publications in the future. I at least commend the Treasurer for this new document, although I think that the word 'saving' is a rather loose description of what have been changes of circumstances, rather than any increase in prudence on the part of the Government. If a project the Government were to undertake were to cost $1m and it were able to do that task for $800,000, that would be a saving of $200,000. But it would not be a saving if due to a decline in the prosperity of the economy, not as many migrants arrived in Australia as the Government anticipates and therefore it would not have to spend so much on assisting those migrants. The Government calls that a saving. It is a lower expenditure than was anticipated, but the lowering of expenditure is determined by the lower tempo of the economy.

I suppose that all these documents collectively indicate in some respect the drift that is now occurring in our economy. I do not think that the Government has any sense of direction so far as the economy is concerned. The Government is reacting rather than anticipating. Every day in this House we hear that the Government is to do something that it should have had under review for quite a long time. We are to receive a White Paper on foreign investment in a couple of weeks time. This is something that has been a problem for at least the last 5 or 6 years, when foreign capital has been flowing in at a magnitude of over $1,000m a year and, as the Reserve Bank pointed out in its last annual report, has had the effect of virtually nullifying the monetary policy which the Government thought, as a sovereign government, it was pursuing. The Government is to appoint a committee to examine taxation. Neither the scale of progression nor, basically, the deductions in the tax structure have been altered since 1954 and, in the 18 years or so since then, the value of money has almost halved. Yet we still have the same progressive scale of income tax
in 1972 as we had in 1954. If there were any logic in it in 1954, there certainly could not be logic in it in 1972, yet the Government only now is to appoint a committee to examine this matter. We have not even been given its terms of reference, its personnel or how long it is likely to sit.

Other examples can be given. The Government conducts reviews of defence after it has wasted $300m on the F111 aircraft, which has been paid for but which Australia has not received. Surely this must have interfered with the logistics of the Navy and the Army as well as the Air Force. We have been told that we are to have a review of defence. The F111 was first thought of in 1963. Since then we have had the election of 1966 and the election of 1969 and we are about to have the election of 1972, yet we still have not received the F111. I can imagine what would have happened if a Labor government had promised the F111 in 1963 and it had not been delivered by 1966. We would have been laughed off the hustings, yet Government supporters can blithely talk about the F111 even though, after 9 years, Australia still has not received the aircraft. In the interim, the Government has spent something like $8,000m to $9,000m on goodness knows what because when one looks at the Government's defence expenditure and takes out of it the manpower and maintenance components, there is very little left that is supposed to frighten the enemy. This has been the Government's record on defence over the last 9 years.

I suggest that it is time the public began to ask for and to receive more information on these matters than currently seems to be the case. Look at the desultory way in which this matter is being examined tonight. Between them, these 2 Bills provide for about $150m. Apparently this is of no interest to anybody except the few who have happened to have chosen one or two of these items and have asked for information. I do not think that is good enough. The Government's expenditure now is of the magnitude of nearly $9,000m a year. I believe that, at the Federal level, we are not spending enough in some directions and that we are spending far too much in others. When the Australian Labor Party went out of office in 1949 the child endowment bill in Australia was 1½ per cent of the gross national product. In 1971, 22 years later, when a higher proportion of the population was under the age of 16 years than was the case in 1949 and remembering that endowment was now paid for student children over the age of 16 years, the child endowment bill represented only 0.6 per cent of the gross national product.

If, in 1949, this affluent nation could afford to provide 1.5 per cent of its total resources for child endowment payments, why is it now providing only 0.6 per cent for child endowment payments? Is it because more important things have been done? I think this simply typifies the sorts of things that the Government has brushed off in this Parliament—the degrees of real poverty facing every family on a low income level. A minimum wage of $51 per week is paid now to a married man who has to support a wife, who is not working, and 2 children. Probably the reason his wife is not working is that she thinks it is proper to stay at home and look after the young children. She might be deluded according to some people's standards these days, but in my view she is not. But of that $51 a week, nearly $4 is deducted for income tax. By reason of the Government's failure to look at the tax structure over the years, the same family is getting now, in real terms, only 40 per cent of the child endowment which it received in 1949.

I think these matters can be remedied. I think they are things that nobody really wanted to happen. I do not think anybody can say that the Government willed the fact that child endowment should be a memorial to the past rather than a payment to the living citizens, which is surely what it is supposed to be. We are simply letting the value of child endowment run down. I do not think that in essence, anybody on the Government side would claim that that is logical, but it is in fact what has happened. I think that these are the questions that surely have to be answered at the next election. Some of them are not easy to answer. It is not very easy to run an election campaign around a new income tax schedule, but basically these are the kinds of things which ought to be considered but
which are not being considered. For that reason I am confident, and I think most people are becoming confident, too, that there will be a change of government. The change of government will be occasioned because people think that no longer is there an effective government in this country and the alternative would be an Australian Labor Party government.

Mr Garland—You have been saying that for a long time.

Mr CREAN—The Labor Party has been out of office for a long time, but what I am suggesting is that you have not won the game on your merits as a Government, and that has certainly become apparent, particularly in the last 2 or 3 years. I think that the rot has set in and nothing will save the house any more. So, I leave it at that. Other honourable members will follow me and deal with other matters.

Mr REID (Holt) (9.4)—There always seems to be ample time to debate defence and foreign affairs in this Parliament but little opportunity to discuss foreign aid, at least, until the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr N. H. Bowen) made a lengthy statement in the House this afternoon. The result is that there are few opportunities to put forward a case for greater financial assistance for Bangladesh. It is for this reason that I am raising this matter in the debate on the Appropriation Bill before the House. The Minister for Foreign Affairs in his statement this afternoon mentioned something of the problems on the Indian sub-continent and the birth of Bangladesh. However, I was disappointed to hear in his speech that no further aid was proposed. The lack of opportunity to discuss the great crisis confronting the people of Bangladesh indicates the low priority of foreign aid. But surely what is happening or about to happen in Bangladesh warrants a full scale debate if we are genuinely interested in coming to the assistance of these impoverished people in a more sacrificial way.

I am pleased to hear that the Minister for Foreign Affairs will be visiting Bangladesh late this month for an on-the-spot inspection and discussions with Government officials. I am sure that the Minister will be greatly concerned to hear of the problems confronting these people, and I feel sure that on humanitarian grounds alone, he will strongly recommend greater assistance at a Government level. Australia has done little to fill the vacuum created by Britain's withdrawal from the South East Asian area. Most of these countries expect Australia to play a more dominant role in the area insofar as foreign aid is concerned. However, we have dismally failed as little leadership or initiative is being given in this field. I regret having continually to raise these matters. However, I will continue to do so until a programme is brought forward to give greater assistance to Bangladesh.

I believe that the Government is influenced far too much by this magical figure of one per cent of our gross national product, which of course was never intended to be the beginning and end of overseas aid. It was only intended to be a percentage for which we might aim in normal times. However, I hasten to say that these are not normal times. Bangladesh is faced with the greatest catastrophe any one country has had to bear in the post war years. Thirty million people are homeless and more than half the people are totally dependent on relief supplies. Some 200,000 tons of food grains are needed monthly. In addition, 100,000 tons of high protein food, skim milk powder, drugs and medicine, etc., 100,000 tons of cement and 100,000 tons of building supplies, including corrugated iron sheeting, are needed monthly.

As the Minister mentioned in his address, the Australian Government seized the initiative in being one of the first countries to recognise the new Government of Bangladesh. However, this is about as far as it has gone. No additional allocation of funds has been made since the Government provided $2.5m to assist the East Pakistan refugees in India last October. Of this amount only $500,000 was used. The balance, that is $2m, arrived several weeks too late to provide any worthwhile assistance whilst the refugees were in West Bengal. India's invasion of East Pakistan quickly brought an end to the refugee problem but not before 400,000 children died of malnutrition and neglect. During this crisis I repeatedly stated that India and the United Nations urgently needed cash, not goods, to provide immediate relief for the refugees. My pleas may just as well have come from
a junior office boy in the foreign office for all the notice that was taken. I might add that I had good reasons for suggesting a cash donation of $10m for the refugees, as I had spent some time visiting a number of refugee camps during the monsoon season last year. I also had on the spot discussions with Mrs Gandhi and the Government of Pakistan. They stressed that their most urgent need was cash with which to purchase goods locally. All I can say is that we did not answer the call as $2m was not even used. Whoever made the decision not to send cash made a wrong decision. It appears to me that the less said on this issue the better.

For these reasons we can take little credit from the fact that we are currently spending $2m on assistance to Bangladesh as this $2m is the amount which was not spent while the refugees were in India. Although food and building materials are needed urgently and will continue to be so needed for the next year or so, a cash donation is the only way of assisting these people quickly. However, I repeat once again, not as a junior office boy but as the president of a voluntary agency which has been working in Bengal since 1964 and as a member of the Government, that cash is needed now, not next financial year, if we are to play our part in averting famine conditions in this country.

Voluntary agencies are tuned in on the frequency of human disaster. I feel that we are failing in our duty unless we speak out strongly on such issues. One would have expected the Government to take some notice of my strong representations over the past 2 years. These views are shared by all voluntary agencies, which are extremely critical of the Government's piecemeal approach to the great human catastrophes that have ravaged Bangladesh in the past 18 months. I refer to the cyclone which devastated the off-shore islands and coastal regions of East Pakistan from the night of the 12th to 13th November 1970 and which left millions of people homeless and destroyed vast tracts of land. This was considered to be the greatest natural disaster of the century as 2 million people lost their lives. Yet the contribution from this Government to the greatest natural catastrophe of this century was $425,000. A few months later war and genocide in East Pakistan resulted in 10 million refugees fleeing to the nearby Indian States—mainly West Bengal. The Government's contribution to the greatest movement of refugees in modern times was $3.5m.

Unfortunately for the people of Bangladesh we now have a third opportunity to come to their assistance, all within 18 months. I sincerely trust that this time we do not fail to answer the call as the whole country is destitute. My own society, For Those Who Have Less, has been sending gift consignments of livestock to the Asian countries for the past 8 years. Indeed, our early consignments played a major part in cross-breeding programmes in many of these countries. During this period we have consistently sought a close liaison with the Department of Foreign Affairs, all to no avail. This applies also to most other voluntary agencies. The Department fails to realise that many of these agencies have been carrying out pioneering work in many fields of overseas aid. As no government or agency alone can hope to meet more than a small percentage of the needs of these countries one would expect the Commonwealth Government to do everything possible to seek a closer liaison with these agencies during catastrophes such as those mentioned above.

I believe the Department of Foreign Affairs is the only department that is reluctant to co-operate with voluntary agencies. However, it is prepared to work through private companies whose only interest in these countries is one of profit. There are 8 divisions in the Department of Foreign Affairs and whilst overseas aid continues to function as one of 3 sections in the Development Division it will continue to be a Cinderella section. The priority of overseas aid must be raised to the status of a separate division within the Department directly responsible to the Minister or alternatively there should be a separate Minister responsible for overseas aid. Surely our priorities in aid should be based more on need than on political kudos. I cannot accept the Government's present approach to these great human problems.

It should be borne in mind that the great voluntary effort contributed through voluntary agencies supplements Government assistance and one would expect that the
Government would be doing everything possible to encourage voluntary participation. It should be remembered also that there is no substitute for voluntary effort, as the people who work through these agencies are dedicated and have a genuine interest in their work, which is given generally without fee or reward. Also, aid from voluntary agencies is channelled largely into the private sector where the need is greatest. This aspect is completely ignored by the Government. I do not think that the Government should ignore the following facts: Firstly, the Secretary-General of the United Nations has called for $565m to meet immediate relief needs in Dacca alone. Against this requirement Australia has, to date, provided nothing, if one takes into consideration the fact that the $2m currently being spent should have been spent on the refugees. Even if this is taken into consideration it represents only 0.3 per cent of the amount called for by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

When one considers that the whole country has been ravaged by war and genocide, 3 million people have lost their lives and 30 million are homeless, little of the land has grown a crop for 12 months and the whole country is destitute, one can never accurately assess the needs of these people. However, having visited the country for on-the-spot discussions, I know that thousands of millions of dollars are needed urgently for rehabilitation purposes if the country is to survive. On humanitarian grounds we cannot possibly ignore these facts. Once again, I urge the Government to provide an immediate cash grant of $10m while we still have time. I also urge the Government to grant a further $40m for rehabilitation work during the next financial year. I have suggested already that this amount be spent on a rehabilitation programme by Australia accepting a responsibility for a certain area. I can assure the Government that all voluntary agencies are greatly concerned that the current situation in Bangladesh will again erupt into civil war and violence unless large-scale assistance is provided quickly.

The Republic of Bangladesh, which has been born out of war and genocide, has been admitted recently to the British Commonwealth of Nations as its 32nd member. For this reason I sincerely trust that the Republic will now benefit from the Commonwealth's multi-lateral and bilateral development schemes, as never before in the life of the Commonwealth has a member nation been in such urgent need of relief and developmental assistance. I believe that the Prime Minister (Mr McMahon) should seize the initiative and call a special meeting of the Commonwealth at Foreign Minister level to discuss ways and means of providing greater assistance to Bangladesh. Surely membership of any organisation carries with it certain obligations. The more affluent and wealthy members of the Commonwealth are expected to play a more significant role in coming to the assistance of a weaker member. Australia, because of her close proximity to and special interest in the Indian Ocean, must provide leadership as we have always propounded the view—

I heard this again put forward by the Minister for Foreign Affairs this afternoon—that we must maintain a presence in this region to ensure our security. I agree with this view. However, I am of the opinion that we can best ensure a lasting presence and peace in the Indian Ocean through economic aid. This is by far the best way to win friends and influence people in Asian countries. I trust that now that Bangladesh is a member nation we will seek a special meeting of the Commonwealth with a view to assisting our newest member as quickly as possible.

Australia prides herself on being a peace loving country, ever ready to come to the assistance of people in times of need. Never before have so many people needed succour as the 30 million homeless people in Bangladesh. Repeated calls for assistance have been made by the United Nations and the Government of Bangladesh, so I sincerely trust a little more notice is taken of my many pleas for greater assistance. The Australian people, I am sure, are looking for strong moral leadership and expect the Government to come to the assistance of these people in a more generous way. If Australia is to continue to call herself a Christian community, we can no longer procrastinate while millions face famine conditions. Knowing these facts I again urge an immediate cash grant of $10m for relief work in Bangladesh. This request is supported by the executive of the Australian Council for Overseas Aid.
Mr Daly (Grayndler) (9.23)—I had not intended to speak on the matter which the honourable member for Holt (Mr Reid) has mentioned, but I shall make passing reference to it. I agree with the honourable member when he criticises this Government, because criticising this Government is justified in relation to anything—not only foreign aid. Consequently I congratulate the member of what we are told is the independent thinking Liberal Party on having the courage to defy that fiery figure, the Prime Minister (Mr McMahon) who sits at the table in this House from time to time, in expressing his dissatisfaction at the Government’s policy on foreign aid. With the honourable member for Holt and other honourable members who sit on the other side of this Parliament I agree that there is a great deal of poverty throughout the world. It is our responsibility to play our part in relieving that poverty. But with due respect to the honourable member I have never heard him speak in this Parliament of the condition of the pensioners in this country, 200,000 of whom live in Australia today on $20 a week. I have never heard the honourable member express concern at the poverty that exists under this Government in this country today.

With due respect to the peoples of the world, I am one who believes that charity begins at home and that it is time that this Government and the honourable member for Holt paid a bit of attention to the churchmen of this country who have brought to the attention of the people of Australia the conditions of poverty under which our own people live under this Government which has been in office for about 23 years. Is it not tragic to think that the Minister for Social Services (Mr Wentworth) had to be shown, as it were, by leading churchmen in Sydney that poverty existed in this country? Is it not a tragedy that churchmen and other people have constantly to bring it to the attention of the Government that people, probably within a stone’s throw of this House, are living below the poverty line? With due respect to those in similar situations abroad, I am one who believes that there is no need to apologise for what Australia is doing for the people of the world. Despite the fact that there is a Liberal Government in office, we as Australians and our government play our part in bringing salvation to people throughout the world by way of aid and things of that nature.

But what I am dissatisfied with and what I decry is that honourable members on the other side of the chamber constantly undermine what Australia does for people abroad and completely neglect their responsibility to care for the people of this country. I heard the honourable member for Holt say that Bangladesh requires $10m for this and $40m for something else. If I suggested that similar amounts should be provided for the pensioners of Australia I would be heehawed out of Parliament by honourable members opposite. By all means let us give aid to the people of Bangladesh and to people in other places, whether it be $40m or $50m, but let us give to the pensioners throughout the length and breadth of this country an equivalent amount because 200,000 of them are living on $20 a week in this age of prosperity and affluence, as we call it.

Whilst I understand the great concern which the honourable member for Holt holds for these people, a concern which I and every member of this Parliament share, I hope he will stimulate his Government to do something for those people who in this country live in want and poverty, at a time when they should be enjoying the fruits of their labours. They are the pioneers of this country who have made it possible for Australia to give to people abroad, but they in turn are now suffering poverty. Yet those who sit opposite in support of this Government not only do nothing for them but also want to give millions of dollars to people on the other side of the world. For my part, and I do not care much who knows it, I want to see every person in this country above the poverty line—well above it. We will have fulfilled our responsibilities for the people whom we represent in this country, the citizens who put us in this Parliament, when not one person in this country is in want. We are all keen to play our part in relieving poverty throughout the world. But to the honourable member for Holt and to other members of the Liberal Party let me say that charity begins at home. This Government
has betrayed its responsibility to the people whom I represent in this Parliament. Today in my district people by the thousands are in want under this Government which boasts of what it is doing in various spheres of activity. Honourable members opposite have a lot of concern for people everywhere, but not for the people whom they represent. That is why this Government’s supporters are going to go where they ought to go, into the political limbo of the forgotten, as soon as the people get an opportunity to send them there.

I turn now to the matter on which I rose to speak. I read that when the Prime Minister is lying awake during many of those sleepless nights, wondering who from among those who sit behind him is going to stab him, he reads the Bible. I hope that when he is reading it he is reading how he will take us into the promised land, because after 20-odd years it is nearly time that he got us there. I want to say to him that if he lived in the districts which I represent—in Leichhardt, Marrickville, Newtown and other places—he would have plenty of time to read the Bible because of the aircraft which, due to the policy of this Government, are permitted to fly at night time 1,000 feet above the heads of the residents in those districts. I would like the Prime Minister to move into that area and live there for a while. If he did so, not only would his interest in the Bible be stimulated but also he might get an inspiration to do something about the menace of aircraft noise in the community today.

When all is said and done, the Prime Minister wants some stimulus. I have noticed that it costs $100,000 a year to maintain his staff, whereas a private member can hardly get a secretary to assist him. Yet the Prime Minister does nothing at all in respect of a number of major issues confronting the people of Australia. In my district we find the aged, the sick and the infirm, the kids in the schools and the residents who have built their homes there, continually menaced by aircraft noise. The Government does nothing at all to curtail this problem in any way, yet it is probably the greatest menace to living standards or residential standards anywhere in this country today. Only yesterday or the day before I received a letter from the Marrickville Municipal Council, which is a good council. It is a Labor council and, what is more, the people in the municipality vote Labor and therefore are worth representing. What these people lack in worldly goods they have up top. In other words, they know the party that they ought to support. Let me tell honourable members what the council said in its letter of 14th April. It reads:

At a recent meeting of the Council it was agreed to adopt recommendations made by the Committee of Representatives of Municipalities Affected by Noise from the Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport at its meeting held on the 15th March, 1972, at Botany Council Chambers, to which this Council sent three (3) Representatives.

This Council strongly protests against any further development of the Sydney (Kingsford Smith) Airport, which is in close proximity to the Marrickville Municipality. The flight path of the North-South Runway, particularly, greatly affects many thousands of residents of the area. It is of particular concern to this Council that the noise generated by the approaching and departing aircraft takes place not only during the normal working day, but because of the frequent breakage of the curfew hours—

Mr Deputy Speaker, you are one of those good members of Parliament who reside in their respective electorates. You know your constituents and the problems that aircraft noise brings to them. I mention that the honourable member for Sydney is temporarily occupying the Chair. The letter continued:

takes place at any time during the night, resulting in extreme disturbance to the peace of the neighbourhood.

The Council has written to the Minister for Civil Aviation and the Regional Director of Civil Aviation protesting at the continued breakage of the curfew hours as laid down by the Noise Abatement Committee. Less regard is given to the curfew hours during the times when people expect some peace and quiet, such as at Christmas, Easter and other holiday periods, than during normal times.

If I might just interpose here, I suppose that Mr Ansett has to continue to make his profits even at that time. The letter continues:

Any further development of the Airport would also lead to further noise pollution by way of increased passenger and freight road traffic. All this would, of course, add to the already dangerously high level of air pollution.

The people of this Municipality have endured, for many years, the disturbance and inconvenience caused by the Sydney (Kingsford-Smith) Airport and although it is appreciated that some of the disturbances are the price which we must pay for
progress, it is considered that the capacity of the Airport should be contained at its present level.

The Council strongly urges that the residents of this Municipality be sympathetically considered when the siting of a second Sydney airport is under review.

The action now taken by Council by reason of this letter is brought about by long-standing, deep concern and is not only generated by reason of the request of the above mentioned Committee.

The Committee of which I speak held a meeting on Wednesday, 15th March 1972 at the Botany Council Offices. The representatives of the following councils were present: Hurstville, Sutherland, Marrickville, Botany, Leichhardt, Drummoyne and Canterbury—all very good councils of the great metropolis of Sydney. The Committee decided, firstly, that it should write to both the Minister and the Regional Director protesting in the strongest possible terms at their practice of continually giving permission for aircraft to take off and land within the curfew hours. I wonder whether the Minister for Supply (Mr Garland), who is at the table, would be able to ponder over his documents in the middle of the night if planes flew a few feet over his head. I wonder what his wife would say if the kids were awakened. No doubt he would have to nurse them for the rest of the night as a lot of people have to do in Marrickville and many other suburbs.

Secondly, the Committee decided to deplore the abandonment of the noise abatement procedures in the pre-Christmas period and any other holiday period. Thirdly, it decided that it should inform the Minister that unless some honest attempt was made to observe and enforce the noise abatement procedures laid down by the Noise Abatement Committee, councils would withdraw their representation on that Committee and seek other ways of obtaining relief from the aircraft. Fourthly, the Committee decided to request the Minister to supply figures for 1971 showing the number of takeoffs, etc. The resolutions passed by this meeting cover a page and a half of print. Time does not allow me to read all of the resolutions. However, what I have read shows the concern of these people who represent in the main, I suppose, half a million souls who are being affected by this menace of aircraft noise. Listen to a letter I received from a distraught constituent—a lady—a few days ago. It says:

I have no idea what the curfew hours are, but please may I add my complaint to the list of those regarding noisy aircraft.

I could not carry the complaints that I have to this Parliament tonight without a lorry. This is why I am referring to only one letter. It continues:

I am employed as receptionist-telephonist at a glass factory situated at Cadogan Street, Marrickville, not far from Sydenham station. At periods during the day, planes, mostly jets, fly over this building, when preparing to land at Mascot. They seem to almost touch the roof. The noise of them is so bad, that I have to close the keys on the switchboard, in the middle of the conversation and keep the caller waiting, until the terrible screaming sound stops, as it is most unpleasant for the person at the other end of the line, as well as myself. It is useless trying to carry on with conversation as not a word can be heard. Sometimes, 2 or 3 jets follow, with intervals of only a few minutes.

One can bet that they were Ansett planes because this Government does not care what they do. The letter continues:

As a result of all this noise, I suffer from severe headaches and at the end of each day, I feel exhausted from nervous tension and I have no doubt that I am not the only person working under these conditions. I wonder how the Minister for Civil Aviation would like to work under these conditions for 8 hours a day.

For the information of the House, let me say that I invited the Minister for Civil Aviation (Senator Cotton) to spend a week at my expense in the best motel that we could get under the aircraft flight path anywhere in my electorate. The Minister for Civil Aviation has a bit of sense. He did not accept the invitation for the simple reason that he knew that he possibly could not survive this.

To add to all of our woes and troubles and just to make certain that not only in the daytime would people be in that demented frame of mind from aircraft noise, the Minister decided in February of this year to give permission to certain airlines to operate Electra turbo-prop freighter aircraft to Sydney Airport during curfew hours. In other words, the Government says: 'We are going to worry you all day while you are working, if you can, and then to make certain you cannot sleep, we are going to keep you awake all night with turbo-jet and other noise'. In a long letter to me dated 21st March 1972 the Minister said:

The restriction which has been imposed at Sydney, commonly called the 'curfew', has always related to pure jet aircraft only. The restriction has never been applied to propeller-driven aircraft, such as the Electra, at Sydney or at any other
airport in Australia. Although this has been publicised in many of my Press statements, it is clear from letters which I have received on the subject that the situation is not completely understood.

The letter goes on to state:

Ansett Airlines of Australia has operated propeller-driven Carvair aircraft during the curfew period at Sydney airport for several years and operations have averaged 10 take-offs and 5 landings per week at the airport during this period.

The Minister says that they were not noticed. Of course they would not be noticed because so many aircraft from Ansett take off in contravention of the curfew that one does not know whether they are jet or other aircraft. This is the only reason why they are not noticed.

Let me warn the people in the areas surrounding the Mascot aerodrome—especially the constituents in the Barton, Kingsford-Smith and St George electorates—that this is the thin end of the wedge to having 24-hour round the clock flying into Mascot Airport. That is the Government's reason for agreeing to allow freighter aircraft to be put in. It looks as though the Minister is being sadistic. He seems to be a decent fellow when one meets him—someone who is reasonable and pleasant. But he is almost sadistic. He even gives aircraft time to warm up before they actually take off. The Minister said:

The general procedures employed at Sydney Airport require that aircraft engine ground running for scheduled maintenance purposes will be restricted to the period 5 a.m. to 9 p.m. daily. Has the Minister ever been awakened at 5 a.m. at Mascot, Newtown or Marrickville and listened to aircraft warming for taking off to bring in profits for those who run these aircraft? The Minister continues:

To minimise the amount of ground running that may commence at 5 a.m., aircraft scheduled for departure between 7 a.m. and 8 a.m. will not be permitted to commence an engine run up more than 2 hours prior to departure.

So if aircraft are to depart before 6 o'clock in the morning one can expect to hear them at 4 o'clock. The Government does nothing about this. It says that people should not live within the proximity of the aerodrome. The fact of the matter is that people were there before aerodromes were thought of.

In 1953 I made a speech in this Parliament on low flying aircraft at Mascot. At that time everyone laughed at me. But I was the pioneer on the Opposition side in warning of aircraft noise in Australia. Aircraft noise has become a very real menace to people today. Just to rub it in, the Minister for Civil Aviation, in his sadistic way, in answer to a question by the honourable member for St George (Mr Morrison) said that the Concorde will shortly come in. Lord knows where that will take us because I understand that the Concorde will probably be noisier than any other aircraft. Honourable members opposite might say: 'What can the Government do about this?' It can do a lot about it, but is not prepared to intervene where the profits of airline operators are concerned, irrespective of the effect on the people in the community. The 'Canberra Times' of 4th March 1972 carried an article on a system for noise abatement. The article states:

A system has been invented which can cut aircraft noise by 30 per cent.

Time does not permit me to deal with the article, but I am told that this can be done. To date the Government has done nothing about it. The House of Commons has introduced legislation to enable effective action to be taken against those people who disturb residents of various areas close to airports in England. The legislation introduced in the House of Commons considerably reduced the menace of aircraft noise in Great Britain. Why does the Government here not do something like that? Of course it will not do anything. It is more wrapped up in the interests of profits and profiteers and the huge airline companies and those who run them than it is with the interests of the people who live in the residential areas in Sydney. In a letter to me of 6th August the Minister for Civil Aviation explained in detail what was done in the House of Commons, but at no stage did he say that the Government would legislate similarly here. He said that, broadly speaking, he thought the Government had this power at the present time. The Government certainly has not exercised it.

The point I make is that the people who live in constituencies adjacent to airports are entitled to consideration because they were there long before aircraft were heard of. Aged people by the thousands reside in those areas, and their health is affected by the menace of aircraft noise. Other residents are affected. Those on night shift, those on day shift and those who work
for long hours in factories, workshops and offices are affected by this noise, as are those people in schools like Newington College, which is in my district, who advise me that many times they have to curtail classes. In many churches sermons and services on Sundays have to be curtailed because of this menace. In every way, in hospitals and other places, aircraft noise constitutes one of the greatest menaces in this country today. Yet we find that the Government—worn out, tired and discredited, split to ribbons by dissent and disunity—cares nothing about this important problem, and does nothing about it.

The Minister for Civil Aviation (Senator Cotton) lives on a property near Oberon where one never sees an aeroplane and tells the people in my district that they ought to put up with what is happening. As the honourable member for Bradfield said once, if the aircraft ever flew low over the dairy farms and stopped the cows from giving milk, you would find every member of the Country Party on his feet wanting to ground every aeroplane in the country. But people in the great metropolis of Sydney suffer from this menace and nothing is done about it. Where people's lives will be affected, it is the Governments' responsibility to establish and plan aerodromes, with expressways to carry people to the great metropolis, instead of having aerodromes established in their midst. Above all else, it is the Government's responsibility to see that people in this country live in security and peace and are not disturbed by this menace of which I have spoken so often.

The honourable member for Mallee (Sir Winton Turnbull) is holding up a notice which reads 'Think big'. The day that he does that will see one of the miracles of this Parliament. Aircraft noise is a major problem. It is a great menace in this country. Why does the Government not learn from Great Britain, America and other places, and establish aerodromes well away from the metropolis, caring for the people and accepting its responsibility to see that those people get some relief from aircraft noise?

Mr ENGLAND (Calare) (9.42)—It is strange to reflect on how the problems of honourable members in this House differ. Although I realise the problems of the people represented by the honourable member for Grayndler (Mr Daly) caused by aircraft noise, I can assure the House that aircraft noise is the least of the worries of the people whom I represent. Indeed, if I could co-opt his assistance to have an alternative airport established west of the Blue Mountains, I would readily do so, because that is what they appear to want.

The Appropriation Bills which we are discussing now will give authority for the expenditure in the remainder of this financial year of funds not already included in the 1971 Budget. Appropriation Bill (No. 4) exceeds $71m, and it consists in the main of $14.6m for additional salaries in the Commonwealth, brought about not only by additional staff but also by increases as a result of arbitration rulings; $13.1m for departmental administrative expenses; $27.6m for other departmental services; and $15.8m for Defence Services. Appropriation Bill (No. 5) exceeds $80m. Of that $49.1m goes for payments to or for the States, and $31.3m goes for capital works and services.

I want to refer to 3 particular appropriations. Appropriation Bill (No. 4) provides, in the Department of Primary Industry, an appropriation of $400,000 for wool marketing assistance. That is in addition to the $3.7m which was appropriated in the Budget. For the same Department, and in the same Division, there is an additional appropriation of $40,000 for emergency assistance to wool growers. That, of course, is in addition to the $150,000 also appropriated in the last Budget. That marks a phasing out of this scheme. Although it has had many critics, it has really provided much needed, quick relief to hard-pressed wool growers—people who are hard pressed not only by the drop in wool prices and the increases in costs, but also by the effects of drought. These appropriations are really machinery measures which put into effect quite a varied group of policies and measures which this Government formulated in its efforts to assist hard-pressed rural industries and, of course, that means hard-pressed rural communities.

Then we have a variety of other measures. I do not want to weary the House by going through them in detail, but we think
quickly of the legislation setting up the Australian Wool Commission and the provisions for funding that Commission. This in itself has been a great success story, and it has been accepted by people inside and outside the wool industry. Then there was the deficiency payments scheme, which will go down in history as marking a turning point in the whole economy of the industry. Then there were devaluation payments and the halving of the levy paid by wool growers for promotion and research, and the doubling of the amount paid by the Commonwealth. Next we had the underwriting of finance—and this is going on at the moment—to integrate wool selling complexes. Then we had the commercial application of pre-sale objective measurements. These are things that assure, we hope, the future of the wool industry.

We know also that the Government is now studying the submissions put forward by the wool industry for acquisition and marketing of the total Australian clip, and that it awaits the report of the Randall Committee before it makes a decision here.

Taken individually, the things that I have mentioned in this Appropriation Bill are significant in a limited area of the rural economy, but taken together they provide a tremendous contribution to the recovery of the economy and the recovery of confidence which has taken place in the rural industries. But I want to speak particularly about rural reconstruction—a further scheme of this Government—and about the re-training scheme. To obtain a clear view of the rural reconstruction scheme I suggest it is appropriate to go back to the instigation of the scheme. This brings me to a point that I want to make quite clearly. The legislation was introduced at the wish of rural producers themselves. No doubt it has helped also and it will continue to help business in rural areas. Two years ago or more it was the experience of many members—perhaps all members—who represented rural areas, to attend many meetings, and at those meetings to hear and to see that producers were in dire straits brought about not only by seasonal conditions but also by a dramatic drop in wool prices, by an over-supply of wheat, by the introduction of wheat quotas, by an unfortunate uplift in land valuations at that time and by increases in costs generally. These were not always pleasant affairs. Views were put quite forcefully and it was not uncommon to hear come from the bodies of halls such questions as: 'When will the Government introduce a scheme which will apply to people in the wheat and wool industries along the lines of the scheme applied in the dairying industry?' I would like to make that point quite clear because it is often said that the Commonwealth Government introduced a policy of get big or get out. The pressures came originally from the industry itself. Now the use of that expression is confined, luckily, to the economists.

To me one of the vital parts of the Bill that brought in the rural reconstruction scheme was Part IV and the Schedule which provided for a review of the scheme after a particular time. The Bill set out what the review should cover. It put a time factor on the first review so that whatever legislation was necessary following the review could be brought into this House to enable the new arrangements to apply before 1st July. Not only did it do this, but it set down that the appropriate State and Commonwealth authorities would meet together periodically, at least once a year, and it laid down a time limit for the exchange of information. For those who had any doubts—that is quite a number did—when the legislation went through and was in its early stages of operation, the provision for review dispelled their doubts.

In a recent statement in this House the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Sinclair) described some of the main difficulties which had affected the working of the scheme. One of the greatest difficulties arose from the difference in the preparedness of the States. I think it is fair to say that New South Wales led the field in its preparation for this work. It had an organisation which was ready to go into action straight away. One of the last to go into action was Tasmania. I make no criticism of that; I put the 2 together for comparison. This difference made it hard to co-ordinate the scheme and to review its proper working.

The Minister also pointed out the difficulty of allocation of funds. As we know, a general objective was laid down by the Commonwealth that funds would be divided
on a 50-50 basis between debt reconstruction and farm build-up. It has turned out that the amount applied to farm build-up has been very small in comparison with the amount for debt reconstruction, and this has proved to be a drawback to the workings of the scheme. The approvals show that $49.8m has gone for debt reconstruction but only $8.9m has gone for farm build-up. It is my view that farm build-up will accelerate as this scheme gets going. It will accelerate as confidence returns and strengthens in the industry. There is room for confidence in the industry. There has been an increase in wheat quotas. There has been an increase in the price of wool and a decrease in the stockpile of wool which the Australian Wool Commission has at its disposal. There has been a strategic siting of wool stockpiles throughout the world. There is a new outlook in the industry, and I think it is correct to say that there is a binding together in the industry, with all sectors setting about an attack on the marketing and handling problems which confront them at this moment.

The Minister in his statement announced some changes. First of all authority was given to spend the remainder of the funds which had been originally allocated for expenditure over a longer period, and the Commonwealth has in effect given an additional $56m for this year. It has doubled the amount available or halved the time in which the original allocation was to be spent. An additional $15m is to be made available to fund approvals. An extra $3m is to go to Queensland to help it overcome its drought situation. This, of course, is a grant to match a State grant. Another change that I regard as important is that the period of loans for farm build-up purposes can now be up to 30 years duration, at the discretion of the States. At last loans are being made for terms which are appropriate to rural industries and conducive to efficiency in rural industries, some of them being for almost the whole working life of a man. In view of cost burdens and other difficulties, these are the types of terms which are absolutely necessary for the correct working of the industry in the future. Rehabilitation loans have been trebled. I still regard them as not being very big. These loans are to assist those who are obliged to leave the industry through hardship. A meeting of the administering authorities has to take place within 2 months of the date of the introduction of the Minister's statement in an effort to get the maximum uniformity between the various States.

It is not held by the Government or anybody else that the rural reconstruction scheme is a panacea for all economic troubles. It is a part of a series of measures. I can mention many of them. I have mentioned some, but I refer particularly to the emergency grants to wool growers, the deficiency payments scheme, rehabilitation schemes, the rural retraining scheme and the rural unemployment relief scheme. I could go on to mention many others. They are all to be seen as part of a general pattern. When State and Federal Ministers met recently they considered the question of rural finance generally, but before I go on to deal with that I want to refer to the fact that much criticism has been levelled and is still being levelled at the traditional lenders that the rural producer knows. I do not think that the extent to which the private trading banks have invested in the Australian Wool Commission and land industries in general is generally known and accepted. Of course, I use the term 'invested' advisedly. They have invested at a profit, of course. To the people on this side of the House at least, to make a profit, provided it is a reasonable profit, is not a crime. The whole rural reconstruction scheme is meant to run side by side with the normal lending from these traditional lenders, and I am sure that the whole scheme operates to the benefit of Australia as a whole.

In discussing rural finance, from my experience in the rural areas I consider that in terms of financial standing, generally speaking, people can be divided into 4 categories. There are those who require no direct assistance with capital at the moment. They can be divided into all sorts of subdivisions, and they are in that position for a number of reasons. Some of them are at the end of a long family line of primary producers and some of them probably would not know what it is like to have an overdraft. If we want to go right to the other end of the scale, and it is best to do it this way, there are those who, no matter what is done for them and no matter what assistance is given to them, will never make a success of
the venture in which they are engaged. For these people the Government has a rehabilitation and retraining scheme. In the third group are those who require assistance as provided by the rural reconstruction scheme about which I have been speaking.

The fourth category is the one that is not well looked after. I regard it as being the category into which the majority of rural producers fall. I refer to those who do not qualify for assistance under the rural reconstruction scheme and who really require additional long term finance. There is little movement at the moment in the sale of land, but the movement at this moment—I hope that with the restoration of confidence in the future there will be further movement—to me accentuates the need to provide long term money for the purchase of rural properties. Although it was strongly held some time ago that low interest meant a great deal to people on the land, there are many who are now conceding that low interest is of relatively small importance compared with the length of the term. When we talk of low interest we talk of subsidised interest. There is no traditional lender who will lend on low interest, and he cannot be expected to. The long term must be available to the efficient operator in primary industry, and this is where big efforts have to be made. There is an area of great need here. The Government knows it.

It is the subject of an intensive study by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. At Wagga not so long ago the Minister for Trade and Industry (Mr Anthony) pointed out:

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has for some time been making a very thorough investigation of this whole question of rural credit. The study has to be thorough, because it's not the simple matter many people think it is. We have to be sure that, if we do come up with some further development of credit facilities, they will do what we want them to do . . . to ensure that the right people get the right kind of help, for the right objectives.

The Minister went on to point out that the Bureau is getting near the end of its task and that the Government will be looking at it very carefully in the future. This matter requires solution by the Government quickly. I have kept in touch with the progress of this study and I am confident that some future Appropriation Bill such as the one we are discussing will make provision for appropriate rural finance with 20-year to 30-year terms of repayment.

Dr JENKINS (Scullin) (10.2)—It is always a pleasure to speak in the same debate as my colleague, the irrepressible, wise and experienced honourable member for Grayndler (Mr Daly). However, on this occasion I feel that I have to chide him for his rather uncharitable and harsh remarks about the Prime Minister (Mr McMahon) and his criticism of the Prime Minister's lack of ability to govern the country. In reading the Perth 'Sunday Independent' of last Sunday I found that the Prime Minister's needs are quite simple. The headline reads: 'Give me a fair go—McMahon's plea'. The article reads as follows:

In an interview telecast by Channels 3 and 9 last night Mr McMahon made an appeal to voters to give him a fair go.

'By the time the election comes around I think people will say: 'Fair go, mate. Give him a chance'.'

'This is the most difficult period I have faced in my political life.

'But we look to the future with a great deal of confidence provided we get a go,' he said.

The honourable member for Grayndler obviously misjudged the Prime Minister. After all, he has only had 21 years as a member of the Ministry. He has only carried a number of portfolios during that time. After 20 years in the Ministry he has only just become the Prime Minister. And with all that experience and with all the mess he has got the country into in the few months that he has been the Prime Minister, he still only wants a fair go. Surely it is the people of Australia who need a fair go. This Appropriation Bill gives some examples of why they need that fair go.

My colleague the honourable member for Melbourne Ports (Mr Crean) pointed out that the necessity for this Appropriation Bill was not only changed circumstances in various instances but also the continuing erosion of money values and the continuing erosion of what can be bought for a given amount. This must be faced fairly and squarely by the Government. It is the Government's responsibility. The Government is responsible for lack of planning. I respect the honourable member for Holt (Mr Reid) in his appeal for more foreign aid for Bangladesh. I did not visit Bangladesh, as he did, last year but I visited
India. The squalor and poverty that one sees there, with the teeming millions, tears at the heartstrings and beggars description. I have no doubt that his appeal for further assistance should be heeded, but he says that the Government should take note of needs when determining this. I sat in the same State Parliament as the honourable member for Holt and I know that over a period of 12 years he made the same appeals for foreign aid there to a Liberal State Government as he has made over almost the last 3 years in the Federal Parliament to a Federal Government, which is partly a Liberal Party Government, to which he belongs. I know just how little success he has had in having the needs of these people satisfied. Perhaps the message given to him by the honourable member for Grayndler is a wise one. If after 15 years he can see little for his efforts from the governments which he has supported, it is about time he did a bit of rethinking about supporting the Government.

I believe that such needs apply not only to foreign aid but also to a number of other areas in this country. There are certain amounts in these Appropriation Bills which give a lead to the needs that exist for further expenditure. I have selected some of them. Even the extra appropriations go nowhere near to solving or even starting to solve the problems that exist. One of these great areas of need is education, particularly educational research. We find that in Appropriation Bill (No. 4) the contribution for research into pre-school education has more than doubled. The amount appropriated under the Budget was $3,400, to which there is now added $3,600, making a princely sum of $7,000 for the year. In fact, it is $229 more than for the previous financial year. What is the extent of the research into this field? The areas of research are many and varied, but no research is needed to know that the pre-school stage is a time when the child has a great potential for learning. It is a period that is vital to intellectual development. Absence of pre-school education leads to educational deprivation in later years. Yet there has been little research into the need for the provision of pre-school centres and to ascertain whether these provisions are more desirable than allowing such education in the home.

Research is needed into the potential numbers that exist in varying areas or districts which need such facilities. Such research cannot be left to the States. On 18th April this year one Victorian State Minister, when asked what were the facilities in a given electoral province in his State, said that 48 centres existed giving places for 2,586 children. Yet he had to add that it would not be possible to assess the total need for day care in any area even if the total number of children of appropriate ages were known. What is more, his whole attitude was that such research would not be carried out to find out the numbers and the need. If the 1966 figures for that electoral province—Melbourne West—are taken, one sees that there were 13,000 3-year-olds and 4-year-olds at that time. So only 20 per cent of them could get pre-school places. In the 6 years that have passed, that population has increased and so the situation is worse. If such research is to be carried out, the Commonwealth needs to give a much greater financial stimulus. It is a tragedy that the percentage of 1971 prep- graders in Victorian metropolitan schools who have had such pre-school education should vary from 2 per cent in some schools to 80 per cent in others. If research is not needed to pinpoint the causes of such inequities, how will the answer ever be obtained?

This Appropriation Bill further increases the appropriation for migrant education on the basis that the increased appropriation will allow some expansion of the migrant education programme. It has been pointed out in the accompanying documents that there has been some saving in the migrant education service due to less expenditure on pre-embarkation and shipboard instruction and in the full time intensive English language course. An Australian Council for Educational Research study showed that only 26 per cent of non-English speaking 3 and 4 year olds attended pre-school centres compared with 49 per cent of other migrants and 70 per cent of Australians. So in what area is it more important that there should be an increased appropriation for migrant education? Further on this matter of migrant education in English, it must be becoming more and more evident that crash courses in English are not...
enough. It is obvious also that certain areas carry a heavier load of migrants and have a higher need for migrant education. In this respect I quote from a paper delivered by Mr Tom Roper of the Centre of Urban Education, School of Education, La Trobe University, at a seminar in Melbourne last Sunday. He said:

All western municipalities have a higher percentage of migrant residents and non-English speaking migrants than does Melbourne as a whole.

Then follows a table which I have shown to the Minister at the table. I seek leave to have it incorporated in Hansard.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Luchetti) —Is leave granted? There being no objection leave is granted.

(The table read as follows)—

| TABLE 7 |
| COUNTRY OF BIRTH (1966 CENSUS) |
| Non British as a percentage of migrants |
| Born overseas |
| Altona | 43 | 66 |
| Footscray | 32 | 75 |
| Keilor | 38 | 80 |
| Sunshine | 37 | 70 |
| Werribee | 28 | 55 |
| Williamstown | 29 | 60 |
| Melbourne (all) | 26 | 50 |

Dr JENKINS—This table illustrates the percentage of population born overseas and the number of non-British migrants as a percentage of total migrants in certain municipalities. To take one example from that table, 38 per cent of the inhabitants of Keilor Shire were born overseas and 80 per cent of those migrants are non-British. Compare this with the overall figure for Melbourne of 26 per cent of its population born overseas of which 50 per cent are non-British. Mr Roper continues:

This was more than confirmed by a 1970 Victorian Education Department survey of migrants here less than 6 years. Of the 100 primary schools classified as having large numbers 20 were in the west and included 3 with in excess of 50. The high and tech figures for the west were 6 out of 24 and 3 out of 10 respectively.

Evidence from my own research suggests that not only the recently arrived migrant suffers a language handicap. Even children born here, if the home language is not English, tend to score at the bottom end of the scale.

This process is accentuated during the middle secondary years when the level of English demanded accelerates. In my view the present migrant English programme is far too limited and thousands of western suburbs children are as a consequence permanently stunted.

This is an indictment of the programme of migrant education that we have. My experience in my electorate also reflects this deficiency. The Preston East High School which serves an area which has a substantial migrant population not only has vacancies for a mathematics and a commercial teacher but also shortly will have positions of deputy principal, a physical education teacher, a fifth year physics and mathematics teacher and a science teacher falling vacant. But its most urgent need is a teacher for migrant children. This is not my statement but the statement of the High School Advisory Council. Is it any wonder then that I am not opposed to any increase in appropriation for migrant education? However, I am disturbed and angry at having to point out the deficiencies of the programme. Crash courses for adults are ineffective and, unless such special training for non-English speaking migrants is started at pre-school level and carried right through the educational process, the efforts are ineffective. Any debate in Australia on any of the migrant programmes of its political parties is an academic exercise unless one is aware of this prime ingredient of educational training for satisfactory assimilation.

The appropriation for Commonwealth university scholarships is increased because of an increase in university fees. This once more highlights the inadequacy of this system to equitably make higher education possible for capable young people. Year after year university quotas exist. Year after year young people have to reject places offered to them because they have not sufficient money and they have not obtained scholarships. These children in many cases are the tip of the iceberg from areas which are deprived of educational advantage. In many cases they come from areas with poor pre-school facilities and poor primary and secondary school facilities; yet having survived all this they are unable to accept the university places offered. I make this comment in passing, accepting with despair the Government’s attitude to such areas. But, in accusation, how can the Government say that in areas of lower than average
earnings it is the lack of parental interest which leads to the disadvantage? This is just not good enough. More help is needed not just for the student at tertiary level, as the Commonwealth believes; emphasis should be on the student in the earliest stage with need being the basis for decision on how help is granted.

The same sort of criticism may be applied to the increased appropriation under the Aged Persons Homes Act. Here I again quote some figures for different areas of the Melbourne metropolitan area. Take the western suburbs of Altona, Williamstown, Footscray, Sunshine and Keilor whose 1968 population was 227,000 and then take as a representative eastern suburbs block, Camberwell, Hawthorn, Kew and Malvern whose 1968 population figure was 220,000. We find that there were 34 single flats built under the Aged Persons Homes Act in the western suburbs whereas 690 single flats were built in the eastern suburbs. There were 12 double flats built in the western suburbs compared with 30 in the eastern suburbs. With regard to the hostels built under the Aged Persons Homes Act, one representing 35 beds was built in the western suburbs whereas 22 representing 652 beds were built in the eastern suburbs.

We must query why this imbalance occurs. In my electorate of Scullin there would be one such aged persons home, ‘Lumeah’, which provides an accommodation of something like 30 beds. The reason for this may be found on examining the answer I received from the Minister for Social Services (Mr Wentworth) after representations had been made on behalf of the Preston City Council. That Council wished to use loan funds to supply such accommodation. An excerpt from the letter states:

When I—

That is, the Minister for Social Services—

pointed out that grants made from loan funds by local governing bodies to other eligible organisations could be used to attract Commonwealth subsidy. I was not inferring that such organisations are more capable of running aged persons homes than local governing bodies, but merely explaining how Councils which wished to help the establishment of aged persons homes could do so under the existing legislation.

To amend the Aged Persons Homes Act in the way suggested by Council would have the effect of changing the concept of legislation, the purpose of which is to provide an incentive to community support for aged persons homes'. Of course, one is there referring to suburbs in which there is less than average earnings, where the community itself is not able to supply the amount that can be raised in more affluent suburbs to allow these aged persons homes to be constructed in order to make accommodation available for the aged. It goes deeper than that. Because of the appropriation under the Aged Persons Homes Act many people are forced to take such accommodation in other areas. These are some of the fringe problems. People are torn from the areas where they have lived for many decades, where they have lived their whole lives, where their friends still live and where their families probably live. Yet because of the requirements of this Aged Persons Homes Act, the purpose of which is to give an incentive to community support, these already deprived suburbs are unable to satisfy the needs of the elderly people. While it is suggested that the Appropriation Bill has provided for an increased sum of money, this area is so undesirable that it requires the attention of the public to be drawn to it time and time again, just as we are drawing attention to the lack of other facilities for the aged.

Provision is made in the Appropriation Bills for increased appropriations for Defence forces pay and allowances, particularly arising out of the Kerr Committee report. It was mentioned to me by members of the Defence forces that while the living away from home capital cities allowances for public servants were adjusted early in January of this year, similar adjustments had not been made for members of the armed services as late as Anzac Day. The query was put to me why this should occur. I should like some explanation at some stage whether this adjustment has been made. I believe that these Appropriation Bills highlight more and more the deficiencies of this Government's policies—a government that deserves the fate that it will undoubtedly get at the end of the year from the electors of Australia.

Mr McLEAY (Boothby — Assistant Minister assisting the Minister for Civil Aviation) (10.22)—I wish to speak to Appropriation Bill (No. 4) and, in particular, to Division No. 357 which deals with the Electoral Branch and with other matters such as salaries and payments
in the nature of salaries to electoral officers. In doing so I wish largely to talk about elections and issues of elections because I have some concern as had the previous speaker, the honourable member for Scullin (Dr Jenkins), that the electorate may be confused as to what are the important issues at the next elections. There is a feeling that I hear expressed around the electorate from time to time that: 'Let the Labor Party get in next time. Let it have a go. After all, it will make such a mess of things that it will be thrown out at the following election'. I wish to underline the point that this attitude just is not a goer. I agree that the Labor Party would make a shocking mess of things but I think that once it becomes the government of this country, it would so gerrymander the electoral system that there would be no way in the world that the electorate could get rid of the Labor Party.

I would like to make passing reference to the electoral policy of the Australian Labor Party. On page 13 of the Labor Party's 'Platform, Constitution and Rules' dealing with electoral policy, item 3——

Mr Scholes—That is not a current copy.

Mr McLEAY—This is not a current copy; one needs to have one of these every 3 months to keep up with the changing policies of the Labor Party. But this is the current electoral policy of the Labor Party. I am sure that the honourable member for Corio will not deny this. The policy of the Labor Party on this matter states:

Candidates for election to the House of Representatives to be elected on the basis of the greatest number of votes to any candidate, i.e., 'first past the post' and on the basis of one vote one value.

Does any honourable member on the other side of the House deny that that is Labor Party policy? I think not.

The Government's policy is to support preferential voting. Surely the test of a voting system is how well it translates the will of the people. In my view, preferential voting is the better of the 2 systems. It ensures that every voter can have a say in the final result. If his first choice is eliminated, he does not lose his vote. He can exercise a choice among the candidates left in the running until ultimately the majority prevails. That is the present method of voting and I think it is near to perfect.

However, I would like to see the present system of preferential voting made voluntary. That is the criticism I would have about our present system. People say that they are compelled to vote. I claim that we are compelled to go to the voting booth; nothing can compel us to vote. In my view, if we were to eliminate that compulsion in our electoral system, we would have the most satisfactory system in the world. It would truly be a representative democracy.

As the Minister for the Navy (Dr Mackay) happens to be in the chamber, I would like to quote what happened in the electorate of Evans at the last election. As honourable members will remember, there were 5 candidates. The parties represented were the Democratic Labor Party, the Liberal Party, the Australian Labor Party, the Australia Party and a party commonly known as the DOGS. The ALP candidate polled 45.4 per cent of primary votes. The other candidates polled 54.6 per cent of primary votes between them. In other words, the majority of electors preferred other candidates to the ALP. After the distribution of the second choice of these voters—the preference vote—the Liberal candidate won the seat with 51.19 per cent of the votes. The ALP candidate had a vote of 48.61 per cent.

I make the point that the Opposition's first past the post system would have given the seat of Evans to the ALP candidate, even though the majority voted against the Labor Party.

Mr Scholes—What would have been the result if you had counted the ALP second preferences?

Mr McLEAY—I would like to pursue this further because I wish to help the honourable member for Corio. I have taken some figures from the last elections. In the 12 seats I was able to research, under the first past the post system of voting, the Labor Party would have won all these seats with a minority of the votes. I have already mentioned the seat of Evans. In the seat of Paterson the Labor candidate scored 37 per cent of the vote. Would honourable members opposite think that he should have won that election? In the seat of Phillip, 43 per cent of votes went to the Labor candidate, while in Holt the figure was 45 per cent. In the electorate of McMillan
Mr McLEAY—I appreciate that interjection, too, from the honourable member for Angas. Of course, many of these countries are communist countries. Is it all right for me to mention that word?

Mr Giles—Do they have an option?

Mr McLEAY—There is no option. There is one party. I might just mention one of the countries because I have been there and I enjoyed being there. I refer to Romania. This is a classic case where in the Grand National Assembly 465 deputies were elected under the first past the post system. In the last election there were 465 candidates. There is no argument in the answer given to the question asked by the honourable member for Grayndle about the first past the post system. Either there is voluntary voting or there is no choice at all, which is the position in communist countries. So I think we could say that the introduction of a first past the post system would create a gerrymander. It would mean the destruction of the small parties in Australia.

Mr Scholes—What a tragedy, the DLP and the Country Party.

Mr McLEAY—This is the thing. I am sure that the great defenders of civil liberties in this country, people like the honourable member for Sydney (Mr Cope), who has been interjecting, realise that there should be an opportunity for people to form small parties. The honourable member for Corio (Mr Scholes) or any other honourable member opposite, would not like to see the disintegration of the Democratic Labor Party; they would not like to see the extinction of the Australia Party or the Communist Party. But the introduction of a first past the post system would mean the end of the smaller parties.

I should like to give an example of what happens under a first past the post system. It destroys the true democratic processes of free voting. Let us take a hypothetical case, say, in the electorate of Bendigo where the Australian Labor Party candidate receives 10,000 votes, the Country Party candidate receives 9,000 votes, the Liberal Party candidates receives 9,000 votes, and another candidate receives 2,000 or 3,000 votes. In that hypothetical case the total Labor Party vote would be only 10,000, and the total of the non-Labor vote would
be 20,000. But under the system by which the Labor Party seeks to create a gerry-mander, the Labor Party candidate would win even with a very small minority vote.

Mr Scholes—What about alphabetical order on the ballot paper?

Mr McLEAY—The honourable member for Corio interjects and refers to alphabetical positions on the ballot paper. This is one area where I would be inclined to agree with him. The Labor Party suggests that there should be a ballot for places on the ballot paper. But let us remember what happened in the Senate election in 1937 with the Labor Party candidates in New South Wales. The Labor Party endorsed 4 men whose surnames began with the letter 'A' so that its candidates could be listed at the top of the ballot paper. I understand that one of the candidates changed his name by deed poll. So I think that the Labor Party should not be critical of the system of placing candidates' names on the ballot paper.

The question that concerns me is that people in the electorate are saying that if the Labor Party were elected to office it would make such a mess of it that the Liberal-Country Party would soon be returned. I would say that if ever the Labor Party becomes the Government we will never get it out of office for the reasons which I have mentioned; the first being that the Labor Party would introduce the first past the post system. I want to know whether honourable members opposite are sincere in suggesting the introduction of a first past the post voting system, or whether they are suggesting it just to win power.

The other issue about which honourable members opposite tend to talk about is the question of one vote one value. It is a parrot cry. This question of one vote one value appears on page 33 of the Labor Party's 'Platform, Constitution and Rules'. But according to the Australian Constitution—and I think that the Australian elector should know how deep run the feelings of the Labor Party in this regard—it is impossible to have one vote one value because no State in the Commonwealth can have fewer than 5 seats. Tasmania, which has 5 seats, has a quota of 40,000 electors. What would the Labor Party do if it got into power? Would it change the Constitution and give Tasmania 2 seats? Of course, it would not. Out of a total of 5 members Tasmania returns 4 members for the Labor Party. So the Labor Party has no intention of changing the system to provide for one vote one value.

Would anybody say that the voting system for the Senate is one vote one value when New South Wales, with 44 per cent of the Australian population, and Tasmania with 3 per cent of the Australian population, both sent 10 senators to Canberra? Would the Labor Party change that? I think not. The other point that the Labor Party makes concerns the question of population. This is another parrot cry of the Labor Party. It says: 'We represent people, not sheep'.

Mr James—Trees.

Mr McLEAY—Not trees. So what the Labor Party wants to do is to represent not electors but people, and this goes down well; this sounds good. If I can deal with South Australia for a moment, instead of the present quota of 60,000 electors for country seats and 50,000 electors for urban seats, under a Labor Party redistribution there would be a quota of 90,000 people. It is pretty simple to work it out. The population of South Australia, including every man, woman and child, is just over one million. So divided by 12 seats, the quota would be 90,000 people. On my calculations, after a future Labor government controlled gerrymander, this would leave South Australia with a representation of 2 country seats and 10 urban seats. One of the country seats would have to include the provincial cities of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln and Port Pirie and it would certainly be a Labor seat. So under a future Labor administration's redistribution South Australia would return one Liberal-Country Party member at the most, and 11 Labor members. No-one could convince me that that is truly representative democracy.

Then there are people—and unfortunately some of these people are on my own side of politics—who say: 'You will never get it through the Senate. You will get one vote one value or first past the post through the House of Representatives, but you will never get it through the Senate'. I should like to place this on the record here and I hope that in the future no-one will ever say that I was proven to be right. It is possible to get it through the Senate. At
present the composition of the Senate is 5 Democratic Labor Party senators, 26 Liberal-Country Party senators, 26 Australian Labor Party senators and 3 independent senators. At the forthcoming election for the House of Representatives Senator Bonner from Queensland will have to go to the people. It is possible—extremely unlikely—that he might be defeated, in which case the composition of the Senate would be 5 DLP senators, 25 Liberal-Country Party senators, 27 Labor Party senators and 3 independent senators. I do not know where the independent senators stand. One of them has been a member of every Party, including being the Leader of the Australia Party for a short period.

This is really the question I address to people who think that they might punish the Government by voting against it just once. If there were a Labor administration and a Senate of the composition to which I have just referred, would it not be possible for someone to be appointed as ambassador to somewhere or other, or for someone to die or to be absent on account of sickness? All of these things are possible. In the event of such a possibility eventuating, the legislation to which I have referred could be put through the Senate. There is a further interesting and to us sinister over-tone here. We are dealing with a hypothetical situation, but what would happen if a Government senator from South Australia or Tasmania, or from both of those States, died tonight? The governments of those States are both Labor governments. They are honourable governments. They would appoint a Liberal-Country Party nominee. But that person would have to go to the polls at the next Federal election in November. We have just seen what happened in Tasmania. It is absolutely certain that in the event of an extraordinary by-election in Tasmania for a Senate seat a Labor senator would be elected. The same thing could happen in South Australia and it could happen also in Western Australia where there is possibly a predominance overall of Labor supporters. So it is possible for the Labor Party to have control not only of this House but also of the Senate and thus be enabled to get through whatever legislation it chooses. It is interesting to note that in 1940 the Chifley Govern-

ment abolished the first past the post system for the Senate and replaced it with proportional representation because at that time it suited the Chifley Government.

I make the point that these are possibilities. It is very likely that a large percentage of the Australian electorate could be disfranchised and its voting rights taken away. This is spelled out in the Labor Party platform—first past the post voting, compulsory voting and a redistribution based on a one vote one value parrot cry. Also there is the Labor Party idea of people not electors building up the electoral quotas. To those who are thinking of risking the future of this country at the next election I say: 'Do not do it', because if the Opposition became the Government we would not get it out in a generation.

Mr REYNOLDS (Barton) (10.42)—It is a most interesting exercise to sit here to listen to, of all honourable members, the honourable member for Boothby (Mr McLeay) parading as the paragon of electoral virtue. After all, the honourable member for Boothby comes from South Australia and that State is rather notorious for the kind of electoral distribution it had in days gone by. There are not many people who would not recollect the Playford Liberal Government in South Australia that was elected to office with only 36 per cent of the popular vote. People will not forget, of course, the South Australian Upper House which is comprised of 20 representatives. Despite the fact that there is a Labor Government in South Australia under Mr Dunstan, in the Upper House 16 out of the 20 seats are held by the Liberals because of the particular kind of voting system that exists for that House. The honourable member for Boothby should forget about lecturing us about gerrymanders and voting systems. When he remedies the situation in his own State we will pay more attention to him. As a matter of fact, the crusty old occupants of the South Australian Upper House were more than the former Premier of South Australia, Mr Steele Hall, was able to stomach. I think the history of that is very fresh in our minds. He resigned the leadership of the Liberal Country League in disgust at their attitude.

Earlier in the evening my colleague the honourable member for Grayndler (Mr
Daly) uttered some very eloquent words on a matter that affects my electorate as well as his own, namely, the problem of aircraft noise. I do not intend to speak at any length on this topic tonight but I would report to the House that just a couple of weeks ago the honourable member for St George (Mr Morrison), who represents a neighbouring electorate, and I, representing the Barton electorate in Sydney, met with representatives of all the churches in our electorates. These representatives invited us to hear them tell the story of aircraft noise as it affected them and their parishioners. They made out a case to us that the noise was completely intolerable. They talked of such things as the interruption of church services, the interruption of school procedures and the effect that it had on sick people, particularly at night time, and on young children.

They asked us whether any remedies were available. To the best of our ability we told them what remedial measures had been implemented as the result of the recommendations of the House of Representatives Select Committee on Aircraft Noise. We had to tell them that these measures were only palliatives and that they could never provide a substantial cure for the problem. We told them quite frankly that it was not possible for us to promise to remedy the mistakes of the present Government which failed to act 7 or 8 years ago when the important decision should have been made to select the site and start building a second airport outside the inhabited areas of Sydney. That was not done and now it is not possible for any government, be it Liberal or Labor, to catch up on those 7 lost years. So, instead of offering these people relief from this problem we had to indicate to them in all frankness that for the years ahead and until some action is taken to build a second airport the position will get worse, because under the present Government's programme it is intended to make saturated use of Mascot Airport in Sydney. There are rumours—pretty well founded rumours—that there are plans to duplicate the north-south runway that extends into Botany Bay. So as a result of the Government's dilatoriness the people of the metropolitan area of Sydney and thereabouts will have an intensification of the problem rather than relief from it. Even now, with the Air-
craft Noise Committee having made its recommendation about the airport sites, the Government deliberately stalls and will not choose the location for Sydney's second airport until after the election. The Government probably presumes, quite rightly, that it will not have to make the decision anyway because there will be a change of government by that time.

Tonight I want to refer particularly to the state of our Australian railway systems. All the States are making strong complaints to the Commonwealth Government regarding the problem they face in respect of their railway systems. Whether we like it or not the fact is that most Australian people like to live in the big cities and as a result we are paying the penalty in terms of road and traffic congestion generally. Apart from that, the railways are involved pretty heavily financially. I quote a few figures at this late hour in relation to my own State of New South Wales. During the year ended at 30th June last the New South Wales Department of Railways earned about $252m. That was a record amount to have earned. However, its expenditure was about $242m, which left an operating surplus of approximately $9m. Unfortunately, on the passenger services it suffered a very considerable loss. The big losses were on the country services rather than the city services which carried most of the passengers. In the country areas of New South Wales in that financial year there was a loss of $31.1m on passenger traffic. In the suburban areas on the other hand there was a loss of $13.1m. In other words, despite the fact that innumerable more passengers were carried in the city areas of Sydney most of the total loss occurred in the country areas.

One of the burdens that the railways in Australia have to carry is the shocking interest burden. In New South Wales last financial year the railways, before paying for anything else, had to meet $38.7m in interest payments to the Commonwealth Government. This was an increase of $3m on the previous year. If one studies the figures it will be noted that this interest burden is escalating year after year. Even though passengers are required to pay increased fares, the increased revenue therefrom is being dissipated by the increased interest burdens that are imposed upon the railway system. Instead of ending up with
a profit, the railways in New South Wales last year finished up with a loss of $26.478m. I understand that the position in New South Wales is not unique to that State. Most other States are in a similar critical position. This means, of course, that the railways are unable to carry out the improvements that are desirable in order to attract more traffic and as a result of not being able to attract more traffic most of the people who are deserting the railways are using cars and are travelling on the already choked highways of our cities.

It is no wonder that on 26th April, just a couple of weeks ago, the New South Wales Minister for Transport called for a Commonwealth take-over of the State's railway system. I understand that this is the attitude of the Victorian Government also. Despite the fact that in both States there are Tory or Liberal-Country Party governments, they are asking the Commonwealth to take over their railway systems. Mr Morris, the State Minister for Transport in New South Wales, went on to say that the State Government did not have the money to supply new carriages and other rolling stock which was urgently needed. He said that many country services would have to be eliminated. Many people in country areas already have had advice about the curtailment of railway systems in their areas.

Let us contrast the treatment that the Commonwealth Government gives to State railway systems with what it gives to other forms of transport in Australia. The Commonwealth in just under 20 years has given road construction authorities by way of grants more than $1,840m free of interest. On the other hand, in nearly 50 years Commonwealth assistance for State railways throughout Australia has been only $240m, most of which has been repayable with interest. A while ago I alluded to the interest burden in New South Wales of $38.7m last year. Most of this money that the Commonwealth has provided for railway systems has been for country areas and very little, if any, has been given to urban areas. As I said, one of the problems is the shortage of money, as the New South Wales Minister for Transport, Mr Morris, said recently.

Admittedly there are similar problems in many overseas countries which have had to provide subsidies through their federal governments, central governments, state governments and, in some cities, through local governments to support their railway systems. The New South Wales railway system is so short of money that it is prevented from carrying out desirable improvements to its services to attract or even retain passenger patronage. Only a couple of weeks ago Senator Cotton, representing the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr Nixon), told Senator Mulvihill that over the last 5 years 'no special grants have been made to the States as an offset to interest on loan funds applied to railway capital works'. Senator Cotton added:

The Commonwealth has, however, agreed to take over $1,100m of State debt progressively over the 5 years 1971-75 and is providing part of the funds approved by the Loan Council each year for State works and housing as grants in lieu of loans, thus eliminating debt charges on the use of these funds.

He went on to say:

It is for the State governments to determine what areas of activity should benefit from these concessions.

It is all very well for the Minister to say that the Commonwealth was taking over some of the debt, but the simple fact is that the debt is great. This applies not only to railways but also to housing, schools and to all sorts of other capital works carried out by State governments. These have amounted to such a great dimension that State railway systems are still left with most of their burden to bear. Because they have this tremendous burden they must find this money each year before they can pay for any other expenses.

Let us look in very brief form at the Commonwealth's obligation in some other forms of transport. What do we find in the field of civil aviation? Some reference was made earlier to Ansett Transport Industries Ltd. That is an example of someone benefiting from Commonwealth expenditure on civil aviation facilities. In 1970-71 Commonwealth expenditure on airports and the like amounted to $56.5m. What could that amount do for State railway systems? What help would that money be to the overloaded trains that traverse our suburban lines? On the other hand the Commonwealth received in revenue from civil aviation sources $32.6m. There was still a net grant to civil aviation facilities of
almost $24m. In the field of shipping the Commonwealth paid subsidies of $19m last year. That would be a very helpful payment to the State railway systems.

We really come into the big money when we look at the situation in regard to roads. The grant under the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act amounted in the same financial year to $218m. This is the sort of thing which is helping to build these great concrete strips, these things which we call expressways, freeways and all the rest of it. The main effect they seem to be having is to induce more people to travel on them, thereby making the situation even more chaotic than it is now. There are also the grants for beef roads. In all the Commonwealth provided $227m for roads last year, whilst it provided so little for our railway systems which could do with huge amounts to alleviate the problems of our already choked cities. In 1970-71 Commonwealth grants for State railways amounted to $3.85m. Compare that with $227m for roads. The Commonwealth provided a further loan of $3.75m for our State railways, making a total Commonwealth commitment of $7.6m, and most of this money was for the standardisation of railways outside the cities.

In the brief time available to me in this debate I want to make one point. To establish my point I seek leave of the House to incorporate in Hansard 4 tables setting out the details of Commonwealth transport grants and the corresponding revenue received by the Commonwealth from the various forms of transport. These tables have been provided by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Library Statistical Service. I have already mentioned this to the Minister for Supply (Mr Garland) who is now at the table.

Mr ACTING SPEAKER—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(The documents read as follows):

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE ON SELECTED TRANSPORT FACILITIES 1966-67 TO 1970-71

($'000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Aviation Facilities—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital expenditure by and on behalf of the Department of Civil Aviation</td>
<td>28,979</td>
<td>31,757</td>
<td>39,326</td>
<td>41,471</td>
<td>53,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development expenditure within Australia—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies to airlines</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local airports—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for flying training</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation research</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship construction</td>
<td>11,660</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>18,758</td>
<td>18,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal shipping—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Island and Bass Strait Islands</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American shipping service</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory—Superphosphate sea subsidy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Aid Roads Acts—Grants</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>193,000</td>
<td>218,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle roads—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>8,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,005</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>6,001</td>
<td>6,268</td>
<td>8,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon River road (Tasmania)—Grant</td>
<td>1,596</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyre and Barkly Highways—Grant</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appropriation Bill (No. 4) 9 May 1972

#### State Railways—Commonwealth—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total payments</td>
<td>12,278</td>
<td>20,925</td>
<td>11,436</td>
<td>11,835</td>
<td>3,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12,647</td>
<td>13,989</td>
<td>7,554</td>
<td>8,277</td>
<td>3,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Transport Subsidies, Northern Territory—

| General(s)                |         |         |         |         |         |
| Transport of stud stock   | 83      | 80      | 175     | 245     | 129     |
| Drought relief freight concessions | 57  | 50      | 2       | 239     | 149     |
| Railway—Railway freight   | 110     | 100     | 113     | 87      | 114     |

(a) Can apply to sea, rail or road transport.

Compiled at request by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Library Legislative Research Service from information contained in the 'Civil Aviation, 1970–71' Report (Department of Civil Aviation) and 'Commonwealth Payments to or for the States, 1971–72' and 'Commonwealth Authorities, 1970–71' (Budget Papers).

### DEBT CHARGES PAID BY STATES TO COMMONWEALTH, IN THE YEARS 1966-67 TO 1970-71, ON LOANS FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES ($'000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railway projects—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt charges</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>4,439</td>
<td>4,942</td>
<td>5,316</td>
<td>5,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>3,011</td>
<td>3,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,455</td>
<td>6,163</td>
<td>6,828</td>
<td>8,327</td>
<td>8,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle roads (a)—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total debt charges</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Queensland only.

Compiled at request by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Library Legislative Research Service from information contained in Commonwealth Payments to or for the States, 1971–72 (Budget Paper).

### DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION SUMMARY OF REVENUE, 1966-67 to 1970-71 ($'000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Navigation Charges</td>
<td>8,184</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>12,805</td>
<td>15,566</td>
<td>20,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends (Qantas and Australian National Airlines Commission)</td>
<td>3,780</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>3,160</td>
<td>4,080</td>
<td>5,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Transport Source Revenue</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>1,697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Commercial Development Revenue</td>
<td>1,526</td>
<td>1,827</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Revenue</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>2,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,804</td>
<td>14,244</td>
<td>19,811</td>
<td>24,521</td>
<td>32,652</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled at request by Commonwealth Parliamentary Library Legislative Research Service from information contained in issues of the annual report, Civil Aviation, of the Department of Civil Aviation.
Mr REYNOLDS—I thank the House. One of the effects of this terrible debt burden on the railways which is so unrelied by lack of Commonwealth assistance is that morale is flagging. It is not only the passengers who are upset. These people who are employed by the railways are also affected. The effect on their morale is quite damaging. The fact is that they never can get in front. They have this tremendous burden of interest debt hanging over their heads, this capital debt. There is a lack of incentive towards efficiency. Often, particularly in the past, salaries in railway services have been poor. The railways have not been able to attract men as well qualified as might have been the case with better salaries offering. There have been inadequate superannuation schemes to retain employees. There has been a high labour turnover. The railway system has always been regarded as the Cinderella of transport services in Australia and, by default, people have left the railways. They have left the passenger services and even in the goods traffic they are leaving. The figures have been improving but not at the rate which one would expect in relation to the increase in population. As a result people have been turning more and more to motor transport and, as one motoring writer said just recently:

For the community, the cost of one vehicle carrying one passenger to an across-town destination is hideously high in terms of road space occupied and congestion created. The social cost of atmospheric contamination cannot be measured but it has been estimated that private motor vehicles are responsible for 40 per cent of air pollution over Australian cities.

I will mention some of the other costs incurred as a result of forcing people to go on to our roadways rather than to travel on our railway systems. There is tremendous cost involved in building highways and expressways in inner city areas. As far back as 1969 every mile of expressway in our inner metropolitan areas was estimated to cost $10m. That was nearly 3 years ago, so it could possibly be $12m or even $13m a mile now, having regard to the cost of resumption of land and construction costs. On top of this there is all the private investment in production and maintenance of motor vehicles, the damage to vehicles, traffic congestion, paying salaries to people who are doing nothing better than sitting in traffic jams looking at traffic lights turning different colours. There is the adverse effect on our environment to which I have referred—the fumes, the noise, the accidents and the pace of living. All these things have an environmental effect.

Mr Foster—The quality of life.

Mr REYNOLDS—It is generally termed the quality of life, quite correctly, and this is one of the aspects of it. I wonder when we will get down to making an estimate of the costs of these different forms of transport. Just a couple of years ago we established the Commonwealth Bureau of Transport Economics. I wonder what it has done about this old problem of estimating whether it is economically desirable—disregarding the social effects—to pour so much money into the construction of urban roads rather than doing something more to update our railway systems. The strong suggestion from overseas currently is that it is bad economic policy. In some of the bigger cities—Boston in the United States of America is one classical example that comes to mind—plans to build great urban expressways have been cancelled and the money has been diverted to other forms of transport. It is high time that we made an evaluation of our investment in the various forms of transport.

I conclude my remarks by saying that the Australian Labor Party has in its policy the establishment of an interstate commission to co-ordinate all types of interstate transport—rail, road, air and water. We intend to provide Commonwealth funds to the States with a view to co-ordinating all forms of transport and upgrading public transport. A Labor government would operate any railways, ports, air routes, shipping services or pipelines referred to the Commonwealth by any State or States. Therefore, if Victoria and New South Wales want to hand over their railways, as they say they do, they will find after the next Federal elections that there will be a government in Canberra which will be only too happy to accept the responsibility of co-ordinating railway development with every other form of transport.

Mr JAMES (Hunter) (11.3)—I congratulate the honourable member for Barton (Mr Reynolds) on his forthright and informative address. The electors of Barton are very fortunate in having a person of his mentality and physical capacity to represent
them. Prior to his address we heard the defeatist speech of the honourable member for Boothby (Mr McLeay). I interpreted his speech as virtually meaning that the Government is doomed and that the Labor Party will fill the Government benches after the next election. The honourable member expressed his disappointment when he mentioned that the Labor Party might introduce first past the post voting. My personal wish is that it will do so. I hope that it will outlaw the splinter parties that stand over governments and threaten to withdraw their second preferences from a government, as the Australian Democratic Labor Party has been doing for some years. It is high time the people of Australia were given a government that was not subject to the pressures exerted by splinter parties.

It is my intention tonight to raise a local matter which is causing great concern to some of my electors. In this debate we have heard much about the aid we give to overseas countries. One supporter of the Government suggested that $50m be given immediately to the Government of Bangladesh toward relieving the starvation and poverty in that country. I think that the provision of some assistance is warranted. I have not been to Bangladesh or India but I understand that the extreme poverty there is appalling and tears at the hearts of Australian visitors. Yet we know that India has more cattle than any other country, and that people in India would sooner starve than slice a piece of beef off the hind quarters of those animals. To Australian people and others who think like them, such an attitude is a bit stupid. However, this behaviour is part of the effect of the dominance of the Hindu religion. One of the 4 freedoms set out in the Atlantic Charter is the freedom of worship. I hope that the Government does do something on an immense scale to relieve the suffering in Bangladesh.

Recently the Public Works Committee approved a sewerage scheme for Tennant Creek—deserving and warranted—and it approved also an improved sewerage scheme at Katherine in the Northern Territory—again, deserving and warranted. I want to direct my remarks to the plight of the people of the little township of Wyee in the southern end of the Hunter electorate. It is known to most honourable members. Residents have been appealing to the local authorities to have their township connected to the water supply. They do not have water, let alone sewerage. The population is growing considerably. A water main has been laid within 1½ to 2 miles of the town. However, the funds of the local council and the Hunter District Water Board are so depleted that they cannot provide water to the homes of these worthy Australian citizens. As the residents of Wyee drive past Lake Munmora and Vales Point power stations day after day, they see hoses which are in operation 24 hours a day to beautify the gardens around these establishments. Yet they do not have access to the regular water supply for their showers and laundry and washing up purposes. I think some priority should be given to these people.

The local government authority has complained about not getting sufficient funds from the State Government. The State Government complains about getting insufficient funds from the Federal Government. While these arguments are going on the people of Wyee are being deprived of water for household needs. If a house in the town caught fire, there would be little possibility of putting out the flames. The problem is aggravated because there is a considerable amount of bushland in the area. As most honourable members know Wyee is situated only 3 miles from the Pacific Highway, which is the main road to Brisbane. It is on the main highway leading into the Hunter Valley. I appeal to the Government, if it is humanly possible, to make a special grant to the Hunter River Water Board so that water can be supplied to Wyee and the standard of living of the residents can be raised.

I think it would be a worthwhile proposition to make a grant to the Lake Macquarie Shire Council, which is one of the most rapidly expanding councils in Australia today. The rate of expansion of a council is usually assessed by the number of building applications that are submitted to it. I understand that more building applications have been submitted to the Lake Macquarie Shire Council than any other council in Australia. The Lake Macquarie shire is a rather expansive shire.

Mr Cope—It is progressive.
Mr JAMES—As the honourable member for Sydney reminds me, it is progressive. Because of its progress and the demands on revenues derived from rates, the shire is unable to allocate any funds for the reticulation of water to Wyee. The Government, in its desperation to stem unemployment, has made grants to certain local councils. But I understand that the Commonwealth Government has stipulated that the money has to be used on the type of work with the highest labour content. Such work would involve picking up papers.

Mr Birrell—And cutting grass.

Mr JAMES—Yes, cutting grass, and the cleaning out of kerbs and gutters. I think that this is a foolish waste of Commonwealth money. It is a fictitious way of reducing the number of unemployed so that the Federal Government will be shown up in a favourable light for electoral purposes later this year. This money which is allocated, for example, to the Lake Macquarie Shire Council should have been used, I should imagine, in a more commonsense way, such as in the provision of a water supply to the little township of Wyee.

Mr Les Johnson—How many people are there?

Mr JAMES—There are 500 or 600 in the vicinity who do not have water. It is high time that the Government reconsidered its scheme. Instead of having men employed on high labour content jobs in the respective shires and allocating money for the sole purpose of reducing the number of unemployed men, this money and the men should be used for jobs that will be everlasting and more beneficial to a community such as the people of Wyee who so urgently need water to be installed to their little township.

As a deputy whip I have always honoured my word to the Government whips, just as I have hoped that they would honour their word to me. I assured the Deputy Government Whip, the honourable member for Angas (Mr Giles), that I would not take more than 10 minutes of the 20 minutes allowed to me in this debate. I understood that the Government was anxious to adjourn this debate after I had spoken. With those few remarks about what is happening to the residents of Wyee, I leave it to the Government to give some consideration to aiding them in a practical and commonsense way.

Debate (on motion by Mr Armitage) adjourned.

CUSTOMS TARIFF BILL (No. 2) 1972

Bill returned from the Senate without amendment.

House adjourned at 11.11 p.m.
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

The following answers to questions upon notice were circulated:

Education: Commonwealth Aid
(Question No. 3485)

Mr Hayden asked the Minister for Education and Science, upon notice:

(1) What was the per student allocation of direct financial aid from the Commonwealth Government to (a) State Schools (b) private non-Catholic schools and (c) private Catholic schools for (i) the last year for which figures are available (ii) the year, five years prior to the last year (iii) the year, ten years prior to the last year.

(2) What was the rate of increase for each category of school listed in part (i) over (a) the five year period and (b) the ten year period.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) and (2) The latest year for which per student figures for direct Commonwealth financial assistance to schools in the States are available is 1970-71. Direct aid to secondary schools in the States in 1970-71 was provided under the Science Laboratories and Schools Libraries Programme for both government and non-government schools and as per capita grants towards the running costs of non-government schools. In 1965-66 such assistance was given for science laboratories only, while in 1960-61 there were no Commonwealth programmes of direct financial assistance to schools. The per student information requested is shown for secondary schools in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning primary schools in the States, per capita grants at the rate of $35 per student were provided by the Commonwealth to non-government schools in 1970-71. In addition assistance is given to both Government and non-government schools under the Child Migrant Education Programme. As this aid, which totalled $1,709,000 for government and $133,000 for Roman Catholic primary and secondary schools in 1970-71, was for a specific group of students only, it is pointless to relate it to total enrolments. It is therefore excluded from the table below.

When considered in isolation, the per student information shown is meaningless because it takes no account of the significant, but indirect contribution by the Commonwealth to the capital and running costs of government schools. For example, with respect to the recurrent costs of government secondary schools in 1970-71 the average per pupil expenditure was in the vicinity of $450 and is estimated to have increased to around $530 in 1971-72. In view of the fact that under the general financial assistance arrangements the Commonwealth Government provides something like half of States' resources for recurrent expenditure on schools, it would be reasonable to say that the Commonwealth contributed indirectly about $225 per pupil towards the recurrent costs of government secondary schools in 1970-71 and is contributing about $265 per pupil in 1971-72.

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT DIRECT FINANCIAL AID TO GOVERNMENT AND NON-GOVERNMENT SECONDARY SCHOOLS
(Average per student enrolled and increase between 1965-66 and 1970-71)

Cheese: Imports
(Question No. 5163)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Trade and Industry, upon notice:

(1) How much cheese has been imported into Australia in the financial year 1971-72 to date.

(2) What was the value of these imports.

(3) What percentage of cheese sold in Australia originated overseas in the years 1969-70, 1970-71 and 1971-72 to date.

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The Commonwealth Statistician has supplied the following information in reply to the honourable member's question.

(1) and (2) For the six months ended 31st December 1971, 7,250,000 lb of cheese were imported into Australia at a value of $3,702,000.

(3) The Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalisation Committee Ltd provides monthly details of sales of Australian cheese for consumption within
the Commonwealth. No details of imported cheese sales, for consumption within the Commonwealth, are available. However, assuming that all cheese imported during the year is sold during that year, the percentage of imported cheese to total sales would be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72 (seven months)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Teachers: Salary Increases
(Question No. 5249)

Mr Lloyd asked the Minister for Education and Science, upon notice:

Can he say what percentage salary increases have been granted to the various classifications of (a) secondary school (b) primary school teachers in the State of Victoria in each of the last 3 years.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

I understand that variations to salaries paid to teachers employed by the Victorian Education Department are promulgated by the Teachers' Tribunal under powers conferred by the Teaching Service Act of the Parliament of Victoria. Variations to salaries are advised by means of Teaching Service (Classification, Salaries and Allowances) Regulations which are published in the Victoria 'Government Gazette' and the 'Education Gazette and Teachers' Aid'.

I suggest that the honourable member might like to consult the files containing these publications in the Parliamentary Library. Alternatively he could approach the Teachers' Tribunal direct for copies of the appropriate regulations.

Education: Student Loans
(Question No. 5493)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Education and Science, upon notice:

Why did his 2 predecessors fail and he himself take so long to release Mr W. J. Weeden's report of 22nd December 1970 on the pros and cons of student loans.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The report by Mr Weeden on the pros and cons of student loans was prepared as a departmental document and was not intended to be a report for publication and general release. However, in view of growing interest in this issue, the decision has been made to distribute the report since it could provide further useful background to any public discussion.

Mr V. G. McGrath: Visit to Taiwan
(Question No. 5499)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Education and Science, upon notice:

What was the cost and purpose of the visit by Mr Vincent G. McGrath to Taiwan in August 1971?

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

I do not have the information requested. I am advised that Mr Vincent G. McGrath made a private visit to a number of countries in Asia, including Taiwan, during the second half of 1971.

Australian National Line: Shipbuilding
(Question No. 4966)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

(1) What is the (a) tonnage, (b) description and (c) contract price of each ship being built in (i) Australia and (ii) overseas for the Australian National Line.

(2) Are vessels of the Australian National Line required to place a substantial proportion of repairs, docking and maintenance work with Australian shipyards.

(3) At what overseas shipyards have vessels of the Australian National Line been repaired during the last 12 months.

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) (i) Australia—
(a) Two of 6,700 g.r.t. each
(b) Roll-on Roll-off steel product carriers
(c) $6,373,389 each.

(ii) Overseas—
One of 25,100 g.r.t.
(b) Cellular container ship
(c) The contract price is 55.707 million Deutsche Marks.

(2) The Australian National Line is autonomous in its day to day operations and no requirement has been imposed on the Line to have the repair, docking and maintenance of its vessels undertaken in Australian shipyards. However, it is the Line's policy, in respect of its coastal vessels, to have this work undertaken in Australia.


Road Fatalities
(Question No. 5061)

Dr Everingham asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

Will he recommend to the Australian Transport Advisory Council the enactment of laws which require (a) safety factors in road fatalities to be investigated as thoroughly as in aircraft fatalities and (b) penalties on unsafe vehicle manufacturers comparable with those on unsafe drug manufacturers.

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

It would indeed be desirable if all road fatalities could be investigated in the same manner as the occasional aircraft fatality. However, the physical resources required and the geographical occurrence of road accidents make the task impracticable.

Insofar as unsafe vehicles are concerned there is no evidence available that new vehicles are the cause of accidents solely because the vehicles are defective.
The Australian Transport Advisory Council has, of course, endorsed the scheme of Motor Vehicle Design Rules and Governments and manufacturers are working to ensure that new vehicles on the road are safe.

The Expert Group on Road Safety has been charged with the responsibility of examining all aspects of road accidents in order to identify their basic causes and to advise how best the road toll can be reduced.

On 14-16 March the Group held a National Road Safety Symposium in Canberra that is expected to play an important part in the national review which the Expert Group is currently making of Australia's road accident situation.

**Railways: Yass-Canberra Link**

(Question No. 5191)

Mr Calwell asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

(1) What is the present position in regard to the proposed railway link between Yass and Canberra.

(2) Has any date been set for the commence-ment of the project.

**Mr Nixon**—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) and (2) As a result of the recently completed Bureau of Transport Economics economic evaluation of a proposed railway line between Canberra and Yass, the proposal was not found to be economically justified. Accordingly there is no plan to proceed any further with the project since it is Government policy that funds will only be pro-vided for those railway projects where it can be demonstrated that the expected benefits exceed the costs involved in their construction.

**Rural Reconstruction Employment Training Scheme**

(Question No. 5292)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Labour and National Service, upon notice:

(1) Will he institute an immediate and urgent investigation into the case of the only rural retrain-applicant I have put forward for Riverina.

(2) Has his attention been drawn to the case of Mr Edwin Collier, of 494 Prune Street, Lavington, who after losing his farm and being found non-viable by the New South Wales Reconstruction Board has been forced to move with his wife and three young children into town.

(3) Is it a fact that his Department has been able to offer Mr Collier a total of only $56 towards his three-year retraining which will cost Mr Collier $1,728.

(4) If so, is this level of assistance not only inadequate, but an insult to farmers in need of assistance.

**Mr Lynch**—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The objective of the Rural Reconstruction Employment Training Scheme is to help eligible farmers to transfer to alternative suitable employ-ment away from their farms. Training may be for one year full time or two years part-time. Full and part-time trainees have their fees paid, are reimbursed the cost of fares to and from the place of training and receive a book and equipment allowance up to $50. Full-time trainees are paid a weekly Training Allowance of $46.20 which is subject to an income test.

Mr Collier has secured suitable alternative employment with an Albury firm. I understand he is being paid at the rate of $80 per week. He asked for assistance with part-time training and this will be approved in order to help him improve his long-term employment prospects. As a part-time trainee he will be eligible for assistance amounting to $36 for fees and books required in the current year, and for similar assistance next year.

**Commonwealth Railways: Industrial Disputes**

(Question No. 5371)

Mr Wallis asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

How many man hours have been lost by employees of Commonwealth Railways in industrial disputes in each of the last 3 years.

**Mr Nixon**—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Ended</th>
<th>Man Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31st March 1970</td>
<td>8,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st March 1971</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31st March 1972</td>
<td>9,461</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of Labour and National Service: Training Schemes**

(Question No. 5386)

Mr Kennedy asked the Minister for Labour and National Service, upon notice:

What are the (a) categories and (b) numbers of officers employed by his Department to administer (i) each and (ii) all of the training and retraining schemes which are being offered by his Department.

**Mr Lynch**—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The training and retraining schemes offered by my Department involve officers in Central Office and in the Regions. There are 24 officers working full time on all schemes. They are able to be used flexibly according to the demand of each scheme. These 24 do not include officers working on international schemes for training people from overseas.

In addition there are officers who deal with applications for training in connection with their work in the Commonwealth Employment Service. There are also Committees which allow officers with special knowledge and experience to play a part in the administration of the training schemes. It is therefore not possible to answer the question with the precision sought by the honourable member.
F111 Aircraft (Question No. 5401)

Mr Daly asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice:

(1) What has been the total cost to date to Australia for the F111 aircraft.
(2) (a) What is the expected date of delivery, and (b) the estimated total cost.
(3) What sum was originally quoted for the aircraft.

Mr Fairbairn—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) Expenditure of $US233,602m has been incurred to 31st March, 1972 on the F111C aircraft project.
(2) (a) Anticipated delivery of these aircraft in the United States is between April and November, 1973. It is expected the aircraft will be ferried to Australia over the period May to November, 1973.
(b) Total aircraft project costs are now estimated at $US344m.
(3) The sum originally quoted for the aircraft project was $US124.5m.

Unemployment (Question No. 5415)

Mr Armitage asked the Minister for Labour and National Service, upon notice:

(1) What are the specific details as to how the number of unemployed is computed for each district including (a) the time allowed before school-leavers, handicapped persons and persons seeking improved positions who have not reported back to the Employment Office are struck from the list of unemployed persons; and (b) the time allowed in respect of all other persons who have not reported back to the Employment Office before they are struck from the list of unemployed.
(2) Has there been any variation in the procedure in recent times either by written or oral instructions.

Mr Lynch—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) At the Friday nearest the end of each month, a detailed count is made in all District Offices of the Commonwealth Employment Service of the number of persons registered who had sought full time employment and were still not placed in a job at the time of the count. Of necessity, these figures will include all those under referral to employers and others who may have recently obtained their own employment without notifying the Employment Office. They also include all recipients of Unemployment Benefit. Persons seeking improved positions are recorded in a separate register and are not included in the count of unemployed; they are, however, assisted to find alternative employment. All applications of persons registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service are kept under frequent and regular review. District Office contact is maintained with the applicants and they are not removed from the registers until it is ascertained that employment assistance is no longer required.
(2) There has been no variation in the procedures, either by written or oral instructions.

Nuclear Energy (Question No. 5533)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice:

Have there been any meetings of the Commonwealth/States Consultative Committee on Nuclear Energy since 8 June 1970 (Hansard, 18 March 1971, page 1123); if so, on what dates.

Mr Swartz—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

There have been no meetings of the Commonwealth/States Consultative Committee on Nuclear Energy since 8th June 1970.

Marine Affairs: Laws covering Private Yachts and Pleasure Craft (Question No. 5538)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

(1) Why did the Acting Minister omit laws covering private yachts and pleasure craft (Hansard, 26 October 1971, page 2556) from the list of matters considered by the Ministers concerned with port developments and marine affairs (Hansard, 26 October 1971, page 2556).
(2) What progress has been made in achieving uniform laws covering these vessels.

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) At the September 1971 meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers on Port Development and Marine Affairs, it was agreed to refer various matters, including control of adventurers and reciprocity in pleasure boat registration, to officials for preparation of a paper.
(2) Officials of the Department of Shipping and Transport and of State port and marine authorities have, for the Council of the Association of Australian Port and Marine Authorities prepared a paper on this subject for consideration by Ministers at their next meeting.

Third Party Insurance (Question No. 5540)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

Has the Transport Advisory Council yet received the report from the committee established by the New South Wales Government to examine all aspects of third party insurance schemes (Hansard, 24 February 1971, page 633).

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

No, the report has not yet been made available by the New South Wales Government.

Australian Wheat Board: Insurance (Question No. 5580)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Primary Industry, upon notice:
(1) Does the Australian Wheat Board insure all wheat of which it takes delivery; if so, with whom does it insure?

(2) If the Board does insure, what premium has been paid by it in each State for each of the years 1967/68, 1968/69, 1969/70 and 1970/71.

Mr Sinclair—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) and (2) The Australian Wheat Board insures all wheat delivered to it. The Board has informed me that its current insurance policy was arranged through a broker with underwriters in Australia and the United Kingdom. It takes the very reasonable view that the publication of the identity of the insurers or the premiums negotiated would be contrary to its commercial interests and thus to the good interests of the wheat industry. It is a view which I support.

Cellular Container Ships

(Question No. 5583)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Shipping and Transport, upon notice:

(1) What is the Government's commitment to cellular container ships

(2) How many ships authorised by the Government are being used by the Australian National Line

(3) What was the cost of these ships

(4) How many more are either being planned or on order

(5) What will be the cost of these ships

(6) Was the Government entered into any agreement with the container lines to guarantee a profitability level covering not only cellular container ships and other vessels of the Australian National Line but also of the conference lines.

Mr Nixon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) The Government is not committed to any particular type of ship and it believes each type has an important role to play in Australia's total shipping requirements.

(2) Cellular container ships being used by the Australian National Line are

(i) 'Australian Endeavour'

(ii) 'Echuca'

(iii) 'Darwin Trader' (also carries bulk cargoes)

(3) The contract price of these vessels to A.N.L. was

(i) 41,065 million Deutsche Marks

(ii) $US1.8 million

(iii) $A6 million

(4) One cellular container ship is on order

(5) The contract price is 55,707 million Deutsche Marks

(6) No.

Australian Meat Board: Chairman

(Question No. 5599)

Dr Everingham asked the Minister for Primary Industry, upon notice:

(1) Is Colonel McArthur, recently appointed Chairman of the Australian Meat Board, the former Chairman of the Australian Egg Board, who presided over the elimination of most small egg producers.

(2) If so, what steps has the Government taken to ensure that similar methods will not be used to eliminate small meat producers when supply exceeds demand.

Mr Sinclair—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) When Colonel McArthur's appointment as Chairman of the Australian Meat Board was announced in the House of Representatives in September 1969, by my predecessor, Mr Anthony, he clearly stated that Colonel McArthur had been Chairman of the Australian Egg Board for the previous two and a half years and President of the Council of Egg Marketing Authorities (C.E.M.A.) since its constitution in 1962. On that occasion Mr Anthony stated that Colonel McArthur's personal drive was largely responsible for the C.E.M.A. plan being drawn up. This plan, which was backed by Federal and State legislation and strongly supported in this Parliament by the Australian Labor Party, drew together the State Egg Boards into a unified marketing organisation and gave the egg industry an opportunity for stability which previously had proved impossible.

It is sheer nonsense to blame Colonel McArthur for the present problems of the egg industry and I take strong exception to the baseless implication in the question that this is the case. On the contrary, Colonel McArthur, having succeeded on behalf of the industry in having their plan implemented, brought to their attention the fact that excessive returns could ultimately be self-defeating by encouraging higher production surpluses for which returns would inevitably be low. It is now some years since Colonel McArthur left the C.E.M.A. and the Australian Egg Board. However, before leaving he had laid the substantial foundation which the egg industry had pressed for and on which they could build for the future.

(2) Neither the Government nor the Chairman of the Australian Meat Board has suggested that small producers of meat should be eliminated nor that their operations should be curtailed in any way. There are many economic and highly successful small operations in the meat industry and whether they continue in the industry or vary the extent of their operations are matters for their own decision.

Private Schools: Assistance

(Question No. 4971)

Mr Kennedy asked the Minister for Education and Science, upon notice:

(1) On what dates and from which officials of (a) Roman Catholic and (b) other private schools in each State and Territory were formal requests received for increased financial assistance in 1971.

(2) What was the (a) nature and (b) value of the assistance sought in each case.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) and (2) I, and officers of my Department, are in continual contact with non-government school officials in the States and Territories. The discussions which take place range over a large number of matters and because of the continuing nature of these discussions they cannot be categorised in the manner suggested.
**M60 Machine-gun**  
(Question No. 5487)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice:

Can he say which countries other than the United States of America and Australia have re-equipped their armies with the M60 machine-gun and for what reasons have other countries declined to do so.

Mr Fairbairn—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The following countries other than the United States of America and Australia have the M60 machine-gun:

- Taiwan
- South Vietnam
- Indonesia (in small numbers)
- New Zealand

It is not known why other countries have not adopted the M60 machine-gun.

**Oil Exploration: Incentives**  
(Question No. 5532)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice:

On what dates have reports been received from the interdepartmental committee established to investigate incentives for oil exploration. (Hansard, 9th September 1971, page 996; 14th October 1971, page 2469; 2nd November 1971, page 2877; and 7th December 1971, page 4131.)

Mr Swartz—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

It is not the Government's practice to provide information of the type sought. However, as the honourable member will be aware I announced the Government's decision to increase the level of incentives for petroleum exploration on 12th March 1972.

**Assistant Ministers**  
(Question No. 5081)

Mr Daly asked the Prime Minister, upon notice:

(1) What facilities, travelling expenses, staff, stamp allowance, telephones and other amenities have been provided to each Assistant Minister.

(2) What sum in travelling allowance has been paid to each Assistant Minister to date.

Mr McMahon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) Facilities approved for Assistant Ministers are:

- actual travelling expenses, to a daily limit, reimbursed for travel in connection with official duties undertaken on behalf of the Minister being assisted (for travel to and from Canberra to attend sittings of Parliament, Assistant Ministers receive the same rate of daily allowance as private Members);
- use of official cars in connection with official duties;
- postage stamps supplied for official mail;
- telephone charges, including home telephone, met by the Commonwealth;
- use of official travel warrants for wife's fares on those occasions when the Minister concerned considers that it is necessary for the Assistant Minister to be accompanied by his wife in the course of his official duties.

In addition, one Clerk/Stenographer position has been approved for the Assistant Ministers assisting the Prime Minister, the Postmaster-General and the Minister for Primary Industry.

(2) Travelling expenses reimbursed to each Assistant Minister against claims made by him to the date shown, in respect of travel in his capacity as Assistant Minister were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Minister</th>
<th>Date of last claim</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. A. A. Street, M.P.</td>
<td>17.2.72</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. D. M. Doble, M.P.</td>
<td>3.12.71</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. Ian Robinson, M.P.</td>
<td>30.3.72</td>
<td>819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Hon. John E. Marriott</td>
<td>30.3.72</td>
<td>1,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. E. McLeay, M.P.</td>
<td>30.3.72</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) No claim yet submitted.

**Assistant Ministers**  
(Question No. 5082)

Mr Daly asked the Prime Minister, upon notice:

(1) What accommodation has been provided for each Assistant Minister in (a) Canberra and (b) each State.

(2) What is the location and telephone number of each office.

Mr McMahon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) & (2) Details of the accommodation provided in Canberra and in each State for Assistant Ministers in their capacity as Assistant Ministers are shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Minister</th>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th>Telephone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. A. A. Street, M.P.</td>
<td>Office at the Department of Labour and National Service, Century Building, 125 Swanston Street, Melbourne</td>
<td>63.0361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. D. M. Doble, M.P.</td>
<td>Office at the Commonwealth Parliament Offices, Martin Place, Sydney, and at the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, East Block, Canberra</td>
<td>25.3804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Hon. John E. Marriott</td>
<td>Office at the Department of Health, Alexander Building, Phillip, Canberra</td>
<td>73.2082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. E. McLeay, M.P.</td>
<td>Office at the Department of Civil Aviation, Da Costa Building, 68 Grenfell Street, Adelaide</td>
<td>81.8411</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No separate accommodation has been provided for the Honourable J. Robinson or the Honourable R. S. King in their capacity as Assistant Ministers. By arrangement, however, with the Minister concerned, Mr Robinson has the use of the offices of the Postmaster-General in Sydney and Melbourne, and Mr King has the use of the office of the Minister for Primary Industry in Melbourne.

The Clerk of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives have provided the following details of accommodation occupied in Parliament House by Assistant Ministers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Minister</th>
<th>Room No.</th>
<th>Telephone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. A. A. Street, M.P.</td>
<td>L98</td>
<td>705 ext. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. D. M. Dobie, M.P.</td>
<td>U104</td>
<td>705 ext. 589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. Ian Robinson, M.P.</td>
<td>U124</td>
<td>705 ext. 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator the Hon. John E. Marriott</td>
<td>M27</td>
<td>705 ext. 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. R. S. King, M.P.</td>
<td>(a) M65</td>
<td>705 ext. 678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. J. E. McLeay, M.P.</td>
<td>L159</td>
<td>705 ext. 120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Shared with one other member

**Incident at Prime Minister's Lodge**  
(Question No. 5144)

Mr Enderby asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice:

(1) Have the Commonwealth Police completed their inquiries into the incident that was alleged to have occurred at the Prime Minister's Lodge on 23 December 1971 when several shots were alleged to have been fired and an attempt made to use a petrol bomb.

(2) If so, what are the results of these inquiries.

(3) Has anyone been apprehended arising out of the incident.

(4) Have any charges been preferred.

(5) Has any inquiry by the police or otherwise been conducted into the part played in the incident by the Commonwealth police officers concerned.

(6) If so, what was the result of that inquiry.

(7) Has any disciplinary or other punitive action been taken against any Commonwealth policemen for any part played in the incident.

(8) Will the Attorney-General publish a full report of what happened.

**Mr N. H. Bowen—The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:**

(1) to (4) An inquiry has been conducted by the Australian Capital Territory Police, since the incident appeared to involve breaches of Territory law. The Commonwealth Police have assisted with the inquiry. The inquiry has covered all sources of information so far available. The inquiry has not been able to establish the identity of the person or persons reported to have intruded into the grounds of the Prime Minister's Lodge or to have fired a shot.

(5) (6) and (7) Commonwealth Police Officers concerned were interviewed by the officers in charge of the inquiry, as part of the normal process of investigation into the incident. The investigation did not disclose any ground for taking disciplinary or other punitive action against the Commonwealth Police Officers on duty at the time.

(8) I think that the position is fully covered in the above answers to the honourable member's questions.

**Department of Foreign Affairs:**  
**China Section**  
(Question No. 5201)

Mr Reynolds asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:

(1) Has there been a reduction in the staff of the China Section of his Department from 5 officers to 2 in the last 2 months.

(2) If so, why has this reduction been made when the question of relations with China has become so important.

(3) Who are the present members of the Section and what are their qualifications and status.

(4) What new appointments are intended to be made in the immediate future.

**Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:**

(1) There was no reduction in the normal number of positions in the China/Korea Section, but for a period of some days recently only 2 officers were actually working in the Section.

(2) This situation arose because of the resignation of the research officer, the temporary absence overseas of the China desk officer, and a short gap which occurred during a routine transfer of duties from one officer to another.

(3) and (4) The structure of the Section and details of the officers occupying the positions at present are as follows:

- Foreign Affairs Officer, Class 4: Mr B. B. Hickey.
- Foreign Affairs Officer, Class 3: Mr R. W. Cottrill.
- Foreign Affairs Officer, Class 2: Mr J. G. Powys.
- Senior Research Officer: Mr C. J. Hole (acting).
- Foreign Affairs Officer, Class 1: Miss S. A. Warner (acting).

There was in addition a further research officer working in the Section who has resigned. Of these officers, Mr Cottrill has undertaken 2 assignments in East Asia and has a fluent knowledge of the Chinese language and Mr Hole and Miss Warner, both of whom have recently joined, the Department, have just returned from studies in Taiwan, and have a high proficiency in the language.

It is proposed that Mr Powys will shortly be posted, and that his successor will be Mr R. C. B. Brown, who also has a good knowledge of the Chinese language.

In addition, the Department advertised the Senior Research Officer position in the Commonwealth Gazette of 6th April as a first step in locating and appointing a suitable permanent occupant of this position.
Until the appointment process is completed, Mr Hole will act in the position.

**Prime Minister's Lodge: Security**  
(Question No. 5238)

Dr J. F. Cairns asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice:

1. What additional security measures have been taken recently at the Prime Minister's Lodge.
2. What has been the cost of these additional security measures.
3. Is it intended to add to the security measures being taken; if so, what will be the cost.
4. Does the Attorney-General or his advisers have any idea of the identity of any persons who may be considered to have endangered security at the Prime Minister's Lodge.

Mr N. H. Bowen—The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:

1. (2) and (3) The security measures taken have been designed to ensure that there is adequate security at the Prime Minister's Lodge at all times. It is not proposed to disclose details of what these measures are, beyond saying that the police guard has been strengthened and that additional communications and other equipment are being installed. The cost of the additional police guard is approximately $670 per week. The first stage of the communications equipment, ultimately intended to serve not only the Lodge, but other Commonwealth Police purposes in the Australian Capital Territory, is estimated to cost $13,000. It is not appropriate to disclose details of other equipment to be installed or of its estimated cost.
2. Not at this stage.

**Privy Council—High Court**  
(Question No. 5302)

Mr Whillam asked the Prime Minister upon notice:

What are the terms of the arrangement with Great Britain under which, since 17th January 1963, Justices of the High Court of Australia are appointed members of the Privy Council.

Mr McMahon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The appointment of Justices of the High Court to the Privy Council stems from an arrangement between the Australian and British Governments entered into in 1962. Under these arrangements, the Australian Prime Minister recommends to his British counterpart that he tender advice to the Queen that Justices be made Privy Counsellors. This is usually done after they have been members of the High Court for some time. Although Justices of the High Court appointed Privy Counsellors become members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, there are no formal arrangements concerning their participation in the proceedings of that Committee.

**Rhodesia**  
(Question No. 5345)

Dr Klugman asked the Prime Minister, upon notice:

1. Has he received a letter from Father Patrick Connor, S.V.D., of the Divine Word Missionaries, Epping, New South Wales, regarding the imprisonment of Garfield and Judith Todd by the Smith regime in Rhodesia.
2. I so, (a) when did he receive it, (b) when will he acknowledge receipt and (c) when will he reply to the letter.

Mr McMahon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Father Connor's letter was received in my office on 11th February 1972 and a reply was sent on 13th March 1972.

**Laos**  
(Question No. 5428)

Dr Everingham asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:

1. Has his attention been drawn to a report in 'The Australian' of 18th January 1972: that the Royal Lao and American military in Laos are resigned to the ability of North Vietnam to take over from the corrupt, divisive nepotism and immorality of the feudal Lao regime.
2. Has a request for military help from Australia been made by Lao authorities.
3. What is the extent of Australian (a) military and (b) civil aid to Laos.

Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

1. I assume the report referred to is the article by Jack Foisi written in Pakse and published in 'The Australian' on 18th January 1972. I do not accept the descriptions of conditions in Laos given by Mr Foisi or quoted by him. In particular, I reject the assertion that difficulties facing the Laotian armed forces 'can be explained only in terms of the divisiveness and immorality in Laos'. The article overlooks the fact that Laos has been invaded by a ruthless and powerful neighbour which, in pursuit of its own ambitions, has disregarded Laotian attempts to live in peace and neutrality.
2. (a) and (b) The Royal Laotian Government has at no time requested the despatch of Australian forces to Laos or the provision of arms or military equipment from Australia. Australia has from time to time provided military training in Australia to Royal Laotian Army personnel. Eighteen such personnel have received training in Australia over the past 11 years. The most recent training (6 officers at the Jungle Training Centre, Canungra) stems from a request for assistance in jungle warfare training made to the Government by the Laotian Delegate for Defence, Mr Sisouk Na Champassak, during the course of his visit to Australia in September 1970. Requests for military training, particularly in jungle warfare, are received from many friendly countries, and Australia is pleased to assist with places when these can be provided.

Between 30th June 1961 and 30th June 1971 Australia gave civil aid to the value of $6,453,700.
to Laos. Over half of this comprised contributions to the Foreign Exchange Operations Fund (FEOF) which was established in 1964 as a measure to help stabilise the Laotian economy. Project aid to Laos has included inter alia the provision of equipment to Laotian National Radio, assistance with a livestock development project, 5 gifts of primary school supplies and assistance with teacher training. Currently the main programmes are the Laos-Australian Reafforestation Project and the establishment of a Forestry Ranger School in Vientiane. Australia has also contributed $A552,000 to the Nam Ngum Dam Project, which is administered by the World Bank.

Asian-Pacific Economic Community

(questions No. 5458)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:

(1) Has a study been made of proposals for the formation of an Asian-Pacific Economic Community with Australia taking the initiative?

(2) Have any preliminary talks been entered into with neighbouring nations, apart from New Zealand with which we already have special trading arrangements, to explore this concept?

(3) Have any initiatives been taken by Australia through United Nations agencies to develop and advance trade in the Asian-Pacific region.

Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) While proposals for the formation of an Asian-Pacific Economic Community have been followed with close attention by interested departments, the Government has not contemplated any initiative with regard to the formation of such a Community. The Government's view is that the specific interests of Australia and the countries of the Asian-Pacific area are better served by multilateral initiatives aimed at the expansion and liberalisation of world trade rather than through the creation of separate economic blocs which would result in the fragmentation of the present international trading system. However the Government sees a need for continuing analysis of its present and future economic relations among Pacific nations and recently I announced that the Government would contribute towards the cost of a joint project by Australian and Japanese academic economists for co-ordinated research on the Western Pacific economy, including the potential for growth and trade in the Western Pacific region and on the role of the major Western Pacific countries in the international economy.

(2) In the normal course there have been discussions, both bilateral and in multilateral forums, relating to matters of regional economic interests although such discussions have not been directed specifically towards the formation of an Asian-Pacific Economic Community. Australia is of course willing to consider any concrete proposals that may be made.

(3) Within the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFÉ), the main forum for economic consultations among countries of the Asian and Pacific region, Australia, with other member countries, has taken and will continue to take an active part in the study and discussion of proposals for regional economic co-operation in various fields. A particular Australian initiative of benefit to the developing countries in ECAFÉ though the scheme is a global one, has been our scheme of tariff preference for less developed countries.

Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act

(Question No. 5476)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice:


Mr N. H. Bowen—The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:

No.

Trade Practices Act

(Question No. 5481)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice:

What progress has been made with the proposal to amend the Trade Practices Act (a) to prohibit horizontal price fixing agreements and (b) to remove the secrecy provisions (Hansard, 18th August 1971, page 198).

Mr N. H. Bowen—The Attorney-General has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:

The Government has been engaged in recent months in a comprehensive review of the restrictive trade practices legislation and hopes to be able shortly to announce its proposals for further legislation.

World Tourist Organisation

(Question No. 5509)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:


Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

No.

Bacteriological and Toxin Weapons

(Question No. 5555)

Mr Whitlam asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:

Which countries have signed the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production
and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction.

Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

The Convention was opened for signature in London, Washington and Moscow on 10th April 1972. In London the following 49 countries signed the Convention:

Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Germany (Federal Republic), Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Spain, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia.

In Washington the following 75 countries signed the Convention:

Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burundi, Canada, Central African Republic, Ceylon, Chile, China (Republic of), Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Denmark, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Khmer Republic, Korea (Republic of), Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Venezuela, Vietnam (Republic of), Zaire.

In Moscow the following 47 countries signed the Convention:

Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany (Federal Republic of), Germany (Democratic Republic of), Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Iran, Italy, Japan, Laos, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Rumania, Rwanda, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Yugoslavia, Zaire.

South Africa: Racial Sporting Policies

(Question No. 5604)

Mr Kennedy asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice:

Did he discuss with the Prime Minister a further possible protest to the South African Government against its racial sporting policies as mentioned by the Prime Minister on 9th September 1971 (Hansard, page 989)?

Mr N. H. Bowen—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

The answer given to the first part of Question No. 5193 on 11th April 1972 (Hansard, page 1462) also applies to this question.

Decentralisation

(Question No. 5635)

Mr Grassby asked the Prime Minister, upon notice:

(1) What is the present position of the Commonwealth-State Officials Committee on Decentralisation established by decision of the Premiers' Conference in July 1964.

(2) Will he bring up-to-date his answer to Question No. 3794 (Hansard, 10th September 1971, page 1148).

Mr McMahon—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) and (2) The Commonwealth-State Officials Committee on Decentralisation met on 27th April to consider a draft report which had been prepared since the Committee last met in October 1971, which among other things will bring together the findings of the commissioned studies referred to in answer to Question No. 3794 on 10th September 1971. I am advised that the Committee's deliberations should enable it to finalise its report and present it to the Governments of the Commonwealth and the States in the near future.

Meat: Sales to United States of America

(Question No. 5639)

Mr Grassby asked the Minister for Primary Industry, upon notice:

What is the reason for the discrepancy in the figures provided by the Australian Meat Board and the United States Department of Agriculture on Australian meat sales to the United States of America in 1971.

Mr Sinclair—The reply to the honourable member's question is as follows:

Neither the Australian Meat Board nor the United States Department of Agriculture, which obtains its figures from the United States Bureau of Census, publish details of sales of Australian meat. These organisations publish respectively statistics of exports and imports of meat. However, in examining the 2 sets of statistics it must be realised that discrepancies occur because of the differing methods of recording used. The Australian Meat Board, as part of its responsibility of controlling exports to the United States to ensure that Australia does not overshade against its quota, keeps records based on meat exported on vessels scheduled to arrive in the United States during the period 1st January to 31st December. This
arrival period approximates to exports made between November and October. A second factor is that the United States statistics include only meat for which the necessary documents have been received by the Bureau of Census. Thus, if a vessel arrives late in a particular month the quantities of meat discharged from that vessel may not necessarily be recorded in the month of discharge but could appear in the following month’s statistics. An example of the differences which can arise because of the above factors is in 1971, when exports of ‘quota’ meats for arrival between 1st January and 31st December, as recorded by the Board totalled 242,304 tons, while the corresponding import figure as recorded by the United States Bureau of Census was 236,607 tons.

NEW SOUTH WALES AND AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY

(A) CONSTRUCTION CAMPS WHICH CLOSED OR WERE REDUCED TO A LEVEL THAT POST OFFICE FACILITIES WERE NO LONGER REQUIRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lostock ($3.13)</th>
<th>Toonumbar Dam ($3.50)</th>
<th>Verandah Camp (60 cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amesbury (79 cents)</td>
<td>Hatfield (13 cents)</td>
<td>Pyree (74 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argents Hill (40 cents)</td>
<td>Hewetsons Mill (16 cents)</td>
<td>Reidsdale (41 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurville (10 cents)</td>
<td>Holmwood (43 cents)</td>
<td>Royalla, A.C.T. (97 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barralier (12 cents)</td>
<td>Jembaicumbene ($1.34)</td>
<td>Ruckenvale (75 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwick (45 cents)</td>
<td>Junee Reefs (30 cents)</td>
<td>Ruthven (39 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Swamp ($4.42)</td>
<td>Kadungie (51 cents)</td>
<td>Springfield (1.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanket Flat (44 cents)</td>
<td>Kangiara (52 cents)</td>
<td>Spring Terrace (61 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boono Boodoo (14 cents)</td>
<td>Karis Springs (15 cents)</td>
<td>Stanford Merthyr (55 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borambil (58 cents)</td>
<td>Langley Vale (50 cents)</td>
<td>Stannum (56 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briggvale (51 cents)</td>
<td>Little Plain (41 cents)</td>
<td>Sunnyside (16 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungulla (6 cents)</td>
<td>Lower Acacia Creek (6 cents)</td>
<td>Talmalmo (16 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrawood (10 cents)</td>
<td>Lower Bucsa (76 cents)</td>
<td>The Risk (47 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrantage (30 cents)</td>
<td>Lower Towamba ($1.11)</td>
<td>Timmsvale (24 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabbage Tree Island (42 cents)</td>
<td>McKee Hill (88 cents)</td>
<td>Tintenbar (57 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Lansdowne (33 cents)</td>
<td>Megan (58 cents)</td>
<td>Toms Creek (23 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleyong (78 cents)</td>
<td>Merroo Meadow (39 cents)</td>
<td>Tooiljooa (37 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergato (63 cents)</td>
<td>Milguy (76 cents)</td>
<td>Trida (83 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colleringa (71 cents)</td>
<td>Miller’s Forrest (89 cents)</td>
<td>Tumorama (51 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colley Blue ($1.17)</td>
<td>Minore (29 cents)</td>
<td>Tuncester (62 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coombell (20 cents)</td>
<td>Mirra View ($1.87)</td>
<td>Upper Bingara (50 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copeton (27 cents)</td>
<td>Missabotti (25 cents)</td>
<td>Urangeline East (47 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corndale (17 cents)</td>
<td>Moleton (17 cents)</td>
<td>Wang Wauk (30 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couridjah (14 cents)</td>
<td>Mongra (35 cents)</td>
<td>Wapengo (79 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossmaglenn (57 cents)</td>
<td>Morans Crossing (21 cents)</td>
<td>West Lynne (70 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cudgera Creek (56 cents)</td>
<td>Morisset Park ($1.62)</td>
<td>Westville (28 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuddirbi (21 cents)</td>
<td>Mount Fairy (81 cents)</td>
<td>Wollandilly (27 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke Forest (29 cents)</td>
<td>Mullion Creek (95 cents)</td>
<td>Wondalga (8 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darnick ($1.21)</td>
<td>Nana Glen Rail ($1.23)</td>
<td>Woodford Dale (46 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Toorale (12 cents)</td>
<td>Nelungaloo (93 cents)</td>
<td>Woodford Leigh (51 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellenborough (58 cents)</td>
<td>New Mollyan (38 cents)</td>
<td>Woodhill (90 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairholme (29 cents)</td>
<td>Noobinba (80 cents)</td>
<td>Woodview (50 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxground (31 cents)</td>
<td>North Araluen (53 cents)</td>
<td>Wyanga (69 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossodia ($1.22)</td>
<td>Oranmeir (24 cents)</td>
<td>Yallah (39 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gular Rail (23 cents)</td>
<td>Owens Gap (70 cents)</td>
<td>Ysouk (3 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulpa (17 cents)</td>
<td>Peakview (41 cents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gum Flat (45 cents)</td>
<td>Peedwood (84 cents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunditjima (43 cents)</td>
<td>Pinlaco (40 cents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES

(C) SUBURBAN-TYPE POST OFFICES IN PROVINCIAL CENTRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bolton Point ($1.09)</th>
<th>East Tamworth ($4.42)</th>
<th>Richmond East ($2.84)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congewai (13 cents)</td>
<td>Goobarrabah Point (85 cents)</td>
<td>South Corowa (30 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowra North ($2.08)</td>
<td>Katoomba South ($4.38)</td>
<td>South Woy Woy ($2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowra South ($2.09)</td>
<td>Lismore Hospital Hill ($3.05)</td>
<td>Yass North ($2.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dapto South ($5.50)</td>
<td>Noraville ($3.74)</td>
<td>Young South ($1.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Answers to Questions

## REPRESENTATIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashfield North ($27.84)</th>
<th>Cronulla South ($6.30)</th>
<th>Lugarno North ($19.41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bayview ($7.47)</td>
<td>Ewey Bay ($1.31)</td>
<td>Monterey ($1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly Hills North ($12.73)</td>
<td>Girraween ($9.15)</td>
<td>Ryde East ($4.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabarita Junction ($12.63)</td>
<td>Lindfield East ($21.08)</td>
<td>Waverley East ($3.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Whale Beach ($3.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VICTORIA

(A) CAMPS AND HOSTELS WHICH CLOSED OR WERE REDUCED TO A LEVEL THAT POST OFFICE FACILITIES WERE NO LONGER REQUIRED

| C.I.C. Bonegilla ($22.43) | Mil. P.O. Broadmeadows ($18.23) |

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allectree ($1.81)</th>
<th>Greta (19 cents)</th>
<th>Neerim North (39 cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Rail (26 cents)</td>
<td>Harcourt North (86 cents)</td>
<td>Newham (91 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthurs Creek (38 cents)</td>
<td>Healesville West (31 cents)</td>
<td>Nowie North (reco d : destroyed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baranduda (11 cents)</td>
<td>Heskct (45 cents)</td>
<td>Oaklands Junction (81 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnadown (17 cents)</td>
<td>Heskct S. S. (78 cents)</td>
<td>Orbost North ($1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barongarook West (19 cents)</td>
<td>Hotspur (33 cents)</td>
<td>Picola West (16 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindi (6 cents)</td>
<td>Illabarook (19 cents)</td>
<td>Pier Millan (27 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blamped (68 cents)</td>
<td>Kal Kallo (71 cents)</td>
<td>Polkemmet East (5 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolwarra (25 cents)</td>
<td>Koroop (21 cents)</td>
<td>Pooitlla (95 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brit Brit (6 cents)</td>
<td>Lab (85 cents)</td>
<td>Rathsar (42 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo River South (4 cents)</td>
<td>Lake Charm Rail ($1.30)</td>
<td>Sailors Falls (33 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullarto (50 cents)</td>
<td>Lake Tyers (20 cents)</td>
<td>Salisbury West (36 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calalu (25 cents)</td>
<td>Lamplough (17 cents)</td>
<td>Scotsburn (73 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapple Vale (19 cents)</td>
<td>Leonards Hill (30 cents)</td>
<td>Skenes Creek (69 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childers (81 cents)</td>
<td>Little Hampton (52 cents)</td>
<td>Tambo Crossing (33 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corangamite (2 cents)</td>
<td>Lorquon ($2.04)</td>
<td>Telford (20 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossley (27 cents)</td>
<td>Magpie ($5.48)</td>
<td>Tolmie (46 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dereel ($2.61)</td>
<td>Markwood (90 cents)</td>
<td>Tongio (30 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollar (28 cents)</td>
<td>Marung (31 cents)</td>
<td>Vasey (53 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreiste (34 cents)</td>
<td>Melwood (31 cents)</td>
<td>Walkerville (30 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drik Drik (54 cents)</td>
<td>Merbein West (56 cents)</td>
<td>Watchupa ($1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eden Park (17 cents)</td>
<td>Middle Creek (12 cents)</td>
<td>Willing South (28 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield (56 cents)</td>
<td>Mirboo (84 cents)</td>
<td>Winnap ($1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evansford (30 cents)</td>
<td>Moliagul (36 cents)</td>
<td>Wongarra (22 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairy Dell (46 cents)</td>
<td>Mumbannar (39 cents)</td>
<td>Woodstock (70 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermans Beach (83.66)</td>
<td>Myamyn (67 cents)</td>
<td>Wool Wool ($1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaggy Creek (16 cents)</td>
<td>Myers Flat (39 cents)</td>
<td>Wulgurumpa (58 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamut (38 cents)</td>
<td>Nambrook ($2.56)</td>
<td>Yerode (15 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goraie (14 cents)</td>
<td>Napoleons (20 cents)</td>
<td>Yoonumite (54 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenvald (49 cents)</td>
<td>Nar Nar Goon North (64 cents)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Queensland

(A) CONSTRUCTION CAMP, PROJECT COMPLETED

| Moongan (6 cents) |

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baking Board (5 cents)</th>
<th>Gilgulgul (44 cents)</th>
<th>Pechev (40 cents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barabon (29 cents)</td>
<td>Glenmorganvale (42 cents)</td>
<td>Rasmussen ($2.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benholme (9 cents)</td>
<td>Gooray (31 cents)</td>
<td>Rockside (13 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benowa (31 cents)</td>
<td>Gootchie (44 cents)</td>
<td>Rossville (6 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byre (69 cents)</td>
<td>Gurulmundu (31 cents)</td>
<td>Scottsville ($1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carstairs (3.58)</td>
<td>Habana (66 cents)</td>
<td>Tanby (31 cents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathu (24 cents)</td>
<td>Iveragh (10 cents)</td>
<td>Tannalo (69 cents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Suburban-Type Post Offices in Provincial Centres

| Cruso (1.52) | Nerrina ($1.15) | Traralgon East ($6.42) |
| Moe East ($2.96) | St Arnaud North (24 cents) | Warragul Heights ($2.44) |
| Morwell West (22 cents) | Specimen Hill ($1.98) | |

## Post Offices in the Metropolitan Area Where There is Another Post Office Within a Reasonable Distance

| Boronia West ($11.41) | Glengala ($26.51) | Seaholme ($5.60) |
| Clarinda ($9.19) | Heatherdale ($8.82) | Westall ($4.85) |
| Donvale ($13.27) | Montmorency South ($4.83) | |
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Cedar Grove (41 cents) Joskeleigh (34 cents) Toobanna ($1.38)
Clarke River (13 cents) Longpocket ($2.03) Upper Brookfield (31 cents)
Cordelia ($1.91) Minden ($1.32) Wandaruu (57 cents)
Dalberg ($1.05) Mount Glorious (33 cents) Willowburn (Nil)
Eimeo ($1.84) Nikenbah ($1.91) Womatilla (6 cents)
Emerald Creek ($1.00) Pawngilly (75 cents) 

(C) SUBURBAN-TYPE POST OFFICES IN PROVINCIAL CENTRES
Ayr East ($6.45) Goose Ponds ($9.02) Rossvale ($32.95)
Bown West ($4.63) Innisfail South ($6.93) 

(D) POST OFFICES IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA WHERE THERE IS ANOTHER POST OFFICE WITHIN A REASONABLE DISTANCE
Auchenflower ($38.10)(a) Camelot ($9.30) Grovely ($12.98)(b)
Rosalie ($42.99)(a) 

(a) New Milton Centre Post Office opened nearby. (b) Office repositioned and renamed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA AND NORTHERN TERRITORY

(A) R.A.A.F. BASE CONSTRUCTION CAMP PROJECT COMPLETED
Tindal, N.T. ($6.06)

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES
Apamurra (25 cents) Harben Vale (24 cents) Steepleton (21 cents)
Athens (37 cents) Huddleston (29 cents) Stockyard Creek (37 cents)
Australia Plains (38 cents) Koonibba (64 cents) Terka (57 cents)
Barabba (26 cents) Koruyne (23 cents) Tickera (70 cents)
Biggs Flat (7 cents) Kuitpo Colony (11 cents) Timber Creek, N.T. (24 cents)
Bookabie (50 cents) Linwood (4 cents) Uooloo (30 cents)
Boowilla (21 cents) Mirikata (68 cents) Wall Flat (65 cents)
Brecon (39 cents) Mortana (30 cents) Wellington East (23 cents)
Caliph (19 cents) Mount Benson (16 cents) Whiptawra (99 cents)
Carpa (34 cents) Neales Flat (10 cents) Willow Creek (16 cents)
Cobera (12 cents) Ninnies (17 cents) Wilpena Pound ($2.03)
Cumlife (5 cents) Port Julia (15 cents) Winulta (38 cents)
Dowlingley (65 cents) Red Banks (19 cents) Wokurna (10 cents)
Everard Central (19 cents) Roper Bar, N.T. (9 cents) Woods Flat (5 cents)
Forster (25 cents) St Kitts (5 cents) Worlds End Creek (5 cents)
Green Plains (2 cents) Sellicks Hill (44 cents) Yandiah (85 cents)

(C) SUBURBAN-TYPE POST OFFICES IN PROVINCIAL CENTRES
Nil

(D) POST OFFICES IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA WHERE THERE IS ANOTHER POST OFFICE WITHIN A REASONABLE DISTANCE
Gepps Cross ($3.33) Wayville ($18.77) West Croydon ($10.11)

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

(A) DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS WHICH WERE COMPLETED, OR PERSONNEL REDUCED, TO A LEVEL THAT POST OFFICE FACILITIES WERE NO LONGER REQUIRED
Ord River Dam ($12.96) Tom Price South ($28.10)

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES
Bickley ($2.12) Horrocks (65 cents) Nolba (24 cents)
Broad Arrow (39 cents) Jingalup (96 cents) Pindar (76 cents)
Collie Cardiff (38 cents) Korbil (32 cents) Point Samson (47 cents)
Eradu (5 cents) Kumarrina ($1.49) Roy Hill (76 cents)
Erikin (65 cents) Mundaring Weir (30 cents) Turkey Creek (49 cents)
Glenfield (48 cents) Mundiwindi (92 cents) Whitmee Creek ($3.13)
Hamecin Pool (11 cents) 

(C) SUBURBAN-TYPE POST OFFICES IN PROVINCIAL CENTRES
Nil

(D) POST OFFICES IN THE METROPOLITAN AREA WHERE THERE IS ANOTHER POST OFFICE WITHIN A REASONABLE DISTANCE
City Beach (records destroyed) Swan View West ($2.03) Victoria Park, Berwick Street West ($3.93)
TASMANIA

(A) HYDRO ELECTRIC COMMISSION TOWN CLOSED DUE TO RE-ARRANGEMENT OF COMMISSION'S FACILITIES

Waddamana ($1.00)

(B) SMALL RURAL POST OFFICES

Bangor (23 cents)
Beulah Lower (21 cents)
Cairns Bay (28 cents)
Eugenia ($1.00)
Glenora (54 cents)
Goshen (18 cents)
Herrick (96 cents)
Highcroft (81 cents)
Liena (42 cents)
Longley ($3.42)

Lorinna (7 cents)
Lunawanna (69 cents)
Mayberry (5 cents)
Moltema (76 cents)
Moorina (40 cents)
Mount Direction (32 cents)
National Park ($1.11)
Oldina (15 cents)
Osterley (68 cents)
Rowella (97 cents)
Royal George (72 cents)
Bunyemede (23 cents)
Sandford ($1.03)
Simpsons Bay (87 cents)
South Mount Cameron (23 cents)
Turners Marsh (25 cents)
Underwood (23 cents)
Weegena (41 cents)
Weldborough (65 cents)

(C) SUBURBAN-TYPE POST OFFICES IN PROVINCIAL CENTRES

Riverside West ($4.07)

Mount Nelson ($1.43)

Television: Colour Transmission

(Question No. 5275)

Mr Scholes asked the Postmaster-General, upon notice:

What alterations will be required to existing television receivers and aerials in order to facilitate the satisfactory reception of colour transmissions.

Sir Alan Hulme—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

I have sought advice on this matter from the Chairman of the Australian Broadcasting Control Board.

In reply to the honourable member’s question, it is first necessary to emphasise that colour transmissions can only be viewed in colour by using a colour receiver. It is not feasible to modify existing receivers to display coloured pictures. It will therefore be necessary for viewers who wish to receive colour television to purchase a new receiver.

However, the P.A.L. system chosen for Australian colour transmissions has been designed to provide good colour reception and at the same time produce satisfactory black and white pictures on existing receivers. There should thus be no need to make alterations to either the receiver or the aerial to continue to receive black and white pictures. It is known that some viewers presently tolerate mediocre picture quality arising from poor performance aerials or receivers which are in need of adjustment. In such cases the colour transmission may cause some further reduction of what is already poor picture quality. These cases are expected to occur in only a small percentage of existing homes and the remedy would be an adjustment of the receiver by a serviceman or in fewer cases, the replacement of the aerial.

In order to obtain satisfactory reception of colour pictures using a colour receiver the existing aerial should prove satisfactory provided the black and white picture is presently of good quality. It is expected that this will apply to a majority of homes in Australia, but for others it could be necessary to replace the aerial and aerial connecting cable. In the case of receivers in blocks of flats and similar situations, where a number of receivers take their signal from the one aerial, satisfactory colour pictures should be received without alteration, if the installation has been engineered to give a high quality of black and white reception.

In general, it is expected that the great majority of viewers will need to make no alteration to their receivers or aerials if they wish to receive colour transmissions in black and white. As indicated above, to receive colour, all viewers will need to purchase a new receiver, and in order to get satisfactory colour pictures, it is probable that a small proportion of the viewers will need to replace their existing aerials. It would seem desirable that before replacing an aerial to receive colour, viewers should await the commencement of colour transmissions.

Telephones

(Question No. 5297)

Mr Kennedy asked the Postmaster-General upon notice:

(1) What is the ratio of public telephones to private dwellings in the Commonwealth.
(2) What is the ratio of public telephones to military permanent married quarters in the (a) Puckapunyal and (b) Seymour areas in Victoria.
(3) How many (a) public telephones and (b) military permanent married quarters are there in each of those areas.
(4) What is the (a) ratio of public telephones to all dwellings and (b) number of. (i) public telephones and (ii) private dwellings in the entire urban area of Seymour.

Sir Alan Hulme—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) 1:111. This ratio is based on the number of public telephones in operation at the time of the
latest statistics which have been released on private dwellings, i.e., the 1966 Commonwealth Census.

(2) (a) 1:66.
(b) 1:256.
(3) (a) Puckapunyal—8.
(b) Seymour—1.
(c) Puckapunyal—531.
(d) Seymour—256.
(4) (a) 1:97.
(b) (i) 18.
(ii) 1,747.
(The number of residences in the Seymour urban area is the current figure recorded by the Council of the Shire of Seymour.)

Film and Television Producers Training School
(Question No. 5350)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for the Environment, Aborigines and the Arts, upon notice:

What progress has been made in establishing a training school for film and television producers which the Prime Minister indicated on 26th October 1971 (Hansard, page 2514) will become the subject of a proposal which could be presented to the Government well before the next Budget and not necessarily, therefore, in a Budget context.

Mr Howson—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

I refer the honourable member to my statement to the House on 19th April 1972 (Hansard, page 1782).

World War II: Japanese Plans
(Question No. 5429)

Dr Everingham asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to a report in the ‘Australian’ of 18th January 1972 that the Japanese decoded official Australian messages indicating that a Japanese invasion was expected after the first bombing raid on Darwin, that the raids were in fact aimed at support logistics, that invasion was never considered by the over-extended Japanese military and that air superiority and more efficient anti-aircraft action finally turned the situation against Japan in 1943.
(2) If so, will the Government review the situation and release documents bearing on this period to show how difficult it would be for a major naval and military force to attempt invasion of a well equipped, trained and informed Australian nation.

Mr Fairbairn—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The Minister has seen the article in ‘The Australian’ of 18th January 1972.
(2) The documents bearing on this period are being prepared for release, as announced recently by the Government.

RAAF Aircraft: Deployment to Butterworth
(Question No. 5453)

Mr Morrison asked the Minister representing the Minister for Air, upon notice:

(1) Have any RAAF aircraft, normally based in Australia, been deployed to the base at Butterworth, Malaysia, since January 1971.
(2) If so, for what purpose were they deployed and how long did they remain on station.

Mr Holten—The Minister for Air has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) Yes.
(2) The following is a summary of deployments of Australia-based Royal Australian Air Force aircraft to Butterworth since January 1971:
(a) Neptune—
4 aircraft for 19 days—maritime exercise
2 aircraft for 4 days—navigation training exercise
(b) Orion—
One aircraft for one day—navigation training exercise
(c) Canberra—
3 aircraft for 6 weeks
3 aircraft for 3½ weeks
3 aircraft for 5 weeks
(target towing; and
(d) Hercules—
Scheduled services involved with the movement of personnel and equipment for the 3 services operated over the period and varied between 4 to 9 flights every 2 weeks. Each Hercules normally remains for one day at Butterworth. Each month one aircraft provides transport assistance within Malaysia for 2 days for Air Headquarters Malaysia.

Mirage Aircraft
(Question No. 5454)

Mr Morrison asked the Minister representing the Minister for Air, upon notice:

What is the distance from Butterworth, Malaysia, to the nearest airport on Australian soil capable of accepting Mirage aircraft.

Mr Holten—The Minister for Air has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

The nearest airfield on the Australian mainland capable of accepting Mirage aircraft is Learmonth and this is a distance of 1850 nautical miles from Butterworth. However, the airfield at Cocos Island which is 1070 nautical miles from Butterworth is also capable of accepting Mirage aircraft.