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An Act to amend the Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act 1975.


Agricultural Tractors Bounty Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 30 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Agricultural Tractors Bounty Act 1966.

Apple and Pear Stabilization Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 17 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Apple and Pear Stabilization Act 1971.

Apple and Pear Stabilization Export Duty Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 18 of 1977)—

Apple and Pear Stabilization Export Duty Collection Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 19 of 1977)—

Appropriation Act (No. 3) 1976–77 (Act No. 35 of 1977)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, additional to the sums appropriated by the Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1976–77, for the service of the year ending on 30 June 1977.

Appropriation Act (No. 4) 1976–77 (Act No. 36 of 1977)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, additional to the sum appropriated by the Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1976–77, for certain expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 1977.

An Act to authorize Australia to Subscribe for Shares of the Capital Stock of the Asian Development Bank.

Australian Development Assistance Agency (Repeal) Act 1977 (Act No. 24 of 1977)—
An Act to repeal the Australian Development Assistance Agency Act 1974, and for related purposes.

An Act to establish an Australian Meat and Live-stock Corporation, and for other purposes.

Australian National Railways Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 38 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Australian National Railways Act 1917.

Automatic Data Processing Equipment Bounty Act 1977 (Act No. 28 of 1977)—
An Act to provide for the Payment of a Bounty on the Production of certain Automatic Data Processing Equipment.

Bed Sheetings Bounty Act 1977 (Act No. 29 of 1977)—
An Act to provide for the Payment of a Bounty on the Production of certain Bed Sheetings.

Commonwealth Bureau of Roads (Repeal) Act 1977 (Act No. 27 of 1977)—
An Act to repeal the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads Act 1964, and for related purposes.

Commonwealth Legal Aid Commission Act 1977 (Act No. 80 of 1977)—
An Act to Establish a Commonwealth Legal Aid Commission and for related purposes.

Commonwealth Teaching Service Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 26 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Commonwealth Teaching Service Act 1972.

Conciliation and Arbitration Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 64 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 and for other purposes.

Customs Tariff Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 73 of 1977)—
An Act relating to Duties of Customs.

Customs Tariff Validation Act (No. 2) 1977 (Act No. 74 of 1977)—
An Act to provide for the Validation of certain Collections of Duties of Customs.

Dairy Industry Assistance Act 1977 (Act No. 34 of 1977)—

Dairy Industry Assistance Levy Act 1977 (Act No. 55 of 1977)—
An Act to impose a levy upon certain Fresh Milk Products produced in Australia.

Dairy Industry Stabilization Act 1977 (Act No. 51 of 1977)—
An Act providing for the collection of Levy imposed by the Dairy Industry Stabilization Levy Act 1977 and the establishment of a Dairy Products Stabilization Trust Fund and for other purposes.

Dairy Industry Stabilization Levy Act 1977 (Act No. 52 of 1977)—
An Act to impose a Levy upon certain Dairy Products produced in Australia.

Dairy Produce Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 53 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Dairy Produce Act 1924.

Defence Amendment Act (No. 2) 1977 (Act No. 20 of 1977)—
An Act to amend sections 80a and 83 of the Defence Act 1903.

Defence Service Homes Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 79 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Defence Service Homes Act 1918, and for related purposes.
Health Insurance Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 75 of 1977)—

Housing Loans Insurance Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 39 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Housing Loans Insurance Act 1965.

Income Tax Assessment Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 57 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Law relating to Income Tax.

Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 37 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Act 1976.

Income Tax (Rates) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 42 of 1977)—

Insurance Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 31 of 1977)—

Law Courts (Sydney) Act 1977 (Act No. 22 of 1977)—
An Act relating to the Transfer of certain Land in Sydney to Law Courts Limited and the exemption of that Company from certain Taxation.

Life Insurance Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 32 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Life Insurance Act 1945.

Live-stock Export Charge Act 1977 (Act No. 68 of 1977)—
An Act to Impose a Charge upon the Export of certain Live-stock.

Live-stock Export Charge Collection Act 1977 (Act No. 69 of 1977)—

Live-stock Slaughter Levy Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 70 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Live-stock Slaughter Levy Act 1964.

Live-stock Slaughter Levy Collection Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 71 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Live-stock Slaughter Levy Collection Act 1964.

Loss (War Service Land Settlement) Act 1977 (Act No. 40 of 1977)—
An Act to authorize the Raising and Expenditure of a sum not exceeding $3,000,000 for a Defence Purpose, namely, Financial Assistance to South Australia, Western Australia and Tasmania in connexion with War Service Land Settlement.

Meat Research Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 72 of 1977)—


New Zealand Re-exports (Repeal) Act 1977 (Act No. 34 of 1977)—
An Act to repeal the New Zealand Re-exports Act 1924.

Phosphate Fertilizers Bounty Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 66 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Phosphate Fertilizers Bounty Act 1963, and for related purposes.

Referendum (Constitution Alteration) Modification Act 1977 (Act No. 23 of 1977)—
An Act to modify the application of section 16 of the Referendum (Constitution Alteration) Act 1906.

Repatriation Acts Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 56 of 1977)—
An Act relating to Repatriation and related Matters.

Roads Acts Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 41 of 1977)—

States Grants (Advanced Education Assistance) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 60 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Advanced Education Assistance) Act 1976, and for related purposes.

States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 33 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act 1974.

States Grants (Roads Interim Assistance) Act 1977 (Act No. 78 of 1977)—
An Act to provide for Financial Assistance to the States in relation to Roads.

States Grants (Schools Assistance) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 61 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Schools) Act 1972, the States Grants (Schools) Act 1976 and the States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act 1976, and for related purposes.


States Grants (Universities Assistance) Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 63 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Universities Assistance) Act 1976.

Stevedoring Industry Charge Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 77 of 1977)—
An Act to extend the operation of the Stevedoring Industry Charge Amendment Act 1975.

Supply Act (No. 1) 1977–78 (Act No. 49 of 1977)—
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 30 June 1978.

Supply Act (No. 2) 1977–78 (Act No. 50 of 1977)—
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 30 June 1978.

An Act to make provision for and in relation to the Establishment of a Tertiary Education Commission.

Trade Practices Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 81 of 1977)—
An Act relating to Trade Practices.

Wool Industry Amendment Act 1977 (Act No. 43 of 1977)—

Wool Tax Amendment Act (No. 1) 1977 (Act No. 44 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Wool Tax Act (No. 1) 1964.

Wool Tax Amendment Act (No. 2) 1977 (Act No. 45 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Wool Tax Act (No. 2) 1964.

Wool Tax Amendment Act (No. 3) 1977 (Act No. 46 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Wool Tax Act (No. 3) 1964.

Wool Tax Amendment Act (No. 4) 1977 (Act No. 47 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Wool Tax Act (No. 4) 1964.

Wool Tax Amendment Act (No. 5) 1977 (Act No. 48 of 1977)—
An Act to amend the Wool Tax Act (No. 5) 1964.
THE BILLS OF THE SESSION
(SECOND SESSION—FIRST PERIOD)

Acts Interpretation Amendment Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First reading.
Criminal Investigation Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First reading.
Crimes (Foreign Incursions and Recruitment) Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third reading.
Human Rights Commission Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.
Income Tax (Arrangements with the States) Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First reading.
International Development Association (Further Payment) Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First reading.
International Fund for Agricultural Development Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. First reading.
States (Personal Income Tax Sharing) Amendment Bill 1977—
   Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.
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PROCLAMATION

Commonwealth of Australia

JOHN R. KERR
Governor-General

By His Excellency the Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia

WHEREAS by the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia it is amongst other things provided that the Governor-General may appoint such times for holding the sessions of the Parliament as he thinks fit, and may also, from time to time, by Proclamation or otherwise, prorogue the Parliament:

Now therefore, I, Sir John Robert Kerr, the Governor-General aforesaid, do by this my Proclamation prorogue the Parliament until Tuesday, 8 March 1977 or (in the event of circumstances arising at present unforeseen which render it expedient that the Parliament should be summoned to assemble on a day earlier than that day) to such earlier day as is fixed by a Proclamation summoning the Parliament to assemble and be held for the dispatch of business:

Furthermore I do appoint the said Tuesday, 8 March 1977, or such earlier day (if any) as is fixed by Proclamation, as the day for the Parliament to assemble and be held for the dispatch of business:

And all Senators and Members of the House of Representatives are hereby required to give their attendance accordingly in the building known as Parliament House, Canberra, at the hour of three o'clock in the afternoon, on Tuesday, 8 March 1977 or, in the event of an earlier day being fixed by Proclamation, at the time fixed by that Proclamation on the day so fixed.

Given under my hand on 28 February 1977.

By His Excellency's Command,

MALCOLM FRASER
Prime Minister

GOD SAVE THE QUEEN!
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Tuesday, 24 May 1977

Mr SPEAKER (Rt Hon. B. M. Snedden, Q.C.) took the chair at 2.15 p.m., and read prayers.

FRASER MINISTRY

Mr MALCOLM FRASER (Wannon—Prime Minister)—I inform the House that the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Howard) has been appointed also Minister Assisting the Prime Minister. Obviously, he will continue to hold his present responsibilities. The Minister will assist me across the whole range of matters handled by me as Prime Minister other than the areas covered by other Ministers Assisting the Prime Minister. He will handle some policy matters on my behalf. In particular, he will relieve me of some of the daily administrative work. He will work closely with my office and keep me fully briefed on the matters he is handling on my behalf. He will begin his new duties forthwith.

PETITIONS

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

Pensions

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

That the delays between the announcements of each quarterly movement in the Consumer Price Index and their application as a percentage increase in age and invalid pensions is excessive, unnecessary, discriminatory and a cause of economic distress.

That proposals to amend the Consumer Price Index by eliminating particular items from the Index could adversely affect the value of future increases in aged and invalid pensions and thus be a cause of additional economic hardship to pensioners.

The foregoing facts impel your petitioners to ask the Australian Government as a matter or urgency to:

1. Require each quarterly percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index to be applied to age and invalid and similar pensions as from the pension pay day nearest following the date of announcement of the CPI movement.

2. Give an open assurance to all aged and invalid pensioners that any revision of the items comprising the Consumer Price Index will in no way result in reductions in the value of any future entitlements to pensioners.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Lynch, Mr Brown, Mr Garrick, Mr O'Keefe, Mr Peacock and Mr Ruddock.
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Abortion

The petition of the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth humbly sheweth that the undersigned are deeply concerned.

That abortion is the destruction of innocent human life.

That on 10 May 1973, the House of Representatives overwhelmimgly rejected the Medical Practices Clarification Bill, which sought to legalise abortion on demand in the Territories controlled by the Federal Government.

That the Legislative Assembly in Canberra should consult Parliament again before discussing and debating the opening and operations of Population Services International and Preterm Foundation in Canberra.

That the situation regarding abortions in the Australian Capital Territory is the same as that in New South Wales where the statute prohibits abortion but allows a defence.

That the situation in the Australian Capital Territory has a great impact on situations in the states.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray.

That the Federal Government will act immediately to prevent the establishment and/or operation of Population Services International and Preterm Foundation, and other private clinics, in the Australian Capital Territory.

That taxpayers' money may not be used, through Medibank, to finance abortion.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Braithwaite, Mr Carige and Mr Millar.

Petitions received.

Compulsory Retirement of Australian Government Employees

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

That Australian Government Employees strenuously oppose the provisions of the Commonwealth Employees (Redeployment and Retirement) Bill first introduced in the House of Representatives on 8 December 1976. The basis for opposition includes the following reasons:

(1) The grounds constituting 'due cause' for termination of services of tenured staff are expanded beyond those already available in existing legislation thereby introducing subjective discretionary powers which are inconsistent with career service expectations and entitlements.

(2) The Bill relegates to subordinate legislation or administrative direction matters affecting substantive rights of employees including the scale of compensation, the composition and powers of the appellate tribunal, and the criteria upon which service may be terminated.

(3) Existing rights of reinstatement in tenured employment are abrogated by the Bill.

(4) Agreement has not been reached on a number of matters which should have been finalised before any attempt to introduce legislation. These include: an arbitral determination on redundancy arrangements; benefits; procedures.

(5) As currently drafted the Bill over-rides entitlements under Arbitration awards.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the House of Representatives, in Parliament assembled, should reject passage of any legislation to extend powers of compulsory retirement of Australian Government employees unless and until any variation has been agreed with staff representatives.
Petitions
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And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Hayden and Mr Willis.

Petitions received.

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

That the public library services of New South Wales are inadequate both in quality and quantity and that the burden of provision is placed too heavily upon local government.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will ensure the implementation of the recommendations of the report of the committee of inquiry into public libraries as a matter of urgency.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Morris and Mr O'Keefe.

Petitions received.

Roads
To the Right Honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned concerned citizens respectfully sheweth:

1. Australia's extensive road system is a national asset wasting because of inadequate Federal and State funding.

2. Commonwealth Government funding of roads has fallen over the last six years from 2.9 per cent of all Commonwealth outlays to 2.3 per cent.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled, should ensure:

That the Commonwealth Government's long-term policy should be to provide 50 per cent of all funding for Australia's roads.

That at a minimum the Commonwealth Government adopts the recommendations by the Australian Council of Local Government Associations for the allocation of $5,903m of Commonwealth, State and Local Government funds to roads over the five years ending 1980-81, of which the Commonwealth share would be 41 per cent as recommended by the Bureau of Roads.

by Mr Adermann.

Petition received.

Education
To the Honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Representatives assembled. Your petitioners believe that all people have the right to education, irrespective of class, age, sex, sexuality and ethnic background, and that it is the responsibility of Government to ensure that sufficient funds are allocated to protect that right. Your petitioners therefore humbly pray:

1. That there should be substantial increases in education expenditure to make education accessible and free to all people who want it.

2. That in view of the substandard living conditions forced on many tertiary students as a consequence of a totally inadequate student assistance scheme, there is an urgent need for an immediate increase in the present level of the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme to 120 per cent of the adjusted Henderson poverty line; and, further, that the TEAS be indexed quarterly to movements in the consumer price index.

3. That all students should receive a living wage, starting at the minimum wage.

4. That the needs-based grants scheme be in no way jeopardised by any other program of student assistance, including supplementary or comprehensive loans schemes.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Beazley.

Petition received.

Royal Commission on Petroleum
The petition of certain members of the Service Station Association of N.S.W. Ltd, and certain members of the motor industry of New South Wales respectfully sheweth:

That the Federal Government give every consideration to implementing the findings of the Royal Commission on Petroleum.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take action to ensure that the needs of the motor industry and the retail petroleum industry are given every consideration.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Cadman.

Petition received.

Metric System
To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned electors of the Division of Capricornia in the State of Queensland respectfully sheweth objection to Metrics and request the Government to revert to the Imperial system.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Carige.

Petition received.

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

That due to the new information on whale communication, behaviour and intelligence, and the depleted state of most of the great whale stocks and the uncertainty associated with whale population estimates, that commercial whaling is no longer acceptable to the vast majority of Australians. It is urged that immediate steps be taken to end this activity.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Dobie.

Petition received.

Australian Broadcasting Commission
To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. We, the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth do humbly pray that the Commonwealth Government:

1. Subscribe to the view that the Australian Broadcasting Commission belongs to the people and not to the government of the day whatever political party.

2. Eschew all means, direct or indirect, of diminishing the independence of the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

3. Reject all proposals for the introduction of advertising into ABC programs.
Petitions

4. Develop methods for publicly funding the Commission which will prevent the granting or withholding of funds being used as a method of diminishing its independence.

5. Ensure that any general enquiries into broadcasting in Australia which may seem desirable from time to time shall be conducted publicly and that strong representation of the public shall be included within the body conducting the enquiry.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Les Johnson.

Petition received.

Income Tax: Cost of Sullage Removal

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House in Parliament assembled. We, the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth do humbly pray that the Commonwealth Government:

1. Recognise that the practice of disallowing taxation claims for sullage removal is discriminatory as tax payers owning property in severed areas are entitled to a concessional allowance of up to $300 for a sewerage services rendered.

2. Take steps to remove the provisions of the Income Tax Law which prevents approval being given for taxation claims for sullage removal unless the charges are annually assessed.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Les Johnson.

Petition received.

Taxation

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

That the existence of a system of double taxation of personal incomes whereby both the Australian Government and State Governments had the power to vary personal income taxes would mean that taxpayers who worked in more than one State in any year would:

(1) be faced with complicated variations in his or her personal income taxes between States;

(2) find that real after-tax wages for the same job would vary from State to State even when gross wages were advertised as being the same;

(3) require citizens to maintain records of income earned in each State.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that a system of double income tax on personal incomes be not introduced.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Morris.

Petition received.

Estate Duty

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

(1) That there are an increasing of electors throughout Australia concerned to abolish Probate and Estate Duties imposed by the Commonwealth Government of Australia and the respective State Governments.

(2) That it may not be possible to forthwith abolish Estate Duty because of the current economic situation.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled should ensure that the incidence of Estate Duty be phased out commencing in the financial year 1977-78 and be finally abolished within five years or such earlier date as reasonably possible.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Simon.

Petition received.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Communication Links Between Tasmania and the Mainland

Mr HODGMAN (Denison)—I give notice that on the next day of sitting I shall move:

That this House places on record its gratitude to the Prime Minister for his courageous and decisive action at 3.55 p.m. on Wednesday, 11 May 1977 in announcing that his Government would not tolerate Tasmania being isolated from the rest of the Commonwealth and that if necessary planes of the Royal Australian Air Force would ensure the maintenance of communication links between the island State and the mainland.

Independence of the Public Service

Mr NEIL (St George)—I give notice that on the next day of sitting I shall move:

That this House censures the honourable members for Hawker and Scullin for participation in subversion of the independence of the Public Service by use of material prepared by a public servant for purposes designed to discredit the Government or a member of the Government parties.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr SCHOLES (Corio) (2.22)—I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent immediate debate of the notice given by the honourable member for St George.

The matter raised by the honourable member is a censure motion against members of this Parliament. As such it should not go on the notice paper but should be dealt with immediately. I believe that the honourable member in giving notice of his motion is merely seeking to use a device to state matters in the Parliament without seriously wanting them debated. I believe that when a member of this place gives notice of a censure motion against other members the House has a responsibility to allow that motion to be debated forthwith.

Mr SPEAKER—The motion will need to be put in writing.

The honourable member for Corio having submitted his motion in writing—

Dr JENKINS (Scullin) (2.23)—I second the motion. As the matter raised by the honourable member for St George (Mr Neil) is so inaccurate
insofar as it is associated with me I believe it should be debated forthwith.

Question put—
That the motion (Mr Scholes's) be agreed to.

The House divided.

(Mr Speaker—Rt Hon. B. M. Snedden, Q.C.)
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In division:

Dr Jenkins—Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order. Is it proper for an honourable member to give notice of a motion which carries scurrilous statements against another honourable member and then to vote against that notice?

Mr SPEAKER—Order! There is no substance in the point of order.

Question resolved in the negative.

**QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE**

---

**INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS BUREAU**

Mr WILLIS—My question is addressed to the Prime Minister and concerns the Government's acceptance of the proposal by the Australian Council of Trade Unions on the Government's proposed amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I ask: Is it a fact that a committee of Ministers, not including the Prime Minister, agreed on 17 May to the establishment of an Industrial Relations Bureau with the same powers as those currently available to the Arbitration Inspectorate and agreed that these powers would be exercised according to the same processes as those by which they have been exercised until now? If so, will the Prime Minister now explain to the House what he meant by his subsequent statement on 19 May that the Industrial Relations Bureau will be able to initiate prosecutions of unions? Specifically, did he mean by that the Bureau would be able to prosecute a union for breach of a bans clause and, if so, would that not represent a complete repudiation of the agreement announced by his Ministers on 17 May?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The decisions in principle on this matter were made in the Cabinet meeting on the day before the date to which the honourable gentleman referred. My colleague the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations had some further discussion the next morning on matters of detail with a number of other Ministers. He consulted with me at lunchtime on that day and there was complete agreement in relation to the matters that had been put and the matters under discussion. As far as I am concerned, there is complete agreement between the Minister and myself on the matters that have been put to the President of the Australian Labor Party and President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. My colleague the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations obviously will make a statement in the
Parliament about this matter because it involves a change to some legislation currently before the Parliament. But it ought to be noted that the powers of the Arbitration Inspectorate are equal handed. They are not pointed only at employers. It ought to be noted also that the processes of the Arbitration Inspectorate for some time have been used in an equal handed manner—not pointed solely at employers. If the honourable gentleman is not aware of that factor, I think he ought to get up to date.

PRICES AND INCOMES PAUSE

Dr Edwards—Could the Prime Minister advise the House of the status of the prices and incomes pause in the light of today’s decision by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission?

Mr Malcolm Fraser—There are 2 statements that I wish to quote. One is a statement by Sir John Moore, President of the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and the other is a statement by the Public Service Arbitrator. Sir John Moore said:

We are satisfied that the prices for a wide range of goods and services have been held stable since the 13 April agreement of the heads of government on a voluntary wage-price pause. In particular, those subject to the surveillance of the Prices Justification Tribunal covering some 3449 companies and those under the authority of Commonwealth, State and local governments have held back price increases and will continue to do so. We see no reason to doubt that for the present many prices beyond those covered by the above have been frozen pending our decision.

The Public Service Arbitrator said:

I am satisfied that since 14 April 1977, i.e., since the call of the 7 Heads of Government for a 3-months’ wage-price pause, there has been a substantial holding of prices... I am aware that the agreement sought by the 7 heads of government has not eventuated in the main because of the refusal of unions to accept the wage pause. But nevertheless the announcement acted as a catalyst to spark off an immediate price pause and it is significant that the pause commenced shortly after the awarding by the Commission of the last national wage increase of $5.70 to all wage and salary earners.

We have now had the decision announcing a 1.9 per cent increase in wages excluding the devaluation effects and we can be grateful for that exclusion. But I believe that the Premier of South Australia set out in a somewhat deliberate manner to try to make it very difficult for the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission to hold wages in relation to the wage side of a wage-price pause. Also, other Labor Premiers refused to make submissions to the Commission in a concerted case with the Commonwealth which would have been compatible with the objectives originally called for by the 7 heads of Government.

I think it is worth emphasising and noting that the statements by Sir John Moore and the Public Service Arbitrator made it quite plain that prices had held overwhelmingly throughout Australia. That being so, I believe it is all the more unfortunate that the Commission was not taken of that factor in the decision that was made granting a 1.9 per cent increase in wages. Since the Commission has done that, it must be regarded that the wage-price pause as such is over. But at the same time, the Commission has indicated that it is prepared to consider the implications of joint wage-price halts in the consideration of the principles applying to wage fixing which will be continuing in the fairly near future. I think it is to be regretted that this decision was necessary in the view of the Commission at this time. If matters had been held to the original objective, a pause for 3 months certainly would have been met. In addition to that, in view of the statements made by Sir John Moore and the Public Service Arbitrator, it would have seemed a reasonable thing because the 7 heads of government had all agreed that a wage pause was a fair exchange for a price pause and a price pause was a fair exchange for a wage pause.

Now that that matter in effect has passed us I still think that it is very necessary for price setters in the community to show the greatest possible degree of restraint in the prices charged for their goods and products just as I believe it is necessary for wage earners to show the greatest possible degree of restraint in the requests they put to the appropriate wage fixing tribunals. I believe that right throughout Australia there are a significant number of companies and individuals who now understand that they can make a significant contribution towards overcoming inflation in this country. It is the sum total of what each person does and what each institution and company does that determines the level of inflation in this country. Each can contribute. It is only to be regretted that the South Australian Government withdrew from this matter and, in the judgment of the Commission, may well have made the present position inevitable.

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS DISPUTE

Mr Keith Johnson—I ask the Prime Minister: Is it a fact that he stated during the recent air traffic controllers dispute that the controllers would not get a cent? Does this statement indicate that the Prime Minister was seeking to establish himself as some overriding arbitral authority who could dictate to the established arbitral tribunals the terms of settlement of the industrial dispute? In view of his statement that
the air traffic controllers dispute provided a classic example of the need to introduce the Industrial Relations Bureau and other amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, will he explain to the House how the introduction of the Bureau, as originally proposed, could have assisted in settling that dispute? Does the fact that the Government has since announced the withdrawal of the substance of that legislation indicate that the Prime Minister now disbelieves his own statements?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The Industrial Relations Bureau in significant measure is designed to protect not only the interests of individuals but also the interests of the community. I hope that the honourable gentleman in his question is not indicating a complete and utter disregard for the Australian community and the people of Tasmania and the harm that was caused to people in Australia and overseas as a result of that dispute. I did say on behalf of the Government that, so far as the Government as an employer was concerned, the air traffic controllers would not get a cent out of the dispute; that we were not in the business of buying off that dispute. We made it perfectly plain that when the matter came before the Full Bench—a forum that was open to the air traffic controllers long before it was used, if only the dispute had ended—the matter should be judged on the merits of the case alone, not influenced by the fact that there had been industrial disputation. That was a proper position for the Government to take and one which it would take again in similar circumstances, and the statement relating to the special provisions legislation also was proper.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr UREN—My question is directed to the Prime Minister. I preface it by noting that, with the honourable exception of the late Senator Hannaford, neither the Government nor any of its supporters even criticised or questioned the Australian Government’s involvement in the Vietnam War. In view of President Carter’s statement that the ‘moral and intellectual poverty’ of cold war obsessions had led the United States into Vietnam, does the Government intend to examine its own past mistakes before developing new foreign policies based on President Carter’s call for a wider concern for human rights?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—My colleague, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and other members of the Government have consistently taken an enlightened and far-sighted view of the development of foreign affairs and foreign affairs policy in this country. In this Parliament and in many forums around the world, the Minister for Foreign Affairs has expressed in a most enlightened and constructive manner Australia’s approach to a whole range of issues, many of which involve the preservation of human rights and the prospects and hope for a better and more peaceful world. The views expressed by my colleague on behalf of the Government as a whole are very similar in context to many of the views expressed by President Carter. I have not for one moment detected any suggestion in President Carter’s statement that he believes that the international stance or the defence of the United States should be in any way weakened. In other words, in a spirit of enlightened realism, to use a phrase that my colleague has used on one or two occasions. President Carter is facing the problems of the world in a manner designed to relieve those problems but at the same time in a manner that does not ignore the realities of the present world situation. It is a statement which is to be applauded as are those of my colleague which are the best foreign policy statements ever made in this Parliament.

BUILDING INDUSTRY WAGE CLAIMS

Mr WILSON—Is the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs aware of excessive wage claims being made by unions in the building industry? Would the Government’s actions directed towards the control of inflation be seriously jeopardised if such claims were granted?

Mr HOWARD—I am aware of some very extravagant wage claims, as the honourable gentleman puts it, being made in the building industry—wage claims which, if acceded to by the building industry, would be quite outside the indexation guidelines. The Government would regard any such agreement by companies in that industry as being so out of step with our inflation policy that it would forthwith send reference to the Prices Justification Tribunal requiring that body to investigate the pricing practices of those companies.

PRICES AND INCOMES PAUSE

Mr HURFORD—My question to the Prime Minister is supplementary to that asked by the honourable member for Berowra. In addition to his selective quotations did the Prime Minister also note in the national wage judgment handed down today by Sir John Moore the explicit criticisms of the Government for failing to prepare properly through consultation for the so-called
wages and prices freeze and for not adequately defining the concept? Did he also note the Commission’s awareness that what the Government was expecting was a compulsory wage freeze but only a voluntary price freeze? In view of this will the Government use the good offers of the Commission made again today by Sir John Moore to institute further essential consultation?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The Government obviously will be examining very closely the case that should be put to the Arbitration Commission concerning the principles relating to the future of wage fixation. The honourable gentleman directs his barbs in the wrong direction. He could well have aimed them into the gallery. He would well know that it was the refusal by the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to accept even in principle the objective of a wage-price freeze that led to the non-calling of a conference to discuss details in relation to that matter.

MEAT IMPORTS FROM NEW ZEALAND

Mr SULLIVAN—I direct a question to the Minister for Primary Industry. By way of background I refer him to an Australian Broadcasting Commission program Horizon 5 shown yesterday, Monday 23 May. In that program it was stated that some Australian meat processors are providing butchers with second-grade cow beef and labelling it prime rump steak. This is forcing butchers to import quality beef from New Zealand. Is the Minister aware of this situation? Does he know the names of these meat processors? If so, will he inform the House, and, consequently, the unfortunate Australian beef producers, of the action he proposes to take in this matter? Will he also consult the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs to see whether action against this unlawful practice can be initiated under the provisions of the Trade Practices Act?

Mr SINCLAIR—For some years there has been some import into Australia of New Zealand carcasses, both lamb and beef. I am told that the quantity of carcasses that Australia exports to New Zealand is significantly greater, however, than that which New Zealand exports to Australia. The one element that concerns me in the report that the honourable gentleman mentioned is the quality of the comparable meat. In several reports there have been references to what would seem to be a greater reputation for reliability established by New Zealand exporters than that which pertains to Australian exporters. Whether it applies to domestic processors and packers is perhaps a matter of conjecture. The Horizon 5 statement suggested that the same difficulty applied. An article was contributed on 25 May to the West Australian by Mr Michael Zekulich following his return from the Middle East on a Churchill Fellowship. He referred to a Dubai woman who lives at times in Mt Pleasant. She said that she had switched to buying New Zealand frozen meat in preference to that from Western Australia or other Australian States. She said:

‘I can rely on New Zealand meat nine times out of ten—Western Australian meat is a 50-50 chance.’

I do not wish to identify particularly Western Australia as against any other State, nor do I believe that that reputation is true. I believe that Australian meat, in packaging, presentation and quality, is equal to that produced anywhere in the world. I am quite sure that it is only a matter of achieving wider understanding of that very high quality product to reverse that apparent consumption trend. With respect to the suggested reference to my colleague the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, I do not believe that there is an illegal practice. However, I hope Australian customers will realise that it is not only in the interests of the national economy but also in their own interests that they buy Australian.

PRIME MINISTER’S MEETING WITH MR PHILIP ALSTON

Mr MARTIN—I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Did the Prime Minister hold a meeting last week with Mr Philip Alston, the then Ambassador designate of the United States of America, in regard to Central Intelligence Agency activities in Australia? Did Mr Alston request this meeting as the Prime Minister’s staff indicated to journalists, or did the Prime Minister request it as Mr Alston stated yesterday at his Press conference? Does the Prime Minister consider it proper and appropriate to summon an ambassador who has not yet presented his credentials? Was the Prime Minister so concerned with the allegations of overt CIA activities in Australia that he took this unusual course?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I consider it entirely proper to ask a distinguished United States citizen to have dinner with me as my guest if he so wishes and chooses. The word ‘summoned’ used by the honourable gentleman is entirely and utterly inappropriate. I think the House would be well aware that the Ambassador was due to arrive in Australia somewhat earlier, but because of other events he was delayed en route. The other events were not caused by actions on his part. As honourable gentlemen know, I am
going to Britain very shortly for the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting. For very obvious reasons, I had wanted an opportunity to have a relaxed and quiet discussion with Mr Alston, and the particular evening in Sydney afforded an opportunity to do so in a manner that might well not be possible during a relatively busy parliamentary sitting week. Those are the facts of the situation.

Mr E. G. Whitlam—Did you approach him or he you?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I have already said that I approached him. It was at my invitation. I regard it entirely appropriate to ask a distinguished United States citizen to dine with me at any time I choose. I believe that the United States is well served by its new Ambassador to this country.

RHODESIA INFORMATION CENTRES

Mr RUDDOCK—Is the Minister for Foreign Affairs aware that the United Nations Security Council is considering a resolution directed at the closure of various Rhodesia information centres? Is the Government prepared to act to close the Rhodesia Information Centre in Sydney? If not, what other countries does the Minister expect will permit such offices to continue operating?

Mr PEACOCK—Yes, the Government is aware of the resolution before the Security Council. As honourable members will be aware, sanctions voted by the Security Council are binding on all members of the United Nations. The Government will therefore consider the introduction of legislation to carry out this new measure should it be adopted. We understand that countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom are thinking similarly, and we would in fact be the only country in the United Nations that was maintaining such an office. The Government will of course take care to ensure that the legislation will be so drafted that it will not interfere with the liberty of individual Australians; that their liberty will not be infringed to the extent that they will be unable to express freely opinions with respect to Rhodesia. The provisions of the legislation would be aimed at the Rhodesia Information Centre itself and at preventing any person in Australia from acting as the agent, or holding himself out as the agent of the illegal regime in Rhodesia, and from receiving or using funds for that purpose. The Government hopes, of course, that current moves towards a negotiated settlement in Rhodesia will be successful. Meanwhile, however, in common with the United States and the United Kingdom which are sponsoring the negotiations, and in common with the United Nations members generally, Australia will continue to apply sanctions as voted by the Security Council.

CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—1 ask the Prime Minister a question. During the referendums campaign the Premier of Western Australia complained that the Prime Minister had not answered his letters about arrangements to hold the next meeting of the Constitutional Convention in Perth next October and the Prime Minister responded that he had not yet replied because the future of constitutional reform might well depend on the answers given to the 4 commonsense and non-controversial questions. I ask the Prime Minister: In view of the exceptionally large support given by the Australian people to the 4 propositions—to three of them in every State and to the other in not fewer than half the States—will he now promptly promote another meeting of the Convention?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The Convention is due to meet in October, I think, and Sir Charles Court is expected to be host to that Convention. I think the honourable gentleman is right when he indicates that Australians to a very significant extent have indicated support for sensible constitutional reform. Only five of 32 proposals had been accepted over the previous history of federation and then in one go three of four proposals were accepted. One of those proposals, for the filling of casual vacancies in the Senate, is a vitally important and far-reaching proposal which I believe will serve well this Parliament, the Senate and also the electors in States, because for all time now the wishes of people as expressed in a State will be protected until they alter their view at some subsequent Senate election. That proposal was well received and very properly received. I hope that constitutional reform can continue in a constructive and proper manner and that the Convention will proceed. I cannot give precise dates at this point but—

Mr E. G. Whitlam—It is 17 October.

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—No dates have actually been firmly fixed; there are dates that are proposed. It is my understanding that one or two Premiers may wish to offer a view in relation to that meeting and I think it proper that they should have an opportunity to do so.

BIRTH OF QUADRUPLETS

Mr BAILLIEU—Is the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development aware that a married couple in the electorate of
La Trobe have achieved a unique event with the recent birth of identical male quadruplets? Does the Minister realise that when there is the happy expectation of one little addition to a family it is at the very least unnerving to suddenly find that there will be 4 little additions to a family? Will the Minister liaise with the Minister for Housing in Victoria and with the Shire of Sherbrooke to make provision for the additional living space that will be required as a result of this memorable event in respect of which all concerned have the fullest congratulations of this House?

Mr Newman—I would have to agree that I would be a bit unnerved if I had the same addition to my family. I must say that there is not much that this Government can do about the young couple's problems. I think the best I can do is to contact my counterpart in Victoria, Mr Hayes, to make sure that he is aware of the problem and to see whether something can be done to help.

INDUSTRIAL PENALTIES

Mr Clyde Cameron—My question to the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations relates to the proposed Industrial Relations Bureau. Is it a fact that at present breaches of section 32 and section 41 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which relate to bans clauses, can be prosecuted by the Arbitration Inspectorate providing that a certificate is issued by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission? Is it also true that breaches of section 138, which relates to incitement to strike, can be processed by the Arbitration Inspectorate without a certificate? If this is so, will these powers of the Arbitration Inspectorate as now operating be transferred to the IRB?

Mr Street—The honourable member will be aware that prior to the announcement by the Government of its proposals regarding this legislation the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions issued a statement saying that whilst the policy of the trade union movement was against penalties in the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, nevertheless it recognised that the existing Act did contain, in his words, 'pains and penalties'. He said that, provided there was no extension of these pains and penalties, and the existing processes—I think that was the word he used—were maintained, the union movement would not raise objections to the establishment of an IRB to take over the functions of the Arbitration Inspectorate. The functions that will be taken over by the Industrial Relations Bureau when it is formed will be exactly those that are exercised by the Arbitration Inspectorate at the present time, and the processes that will be followed by the Industrial Relations Bureau will be exactly those that are laid down for the Arbitration Inspectorate, including the criteria laid down and issued last year—I think, in about August. I sent a copy of those criteria to the honourable member for Gellibrand as the Opposition's shadow Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations. So the short answer to the honourable member's question is yes, exactly the same processes and procedures will apply as now apply.

COMMONWEALTH CASH LOAN

Mr Garland—Can the Treasurer inform the House of the outcome of the recently closed May loan raising?

Mr Lynch—I am pleased to be in a position to advise the House that subscriptions to the Commonwealth cash loan that closed on 19 May totalled some $452m. That is a record result for a cash loan held in the April-May period. From the point of view of economic management, a very encouraging feature of the loan raising has been the high support received from the non-bank sector. I inform the House that the previous highest level of subscriptions received in a cash loan held at this time of the year was $296m. That was in April 1976. The previous 5 cash loans in the April-May period raised an average of $134m. The result of that May loan is a clear expression of confidence by investors in the Government's economic policies which, of course, are directed at curbing inflation as a prerequisite of, amongst other things, a lowering of interest rates.

URANIUM: FOX REPORT

Mr E.G. Whitlam—I address a question to the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development. He will remember the different accounts that were given last November and December by the Minister who represents him in the Senate about the letter which Mr Justice Fox gave to him concerning the interpretation that had been placed on the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry's first report. He might remember telling me on 2 December last that he would consider the question of the tabling of the correspondence. I hope he has noticed that I have had a question about it on the notice paper since 3 December. Since the second report is to be published tomorrow and presumably will be followed by a full parliamentary debate, I make bold to ask the honourable and gallant gentleman: What decision did he make about tabling Mr Justice Fox's letter expressing misgivings about the interpretation
placed on the first report? Also, if I may be still bolder, I ask: When will he answer the question I have had on the notice paper since 3 December?

Mr NEWMAN—In reply to the bold and gallant Leader of the Opposition: As to the first question, I have decided not to table the letter. So, that clears up that question. As to the second question, I must say that I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition has not received an answer to his question on notice. I will give him one—an answer; not the letter—this week.

TASMANIAN RAILWAYS

Mr HODGMAN—is the Minister for Transport aware that at its meeting in Hobart yesterday the Australian National Railways Commission decided to lease the Hobart railway station property to the Tasmanian Government at a peppercorn rental to enable a slip road to be built across the tracks? Is that crazy decision subject to ministerial veto or approval?

Mr NIXON—I am not aware of the information that the honourable member has provided in respect of the proposal to build a slip road across railways tracks other than a proposal that was put to me by the Tasmanian State Minister for Transport that some arrangement be made with the Australian National Railways to overcome the traffic problems of Hobart in such a fashion. Again, I cannot give the honourable member any information in respect of the proposed rental of buildings other than information related to the Joy report. The honourable member will know that the Joy report contains a number of proposals in respect of the Tasmanian railway system. These proposals are presently under consideration by both this Government and the Tasmanian Government. No decisions will be taken in respect of any of these matters until the Government has firmly considered the proposals.

SALES TAX ON MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr YOUNG—is the Prime Minister aware of the drop in registrations of new motor vehicles for the last month? Is he also aware that this has a great deal to do with the speculation surrounding a drop in sales tax not only from spokesmen within the industry but also from many retail outlets throughout Australia which are now advertising that they are in fact, on their own initiative, dropping the level of sales tax on new cars? Is a reduction of sales tax under consideration to revive the automobile industry in Australia? If not, will the Prime Minister give a clear indication that the Government has no intention of doing so and so eradicate any further speculation?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I think the honourable gentleman’s question demonstrates very clearly the harm that can be done when people within or outside an industry, or political spokesmen, speculate in these ways. The problems, of course, within the industry are concentrated in one manufacturer which I know has a greater impact in South Australia. I believe that that manufacturer has been having a harder battle in the sales arena than have the other two major Australian automobile firms. In case what I have said may be misunderstood, the firm which is in the greatest difficulty obviously is General-Motors Holden’s Pty Ltd. Both General-Motors Holden’s and Chrysler Australia Ltd are heavily involved in South Australia. Under these circumstances some sorting out needs to be done in the industry. I have been advised that General-Motors Holden’s is in discussion with union representatives about the current situation. I have not heard what conclusions have been reached. But I hope that a proper and satisfactory solution is reached which protects the interests of employees and which is reasonable from all points of view. The Government has no proposal before it of the kind that has been mooted by sectors within the industry and which was the subject matter of the honourable member’s question.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

Mr MALCOLM FRASER (Wannon—Prime Minister)—I table the interim report of the Committee on Official Establishments. I seek leave to have a very brief statement, which the Leader of the Opposition (Mr E. G. Whitlam) has seen, incorporated in Hansard.

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

The document read as follows—

INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

The interim report which has just been tabled was prepared by an independent committee appointed to provide advice in matters concerning the official residences owned by the Commonwealth Government.

The residences are Government House and the Lodge in Canberra; and Admiralty House and Kirribili House in Sydney; all of which are important parts of the National Estate.

Advice provided by the Committee deals inter alia with the future conservation, fitting-out and maintenance of these assets.
A major aim in establishing the Committee is to protect the residences against the personal whims of the occupants of the day and to ensure their proper development and preservation for future generations of Australians.

The Committee has yet to complete its enquiries which will extend also to official accommodation and facilities for VIP's visiting Australia as guests of the Commonwealth Government.

Its final report with recommendations is expected to be available after the commencement of the Budget Session of Parliament.

**FISHING INDUSTRY ACT 1956**

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Minister for Primary Industry)—Pursuant to section 8 of the Fishing Industry Act 1956 I present the twentieth annual report of the operation of that Act during the year ended 30 June 1976.

**AUSTRALIAN ARBITRATION INSPECTORATE**

Mr STREET (Corangamite—Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations)—Pursuant to section 125 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 I present the report of the Australian Arbitration Inspectorate for the year ended 30 June 1976.

**AUSTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AGENCY**

Mr PEACOCK (Kooyong—Minister for Foreign Affairs)—Pursuant to section 30 of the Australian Development Assistance Agency Act 1974 I present the annual report of the Australian Development Assistance Agency for the year ended 30 June 1976.

**CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY ACTIVITIES IN AUSTRALIA**

Ministerial Statement

Mr MALCOLM FRASER (Wannon—Prime Minister)—by leave—We have seen over the last 4 weeks efforts to expose some of Australia's most closely held secrets and to publicise allegations based on hearsay or worse, to the embarrassment of Australia's relations with the United States, our closest ally. Accordingly, I believe it is important that I make a statement on these matters and attempt to put them in a proper perspective. Any public discussion which disregards Australia's interest is of serious concern to the Government. Those who are opposed to our alliance with the United States have naturally sought to exploit this issue for their own purposes.

The situation I have described has been precipitated by the allegations of one Christopher Boyce, a 23 year old communications clerk, who was on trial in California and has since been convicted of selling United States secrets to the Soviet Union. His allegations about Central Intelligence Agency activities in Australia were an attempt to rationalise his crimes. The Government has examined relevant parts of the transcript of the Boyce trial which in fact add little or nothing to the allegations which have already appeared in the media. I shall arrange for a copy of this transcript to be placed in the Parliamentary Library for the information of honourable members. We have since seen some former members of the CIA making, for their own motives, hearsay allegations, some of which would appear to come within the ambit of what is known as 'disinformation' or the attempt to gain political ends through false and misleading information.

It has been the Government's longstanding policy to avoid comment on matters involving intelligence and security. There are good reasons for this policy in that the mere act of denying specific allegations can often provide important leads and be damaging to our own and our allies' national security. I do not therefore intend to deal with specific allegations which have been made. As part of our defence relationship with the United States, there have grown up extensive arrangements for exchanging information and views with a wide range of United States Government agencies including those in the intelligence and security field. Under these arrangements officers from United States agencies are declared to the Australian authorities and work with various Australian agencies. Of course, Ministers with relevant responsibilities know who they are. Australian officers are engaged in similar declared capacities in Washington. These arrangements are long-standing and have been, and still are, of great value to Australia. They are an important aspect of the close and intimate relationship which we have with the United States. Through these arrangements we have access to and exchange valuable information with the United States on a wide range of international strategic developments as well as security and intelligence matters—such as espionage and international terrorism to name 2 examples—which contribute in the broadest terms to the protection of Australia and the Australian community.

There is also a long established convention that close allies do not conduct covert activities within each other's territories. Such activities are not necessary between friends. In this connection I wish to reassure the nation that I have carefully reviewed the activities of the United States Government in Australia and have found them.
on all advice available to be fully consistent with the interests and policies of the Australian Government and people. I am satisfied with the assurances I have received from elements of my own Government and administration and from President Carter personally through his Ambassador, that neither the United States Government nor its representatives are involved in improper or inappropriate activities here. I note that that is the personal reassurance of President Carter, very recently received. Our joint activities with them are important to the national security of both countries. Furthermore, we are most happy with the results we are obtaining from these activities.

I appreciate that some honourable gentlemen opposite enjoy deceiving themselves with conspiracy theories, and would like to believe that it was the CIA rather than the Australian electorate which put them out of office. Such views are, however, not merely politically self-serving, but naive. They will also be aware that, in recent times, the activities of the CIA, unlike most other foreign intelligence services, have been kept under close scrutiny by the United States Congress and that allegations of improper activity will be investigated as a matter of routine by the Congress.

The Leader of the Opposition has called for a Royal Commission into the allegations which have been made. I believe that such an inquiry is totally unnecessary. I note that the Leader, when Prime Minister, sought and was advised of the names of representatives of United States intelligence agencies then in Australia. I repeat: I note that the Leader, when Prime Minister, sought and was advised of the names of representatives of United States intelligence agencies then in Australia. He was apparently then satisfied with the information he received because after detailed inquiry he took no further action in relation to it. The Royal Commissioner on Security and Intelligence, Mr Justice Hope, who was appointed by the Leader of the Opposition in August 1974, has recently completed a most extensive series of investigations and reports on all aspects of Australian intelligence and security. His investigations included the activities of foreign intelligence services in Australia. There is nothing in the royal commissioner’s reports which gives any substance to the allegations relating to CIA activity which have occupied so much attention over the last 4 weeks.

Mr Justice Hope has made recommendations to increase the effectiveness of our internal security arrangements. These concern the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation in particular and are aimed at ensuring that it will be better equipped in the future to meet its responsibilities for investigating and providing intelligence about threats to the internal security of the nation. Mr Justice Hope’s recommendations have already been the subject of detailed study and I shall be making a statement to the House after my return from the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in London about the Government’s decisions concerning the Royal Commissioner’s report. As I have already said in this House, I look to the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation to provide timely advice on all matters which might affect the security of this country, including improper activities by any foreign intelligence service in Australia. It is my belief that the Director-General of ASIO, Mr Justice Woodward, carries out this responsibility creditably and faithfully. Similarly, the Leader of the Opposition, whose Government appointed Mr Justice Woodward, has recently reaffirmed in the House his confidence in the Director-General. For that I am glad, because it is most important that the Director-General of that organisation has the confidence not only of government but also of the Leader of the Opposition. Improper activities by the representatives in Australia of any foreign government have in the past been and would in the future be regarded just as seriously by my Government as they have been by previous Australian governments.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM (Werriwa—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—The statement of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) gave us no information. It gave us no reassurance. It contained only one sentence that was wholly candid and truthful. The Prime Minister stated that he did not intend to deal with the specific allegations about Central Intelligence Agency activities in Australia, and therein lies the irrelevance and the pusillanimity of everything he said. On all the specific questions of concern to this Parliament and to the Australian people, on all the specific charges made in recent weeks, statements supported and repeated by numerous sources and individuals inside and outside Australia, the Prime Minister was resolved to say nothing, and say nothing he did. If there was any point in him speaking on this subject, it was to deal with the charges made. It was to answer or even refute the grave allegations we have heard in recent weeks. It was to reassure the Australian people that there was no substance in the charges or that the Government was taking action at least
to prevent any such activities now or in the future. The statement was worthless.

I share the Prime Minister's attitude that one does not comment on matters of intelligence or security. I have not done so and, despite a great deal of provocation from time to time, I shall not do so. A great number of the things the Prime Minister said about me or my Party were surely utterly beside the point. I have not asserted and my colleagues have not asserted that the coup d'état, or putsch, of 11 November 1975 was due primarily to any CIA conspiracy. The principal conspirators were Australians and they have been identified. They are becoming increasingly exposed. Furthermore, I endorse the right honourable gentleman's tribute to Mr Justice Hope and Mr Justice Woodward. I have known each of them for many years. My regard for them is utterly undiminished. It has increased with my period of acquaintance with them. But Mr Justice Hope, in my suggestion, is not supposed to carry out any inquiry other than that which he was commissioned by my Government to carry out. He was appointed as a royal commissioner. That does not mean that he felt he had to take all the evidence in public or that we expected his reports would all be fully published. But he was a royal commissioner, he carried out an inquiry and his inquiry had been completed and his report tendered before these last allegations were made. One would have thought that he was just the Australian equipped to carry out an inquiry into the subsequent allegations. They had not been made at the time he made his inquiry and completed his report.

In respect of Mr Justice Woodward and the Acting Director-General, Mr Frank Mahony, whom my Government appointed, I would completely endorse the accuracy of all they say and the propriety of all they do. But it is scarcely their job to make inquiries into what has been done about Australia outside Australia. Certainly it is their job, and I believe they will do it, to look into the activities which are carried out in Australia by the agencies of other powers, be they the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or a few others one can think of. It is not their job to carry out inquiries—they are not equipped or authorised to carry out inquiries—into allegations which have been made about activities concerning Australia in other countries. Their writ does not run there.

Mr Martin—There are also the fundings of the Liberal Party.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—Yes, they have been mentioned too, but the Prime Minister shrugged that off. The Prime Minister's statement was less than candid. It shirked and distorted the real issue at the centre of this controversy. That issue, like all great issues in political debate, is basically a simple one. It is whether the Australian Government, any Australian government, is ultimately responsible for this country's internal affairs or whether it is prepared to tolerate interference in those affairs by the agents or representatives of any foreign power. In short, are we the masters of our own house? On that question, central to our freedom, our independence and our national sovereignty, the Prime Minister was silent. What this House requires, what the Australian people are seeking from this Government and its leader, is an affirmation of the supreme principle of national sovereignty. The Prime Minister was unable this afternoon to give that affirmation. Until he is prepared and willing to give it, whatever the truth or otherwise of the specific allegations that have been made, neither he nor his Government will deserve the respect of this Parliament or the trust of the Australian people.

It is utterly beside the point to argue that Australia and the United States are friendly powers bound by treaties and military alliances. Those treaties and military alliances do not endorse—they cannot condone—covert operations. Our alliance with the United States is valuable and important. It is valuable to the United States just as much as it is valuable to Australia. No one on this side of the House has questioned it, but it has nothing whatever to do with the present argument. It is totally irrelevant to the allegations made about the activities of the CIA. The Prime Minister's statement is based on a flagrant and deliberate confusion between Australia's military and internal security and Australia's interests as a sovereign power. The interests of the CIA are not necessarily those of Australia. They are not even necessarily those of the United States, nor are Australia's interests necessarily those of the Liberal Party. It is precisely because America is our principal ally that Australia must be satisfied that American agents are not acting in a manner contrary to our interests as a nation. Are we to let an ally get away with something that a rival would not be allowed to get away with? Implicit in the Prime Minister's statement is the belief that there can never under any circumstances be any secrets between the United States of America and Australia. The best rejoinder to that naive and dangerous belief is to be found in Mr Justice Hope's third report which was tabled on 5 May. In it he says:
Australia's intelligence interests do not and cannot coincide with those of any other country. Concern about the recent allegations is not confined to my Party. It is shared by the principal figures in this debate—not least by the Americans themselves. Yesterday, the new United States Ambassador in his first Press conference here declared that he was very much concerned at the allegations he had seen in the Press. Two weeks ago, the United States Senate Committee on Intelligence under the chairmanship of Senator Inouye of Hawaii asked the Central Intelligence Agency for a report of its activities in Australia. On the basis of that report, the Committee will decide whether to pursue its inquiries. That report has not even been presented to the Senate Committee, yet the Prime Minister has prejudged the result of it. If it is good enough for the Americans, our allies, to show a prompt and proper concern about these matters, why should not the Australian Government do likewise? Alliances are not strengthened by covert operations or by condoning and covering up such covert operations.

The people who have made the allegations are not fanatics, crackpots or headline seekers. Some of them are former officers of the CIA itself. Many of them have worked inside the organisation and become disillusioned with some of its methods. So, too, have American senators, congressmen, cabinet ministers and American Presidents now become disillusioned with the operations of the CIA in past years. One does not have to admire personally the people who have made these allegations to accept the fact that they know what they are talking about. Mr Victor Marchetti worked for the CIA for 14 years finally becoming executive assistant to the deputy director. He is the co-author of a book The CIA and the Cult of Intelligence which was so authoritative, so well-informed and so accurate in its disclosure of facts that the U.S. Administration took protracted legal action to have it banned. At the insistence of the CIA, it was finally censored and 168 passages were deleted by court order. The legal battle was a tribute to Mr Marchetti's honesty and accuracy—to his credibility. His facts have never been challenged by the United States Government or the intelligence community. He is a free man.

Other allegations have been made by Mr Phillip Agee who was employed by the CIA for 12 years. On his own admission, he was engaged on destabilising political parties and governments in Latin America. As I mentioned 3 weeks ago, Australia had some small part as a proxy for the CIA in such operations in Chile until 4 years ago. Mr Agee recounted his experiences in another disturbing book, Inside the Company—CIA Diary. Again, his facts have never been challenged. Mr Speaker, whatever you may think of his motives or ethics, the only point at issue here is whether he is credible. The Foreign Minister (Mr Peacock) enhanced Mr Agee's credibility last week when he confirmed that people named by him were indeed CIA officers. The Prime Minister has made a feeble attempt to exonerate his Foreign Minister for his indiscretion. But there is no doubt that the Minister has given substance to Mr Agee's allegation. Mr Agee has aroused the anger of the British Government and he is being deported for unspecified activities harmful to the security of the United Kingdom. What is important in this context is that the United States Government which employed him as a spy for 12 years is taking no legal action against him. He is free to return to the United States if he wishes to do so. He is being deported from Great Britain. He is not being extradited.

The Prime Minister has poured scorn on Christopher Boyce, whose initial allegations were debated in this House 3 weeks ago. Boyce was employed by TRW, an aerospace firm which has links with secret American facilities in Australia. He is presently appealing against his conviction for espionage. Whether or not his motive was as he said—that he was disgusted at the way the CIA was deceiving the Australian Government—there is only one relevant question to be asked about Boyce: Was he in a position to learn the information that he has disclosed? The New York Times in a 7-page article 2 days ago revealed that indeed he was. Boyce was in charge of the top secret code room at TRW where he was apparently in a position to monitor and decode CIA messages to and from its facilities in Australia. His allegations, profoundly disturbing, cannot be dismissed. Sure, he is a convict. He was, as the radio program AM described him this morning, a college dropout of 24 years of age. It is extraordinary that a man of that record and that experience should be in such a confidential position. He was in a position to know facts. No one knows whether he gave those facts. Maybe the U.S. Senate Committee will ascertain that. Maybe if he was in this country, a royal commissioner could ascertain that.

Another source of allegation is Mr K. Barton Osborn, a former CIA officer in Vietnam who became disgusted with his work and left the agency. Another is an Australian computer programmer, Mr P. L. Kealy, who worked at the joint defence space research facility near Alice
Springs for 5 years. Respected Australian trade union officials have alleged CIA interference in union activities. I gave the instances 3 weeks ago. The legal adviser to the Central Land Office in Alice Springs, Mr Geoffrey Eames has claimed that the CIA has intervened on behalf of American mining communities in the NT. More recently, the Attorney-General of South Australia, Mr Peter Duncan, has said that he has no reason to disbelieve that the CIA has been financing groups seeking to destroy the Australian Union of Students. My colleague, the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr Clyde Cameron), has spelt out in this place how the CIA engaged in McCarthy-like operations against loyal and trusted members of the Australian Labor Party.

Mr Armitage—What about the honourable member for Lowe?

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—Indeed, the right honourable member for Lowe (Mr William McMahon), my predecessor, declared on the Australian Broadcasting Commission program *Four Corners*:

> A possibility is there that the CIA might have been operating in a way that was not only unconstitutional—

Mr William McMahon—' Might have been '.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—I am quoting the precise words.

Mr William McMahon—I was referring most of the time to you and what I thought you had done in order to incite the suspicions of the American Government.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—The right honourable member was not limiting himself to those helpful remarks.

Mr William McMahon—I was exactly. If the honourable member would like to get the context, I will prove it to him.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—I have the complete text. But not for the first time, the honourable gentleman pipes up in a way which leaves other people confused.

Mr William McMahon—The honourable member has been confused since the beginning.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The Leader of the Opposition will continue with his speech.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—I will quote the precise words as transcribed by the Parliamentary Library:

>A possibility is there that the CIA might have been operating in a way that was not only unconstitutional, not only contrary to any sensible interpretation of international relationships but it was acting so far as we were concerned in an improper way. That could happen.

If I may make my own gloss on that, if the CIA was acting in an unconstitutional way, if the CIA was acting contrary to any sensible interpretation of international relationships, whether it happened under the Government formerly led by the right honourable member, my Government or the present Government, it was as he says, acting in an improper way.

I have named a few of the people who have disclosed information or have expressed their disquiet about the nature of the CIA activities in Australia. Surely the right honourable gentleman would not say that the CIA can act in an unconstitutional way, contrary to international relationship or in an improper way if a Labor Government is in power but that its actions are OK under a Liberal Government. At no stage has the Opposition endorsed his allegations or those of the others whom I have quoted. Our position was stated in a resolution passed by the national executive of the Australian Labor Party 2 days ago. Mr Speaker, I ask leave to have that resolution incorporated in the *Hansard* record.

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

*The document read as follows—*

The National Executive of the Australian Labor Party: Noting allegations made during the past month that the United States Central Intelligence Agency has engaged in improper activities in Australia, including deception of the Australian Government, especially in relation to the operations of the joint defence space research facility; manipulation of political events in Australia in 1975; channelling of funds to Australian political parties and interference in trade union activities in Australia;

Further noting that these allegations emanate from a variety of sources in the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia;

Recognising that such activities would be inconsistent with the integrity and mutual respect on which relations between Australia and the United States should be based;

Believing that any improper activities in Australia by foreign intelligence services should be a cause of the deepest concern to any Australian Government, and endorsing in this context the statement made by Mr Justice Hope in his Third Report on Intelligence and Security that 'Australia's intelligence interests do not and cannot coincide with those of any other country';

Noting with appreciation that the Carter Administration has pledged to end abuses by United States intelligence authorities of the sovereignty of other countries;

Further noting with appreciation that the United States has called for a report from the CIA on its activities in Australia;

1. Invites the United States Administration and Congress to investigate fully the activities of the CIA in Australia and to report publicly on any improprieties which may have occurred; and

2. Expresses the hope that such investigations will include full examination of the allegations already made and
the receipt of personal testimony from persons who have made such allegations.

Mr E. G. WHITLAM—The allegations to which I have referred are too grave and too disquieting to be brushed aside by the Prime Minister. Their enormity demands that they be fully investigated in Australia as they are now being investigated in the United States. They are not isolated charges. Their frequency, their detail and their very similarity give grounds for urgent concern. Let me recount the more serious of them. Mr Boyce said at his trial that his daily duties included continued deception against Australia. He referred to an alleged project at one of the joint United States-Australian facilities by which Australia would be cut out of certain information being acquired through that facility—and he was working in TRW under my Government and under the present Government. There have been claims that telephone and telex calls in Australia could be monitored by one of the joint facilities, a suggestion which provoked the Australian Financial Review—not one of our most rabid or radical journals—to comment in an editorial on 5 May:

Access by the Americans to our international communications effectively means that American business might have the potential day by day to track the progress of negotiations by its Australian competitors. That allegations of such intrusion into Australia’s national sovereignty should go unanswered is entirely unsatisfactory.

They have gone unanswered today. A former Australian employee at the Joint Defence Space Research Facility told the Canberra Times that he doubted whether Australian politicians were told all about the functions of the Facility. Mr Marchetti told the Sydney Sun:

Boyce has proof that the CIA manipulated political events in Australia in 1975 which led to the downfall of the Whitlam Government.

Mr Boyce himself remarked:
If you think Chile’s bad, you should see what the CIA is doing in Australia.

Mr Agee told the Australian Broadcasting Commission that he had no doubt that an Australian social democratic government “which shows a certain independence” would be undermined by the CIA. Mr Agee should know. That is what he was doing in South America.

A former CIA officer told the National Times that the National Country Party was a recipient of CIA funds. The way this information emerged is particularly significant. He was being interviewed by another former agent, Mr Osborn, and the interview was reported in the National Times on 16 May. Mr Marchetti, quoting Mr Richard Lee Stallings, has said that financing of conservative parties in Australia had to his knowledge gone on since 1967. That is well before the time of my Government. The allegations of interference in union activities are too numerous to list here, but they have been widely reported by responsible newspapers and the Australian Broadcasting Commission. The most glaring example of CIA interference in Australia affairs was the telex message sent from Washington on 10 November 1975 to the Acting Director of ASIO, the text of which was published in the Australian Financial Review of 29 April. That message, which appears in Hansard at page 1520, was a clear example of the attempted deception of the Australian Government by the American intelligence community. It sought to make use of Australia’s counter-intelligence organisation in order to deceive the elected Government. The message was offensive in tone, deceitful in intent and sinister in its implications.

It is utterly unsatisfactory for the Prime Minister to say that Mr Justice Hope has investigated the activities of the foreign intelligence services in Australia and that therefore no further inquiry is needed. The point is that these allegations had not been made before Mr Justice Hope concluded his investigation. They are new charges based on new allegations which were not available to Mr Justice Hope. They should be placed before him not in a public inquiry, as the Prime Minister implies, but in the manner in which previous evidence was presented to him and assessed by him. We all know, as a result of Mr Justice Hope’s inquiry, how necessary and how prudent it was to have an inquiry into our intelligence and security services. These latter allegations surely should be assessed with no less urgency and with no less care.

Mr Martin—Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a short statement on the same subject.

Mr SPEAKER—Is leave granted?
Mr Malcolm Fraser—No.
Mr SPEAKER—Leave is not granted.

GOVERNMENT POLICY ON NUCLEAR SAFEGUARDS

Ministerial Statement

Mr MALCOLM FRASER (Wannon—Prime Minister)—by leave—The future course of world nuclear development and the regime of international controls which should apply to such development are currently subjects of great international interest. In the past few weeks, for example, there has been an important statement by President Carter on nuclear energy in which he emphasised the need to restrain the spread of nuclear weapons or explosive capabilities without
forgoing the tangible benefits of nuclear power. Again, at their recent Summit meeting, the Heads of Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, West Germany, France, Japan and Italy committed themselves to increasing nuclear energy to help meet the world’s energy requirements while reducing the risks of nuclear proliferation. They launched an urgent study to determine how best to fulfil these objectives. At the conclusion of the recent Salzburg Conference, the most important international conference held in recent years on all aspects of nuclear power, the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency referred to the agreement of the meeting that nuclear power was a necessary and irreplaceable source of the future energy supply to mankind for both the short and the longer term.

It is clear that there is widespread international concern to establish a framework of control within which the benefits which many countries see in the peaceful use of nuclear energy can be safely realised. These are issues of major international importance in their own right, but they have an added significance for Australia because of our potential as a supplier of uranium. They are issues on which I have already written to President Carter and Prime Minister Trudeau and on which the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Anthony) and Australian officials have held detailed consultations with the United States, Canada and other countries. They are issues which have been under the closest and most careful consideration from the moment the Government took office. In the present period of international reappraisal of these issues the Government is determined that Australia should play an active role with other countries in the search for, and achievement of, joint solutions.

A proliferation of nuclear facilities without adequate protection against diversion of material to nuclear weapons production or nuclear explosives would pose serious threats to international stability and peace, obviously, inimical to Australia’s interests and to global and regional security. It was for this reason that, in his address to the United Nations General Assembly last September, the Foreign Minister (Mr Peacock) described the strengthening of measures to prevent proliferation of nuclear weapons as a central and fundamental area in which Australia looks and hopes for early progress. This will remain the case whether or not Australia is ultimately to become a major exporter of uranium. The safeguards policy which we will follow is, in our view, appropriate for any country to follow whether it be a uranium supplier or consumer. I make clear from the outset that the term ‘safeguards’ is used here to denote the whole range of measures used to provide assurance that nuclear material supplied for peaceful purposes is not misused for non-peaceful or explosive purposes.

The Government fully accepts that, if it were in future to permit new uranium export from Australia, this would carry with it added responsibilities. Against the background of these international responsibilities the Government accepts that uranium is a special commodity, the export of which would involve important considerations of a kind not involved in the export of other commodities. This implies a requirement for selectivity in the choice of customer countries and the closest attention to ensuring adequate safeguards. It is not the Government’s view that safeguards should be regarded as something to be balanced against commercial considerations. We view adequate safeguards as a fundamental prerequisite of any uranium export which we would also expect responsible customer countries for Australian uranium readily to accept.

It will be recalled that, following the release of the First Report of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry, the Government announced in the House on 11 November 1976 that it supported the Inquiry’s view on the need for the fullest and most effective safeguards on uranium exports. The Government also stated that it was carrying forward more detailed consideration of safeguards in order to develop further a national policy on this subject. The announcement of a policy at this stage, of course, in no way pre-empts a decision on the question whether any such new contracts for the export of uranium will be permitted. As the Government has repeatedly emphasised, this remains a matter for consideration following receipt of the final report of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry. However, as the Foreign Minister said in the Government’s foreign policy statement in the Parliament on 15 March 1977, the Government would be remiss if it did not address itself to safeguards questions in the meantime.

That the Government has taken certain decisions on safeguards policy at this stage reflects its determination to make sure that an established framework of policy exists so that any new uranium exports take place under the most carefully considered and responsible conditions possible. The Government wishes to avoid a situation in which decisions may be required on new uranium marketing at some point in the future without the benefit of a clear policy on the
ground rules to apply so far as safeguards are concerned.

The Government has long recognised the desirability of defining a comprehensive policy on safeguards. It would not be desirable for safeguards requirements to be left to ad hoc decision as this would not afford the strong and clear support for international efforts to strengthen controls against nuclear weapons proliferation to which the Government attaches major importance. Australia is a potentially significant supplier of uranium, but if we are to play the part which this potential gives us the opportunity to play of contributing effectively to international efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, it is desirable that uranium importing countries and other nuclear supplier countries alike know where Australia stands on the matter of safeguards. In the narrow sense, safeguards are systems of containment, surveillance, accounting and inspection of nuclear materials and facilities designed to verify that diversion does not take place from peaceful to non-peaceful or explosive purposes. The major systems of international safeguards are administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency. In a broader sense, safeguards for future Australian uranium exports would comprise, as well as the application of international safeguards in this strict sense, the securing from importing countries of adequate assurances regarding the use and control of supplied nuclear material and the conclusion of binding arrangements to give effect to such assurances. In both senses, as mechanisms for verification and as controls and conditions for nuclear exports, safeguards arrangements are an evolving structure, continually being strengthened, refined and improved.

Against this background, I would like to announce the following specific components of the comprehensive safeguards policy which the Government has adopted. These cover:

The need to keep policy under review; careful selection of eligible customers for uranium; the application of effective International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards; bilateral agreements with customer countries; fallback safeguards; prior Australian Government consent in relation to re-export, enrichment and reprocessing; physical security; safeguards provisions in contracts; and international and multilateral efforts to strengthen safeguards.

First, it will be a basic feature of our approach to recognise that the process of strengthening and improving international safeguards arrangements is an ongoing one. Our policy and safeguards arrangements must be kept closely under review to take account of the future evolution of international thinking on safeguards. In this regard the Government is pleased that, as recently announced, Mr Justice Fox has agreed to become an adviser to me on policy matters relating to nuclear non-proliferation and safeguards. Second, should the Government approve further development of the Australian uranium industry it will retain the right to be selective in the countries to whom uranium export will be permitted. The following minimum criteria for eligibility to receive Australian uranium will apply. The Government emphasises that these represent minimum conditions for countries to be eligible to receive Australian uranium. The Government makes clear that wider foreign policy considerations may also be taken into account, and that it reserves the right to refrain from permitting export should this be appropriate in the light of such considerations. It does not, therefore, follow that the Government would necessarily permit export to a country meeting these minimum safeguards criteria.

In the case of non-nuclear weapon states—that is to say, all countries other than the 5 existing nuclear weapons powers recognised by the Non-Proliferation Treaty—sales will be made only to countries which are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Because of these countries’ safeguards obligations under the Non-Proliferation Treaty this policy will make sure that the entire civil nuclear industry in such customer countries is subject to effective safeguards to verify that nuclear material, whether of Australian or any other origin, is not diverted from peaceful uses. The Government is aware that work has recently been under way within the International Atomic Energy Agency on a new system of equally stringent safeguards to cover the entire nuclear industry in non-nuclear weapon states which are not parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. It will be following progress on this matter and the implications which it may have for our policy. Regarding existing nuclear weapon states, they are not obliged under the Non-Proliferation Treaty to renounce nuclear weapons or accept international safeguards. They retain the right to use nuclear material for weapons as well as for peaceful purposes. Even so, Australia would want to have assurance that nuclear material we may supply for peaceful purposes is not diverted to military or explosive purposes. We will therefore export only to nuclear
weapon states which give Australia this assurance and accept that the uranium we supply be covered by International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. In this respect the Government's policy introduces a requirement additional to those recommended by the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry in its first report.

Third, the Government wishes to ensure that if a decision is taken to permit new uranium export, the uranium will be covered by International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards from the time it leaves Australian ownership. As matters stand, while safeguards applied under the Non-Proliferation Treaty require notification of transfers of yellowcake, the full intensity of such safeguards only commences to apply later in the fuel cycle. Accordingly, it will be the Government's policy that any future sales arrangements for exports of Australian uranium should be such that the uranium will be in a form which attracts full International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards by the time it leaves Australian ownership. Fourth, Australia will require the prior conclusion of bilateral agreements between the Australian Government and countries wishing to import Australian uranium under any future contracts. These bilateral agreements will provide a framework for direct and binding assurances by importing countries to the Australian Government in relation to the use and control of uranium supplied by Australia or nuclear material derived from its use. The fundamental undertakings the Government will wish to obtain from uranium importing countries in such bilateral agreements are that nuclear material supplied by Australia for peaceful purposes or nuclear material derived from its use will not be diverted to military or explosive purposes and that International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards will apply to verify compliance with this undertaking. Australia would seek to arrange with uranium importing countries regular expert-level consultations to satisfy ourselves of the implementation of the provisions of bilateral agreements. In line with the positions taken by the United States and Canada Australia would retain the right to cease supply of uranium to any country which breached safeguards undertakings.

Fifth, the Government takes the view that nuclear material supplied by Australia or nuclear material derived from its use should remain under safeguards for the full life of the material in question or until it is legitimately removed from safeguards. In line with this basic principle the Government has decided that bilateral agreements with non-nuclear weapon states should make provision for so-called fallback safeguards. I have already made clear that Australia would not be prepared to export uranium to such countries in the absence of International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards applied under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, the question arises of ensuring the continued safeguarding of material already present in an importing country should safeguards under the Non-Proliferation Treaty at some stage cease to apply in that country. There should be provision under the bilateral agreements for the contained application of international safeguards in such circumstances. Further, the bilateral agreements should provide for Australia to make alternative arrangements for the safeguarding of nuclear material supplied by us in the event of international safeguards as such ceasing to operate. Moreover, the Government feels it is reasonable to ask importing countries who will already accept International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards of comprehensive scope under the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to accept that, at the first fallback level also, international safeguards should apply to all nuclear material not just that portion supplied by Australia.

Sixth, the Government considers that it would be an unsatisfactory situation for uranium supplied by Australia to one country, or nuclear material derived from its use, to be able to be re-exported to a third country without the opportunity for Australia to satisfy itself that adequate controls would apply to the transferred material and that the ultimate destination is acceptable to us. For this reason the Government has decided that bilateral agreements with uranium importing countries should make any transfer of supplied material to a third party contingent on a prior consent of the Australian Government. This provision will give Australia the means of making sure that our safeguards requirements are met despite any onward transfers of the uranium we supply or nuclear material derived from it.

Seventh, we would require that Australian uranium supplied to other countries for peaceful uses not be enriched beyond 20 per cent uranium-235 without prior Australian consent. This provision is in line with the practice adopted by other nuclear supplier countries. The figure of 20 per cent has been chosen as representing a level of enrichment below the practical requirements for a nuclear explosive, while being above the enrichment level required for most peaceful uses, excepting, for example, some research and radioisotope production reactors, for which approval to enrich to the necessary
level would need to be obtained. In respect of this requirement also, the Government’s policy extends beyond the recommendations made by the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry in its first report.

Eighth, the Government is aware of the interest of some countries in the reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel to meet their anticipated future fuel requirements, and to facilitate the management of nuclear material following its use in nuclear reactors. At the present time the need for reprocessing and the details of an effective control regime for this area of the nuclear fuel cycle are the subject of close study internationally. This is an area in which there are a number of new ideas and initiatives. The United States has proposed an international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation program to consider various nuclear fuel cycles in terms of their implications for proliferation control. There are also such ideas as various schemes for multinational control of reprocessing facilities and for the management of spent fuel and plutonium. The Government welcomes these studies and consultations and will seek to contribute actively and constructively to relevant aspects of them such as fuel supply assurances and waste management.

The Government’s view is that, prior to a clearer outcome emerging from this current international activity, it would be premature for Australia to adopt a unilateral position on the detailed conditions under which we might be prepared to agree to reprocessing, if any, of nuclear material supplied by Australia. In order to reserve effectively Australia’s position on this matter for the time being we would wish to make provision in bilateral agreements with countries importing Australian uranium that any reprocessing of nuclear material supplied by Australia may only take place with the prior consent of the Australian Government. This requirement is additional to those recommended by the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry in its first report and reflects similar concerns to those expressed by the inquiry in relation to reprocessing.

Ninth, the Government would require in future bilateral agreements the assurance from uranium importing countries that adequate physical security will be maintained on their nuclear industries. In addition, we believe the agreements should specify compliance with standards of physical security based, at a minimum, on International Atomic Energy Agency recommendations as presently defined and as updated from time to time. They should also make provision for expert level consultations as necessary on physical security arrangements. These requirements also translate into concrete policy measures concerns expressed by the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry. The incorporation of these provisions in the Government’s safeguards policy reflects our concern that total nuclear control should encompass safeguards not just to verify that nuclear material is not illicitly diverted from peaceful uses by national governments or national authorities, but also to protect nuclear material from illegal use by groups or individuals.

Tenth, the establishment of effective arrangements for safeguards is essentially a matter for governments and for inter-governmental agreements, either bilateral or multilateral. Nevertheless, it is important to make sure that the actual parties to commercial contracts, which may be private organisations, are also aware of the safeguards obligations to which their transaction is subject. For this reason, although the Ranger uranium environmental inquiry in its first report did not make a recommendation on this matter, the Government has decided that it is desirable that, as a standard practice, a clause should be included in any future contracts for the export of uranium from Australia noting that the transaction is subject to safeguards as agreed between the importing country and the Australian Government.

Finally, as an important complement to the measures I have outlined so far, the Government recognises the importance of Australia contributing to constructive multilateral efforts to strengthen safeguards. There is a need for what President Carter has described as systematic and thorough consultations in this area. We too consider that it is highly desirable that there should be the widest possible consensus amongst both nuclear supplier countries and nuclear importing countries on the controls to apply to the world nuclear industry. The wider the consensus, the more effective these controls will be as a barrier to nuclear proliferation. The more uniform the views of the countries concerned, the easier it will be to implement a properly effective regime of controls. It will be an integral part of Australia’s approach to safeguards to seek to promote such a consensus.

In particular, we will seek to co-ordinate policy on safeguards with other like-minded countries. As I noted at the outset, I have already initiated an exchange of correspondence with the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Canada expressing this wish, and extremely valuable consultations have already taken place. The policy I am now announcing
incorporates the Government’s consideration of these consultations and represents a very similar approach to safeguards to that adopted by the United States and Canada. More generally, nuclear supplier countries have a special role and responsibility in the ongoing development of safeguards and Australia will be prepared to participate with them in any constructive efforts to develop a co-ordinated approach. We will also continue to attach major importance to the effective application of safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency. We will investigate whether there are specific areas in which Australia could usefully assist the Agency’s capacity to apply increasingly effective safeguards.

At the present time the Government sees a multilateral approach towards safeguards questions as being especially desirable in one specific area as well as in the international nuclear fuel cycle evaluation program already mentioned; we would wish to lend support to the development of an international convention on the physical protection of nuclear material in international transit. Also, we would wish to explore with other countries a common approach to sanctions in the event of a breach of supply conditions.

The essential ingredients of the policy I have outlined are careful selection of customer countries, the application of international safeguards to verify that material supplied for peaceful purposes is not misused, the establishment of additional safeguards through bilateral agreements, and an active involvement by Australia in international efforts to upgrade safeguards. The policy is the result of full, careful and detailed consideration of safeguards by the Government. It builds on the preliminary thinking of the Government described in testimony to the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry last year, as well as the recommendations of the First Report of the Inquiry itself. The policy has been the subject of detailed exchanges of views with other countries—both uranium importers and major nuclear exporters—and relevant international organisations including the International Atomic Energy Agency.

As a result the Government is satisfied that the policy it has decided upon represents a practical, reasonable and effective package of safeguards measures to seek from countries wishing to import uranium from Australia under any future contracts. It is fully in step with current international efforts to strengthen safeguards. The policy goes beyond a mere acceptance by Australia of our international obligations as a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and constitutes a policy as stringent as that adopted to date by any nuclear supplier country. I present the following paper:


Motion (by Mr Sinclair) proposed:
That the House take note of the paper.

Mr Keating—Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a statement on the same subject and reserve the right to make the balance of my address in the subsequent debate.

Mr SPEAKER—The Leader of the House (Mr Sinclair) has moved: ‘That the House take note of the paper’. The honourable gentleman will therefore speak to that motion. He is entitled at an appropriate time to seek leave to continue his remarks at a later stage.

Mr KEATING (Blaxland) (4.4)—Thank you, Mr Speaker. The statement by the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) is an obvious political ploy, drawn up at the last moment, to provide him with something to take to the United States and Canada on his forthcoming trip. The House needs to ask the Government why the Prime Minister has brought into the Parliament today a statement about nuclear safeguards when in fact the second Fox report will be presented publicly tomorrow and before the Parliament has a chance to comprehend what is in that report. The Prime Minister’s statement is so close to the thinking of the Carter Administration that one must remain cynical as to his motives for introducing it.

I should like to refer to 2 parts of the Prime Minister’s speech. At page 4 he said that the Government has taken certain decisions on safeguard policy at this stage and that this:

...reflects its determination to make sure that an established framework of policy exists so that any new uranium exports take place under the most carefully considered and responsible conditions possible.

It was only 5 months ago that the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Newman) said in a statement that the Government welcomes any international initiatives for strengthening the international non-proliferation regime, implying that the Government itself was not going to devote its attention to the development of safeguards. Now the Prime Minister is contending that the Government has been considering safeguards from the moment of the Government’s inception and that this policy is the result of thoughtfulness on the part of the Government. Obviously the development of a sophisticated safeguard regime on nuclear materials would take a number of years to develop because it is the international
development of this regime which is important. We have witnessed the time it has taken to develop the strategic arms limitation agreements. The same kind of time and effort and painstaking performance would need to go into the development of a regime such as this. In the last paragraph of the Prime Minister’s speech he said:

As a result the Government is satisfied that the policy it has decided upon represents a practical, reasonable and effective package of safeguards measures to seek from countries wishing to import uranium from Australia under any future contracts.

The point is that the Government now regards this statement as a complete policy on safeguards to usher in a policy of uranium exports. The basic implication behind the statement is that Australia will export its uranium, and pretty soon. The Opposition has always believed that the Liberals would export uranium irrespective of what the Opposition or the public might wish. It became obvious that the Fraser Government intends to export following a trip by the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Anthony, to the United States recently. At that time the Deputy Prime Minister softened up the Carter Administration and made it perfectly clear that Australia would do all that it could to export its uranium. In the 1960s Australia had an ‘All the Way With LBJ’ policy on the question of Vietnam—a policy formulated by the then Liberal Government in Australia. It is now obvious that the Liberal and National Country Parties want, as some wag put it, a ‘Cart it to Carter’ policy on the question of uranium.

I take just one specific component of the Government’s safeguard policy to illustrate how poorly thought out these safeguards are, apart from the implied reliance upon the International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards, which the Fox Commission said were next to useless and which the Opposition has referred to constantly in this House. The specific component that I want to deal with in the short time available is No. 4 of the Prime Minister’s address which deals with bilateral agreements between the Australian Government and countries wishing to import Australian uranium. The Prime Minister says that the Government will insist upon agreements with such countries containing clauses ensuring that nuclear materials supplied by Australia for peaceful purposes or nuclear material derived from it will not be diverted to military or explosive purposes and, further, that International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards will apply to verify compliance with this undertaking. Such a statement by the Government makes a mockery of international relationships as they exist today.

If the Government wants an example of the failure of such bilateral agreements on uranium, the case of Canadian uranium and nuclear technology being sold to India is a good example. The bilateral agreement in that case did not stop the Indians from developing an effective nuclear device. The Government’s proposals, while indicating some good intentions, are absolutely naive of the international political realities existing in the world today and fall far short of the kind of provisions called for the Fox Commission. The Parliamentary Labor Party has made it quite clear where it stands on the question of uranium exports. Just so that the Prime Minister and the Carter Administration are under no illusions I shall repeat our policy once again. The existing policy of the Parliamentary Labor Party is:

1. That existing contracts for uranium mining should be honoured, provided that no new mining developments are permitted to take place.
2. That the Labor Party should continually press for stricter international safeguards and controls over the handling of nuclear materials.
3. That it be made clear that the next Labor Government will not be bound to honour any future contracts entered into by the present Government.
4. That if, in Government, the Labor Party is satisfied that the hazards associated with nuclear power have been eliminated and satisfactory methods of waste disposal developed the question of uranium mining be reconsidered in the context of full public debate.

I shall dwell upon clause 3 of that policy where it states that the next Labor Government will not be bound to honour any future contracts entered into by the present Government. This is not saying that we will not honour any future contracts. However, Labor reserves the right to cancel such contract approval if it believes it is in the national interest to do so. This is not a capricious policy; it is a responsible attitude that makes it clear to the Australian uranium mining industry that any initiatives that the Fraser Government may take on uranium development do not necessarily lock a future Labor Government into such arrangements. I have stressed these provisions to international finance groups and to the mining industry and, I hope, to the Carter Administration so that they understand that the Government cannot lock a future Labor Government into a premature uranium development policy. This statement by the Prime Minister is too early as the Government is well aware and it is far too glib. If the Government thinks it is going to get away with this kind of policy by introducing it today, bringing the Fox report in tomorrow and making a decision next week, it will fail totally in its purpose. Perhaps the Government’s uranium
policy will join the long list of the Prime Minister’s recent failures—the wage-price freeze blow-out, the airline strike provocation, the Industrial Relations Bureau backtrack, the first referendum failure and now a broken down uranium policy to follow.

If the Government is kidding the industry along that it can make this policy stick it is wrong. The Government realises that the plants cannot be financed unless there is a consensus in policy between the two major parties in Australia because no matter what the Government says the international banking consortiums will not advance development moneys until they are sure a future Labor Government will not interrupt cash flows to service those debts. As well as that, the plants will not be fabricated by the Australian trade union movement until the Government is able genuinely to come to a consensus about uranium policy. So much for the glib statement of the Prime Minister and his attempt to offer the Carter Administration something which is plausible. I put on notice here for the American Administration that we regard American policy in the nuclear field as paramount to changes in relation to safeguards and waste disposal. But the development of policy will take time, and it will not happen overnight and it will not happen for the convenience of the Prime Minister in trying to shore up what he sees as an opportunity with the American President.

In conclusion, just to put it on the record, the statement is political. It comes before the second Fox Report, it is far too early, and it is far too glib. Whilst the Opposition does not disparage all the provisions of it, it does not support the spirit of it which is the beginning of a premature uranium policy for Australia. Mr Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later time.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Mr WILLIAM McMAHON (Lowe)—Mr Speaker, I wish to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER—Does the right honourable gentleman claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr WILLIAM McMAHON—Yes, I do. I draw attention to an article in today’s Australian which, referring to me, states:

He said he would tell the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, later this week of a plan which he claimed would assist greatly in overall recovery of the economy.

What I did do at a meeting with the building societies yesterday was to state that whilst a policy I mentioned could not be implemented immediately it was well deserving of consideration by the Prime Minister in his next policy speech, whenever that might occur. That is totally different from recommending action at present. I said that it was impracticable. Later on in the article a partial presentation was printed and it does not set out precisely the idea I was attempting to convey. I want to complete the picture. What I advised was that the time had come when we should be considering an organisation to guarantee repayments of loans. Such organisations are in existence in the United States and are in fact profitable. They are controlled by the government there. I think we ought to have one, too. We could make money out of it. Above all, it would bring confidence back into the industry. Secondly—you will remember most of these considerations yourself, Sir—I suggested that we should have an opportunity to have a market for mortgages over houses and said that the quicker that was implemented the better. Thirdly, I suggested that there should be reductions in taxation not only for those who had deposited money with the permanent building societies but also for those who lent the money. I said that if proper action were taken there could be a reduction in interest rates of something between 2 per cent and 3 per cent, which would be an enormous help.

The second thing I am supposed to have said, Sir, is that there should be no restrictions on housing financing today. I was asked a question as to whether I knew that the Reserve Bank had placed restrictions on the permanent building societies or told them that they should restrain their activities in the lending of money for the purchase of a first home. I said that I doubted whether that was the policy of the Government and that if it was I had never heard of it until today. I also said that if there was such a restriction by the Reserve Bank I believed that it was an improper one and that it was contrary to the interests of the people of this country. Approvals for commencements have in fact fallen. Those are the 2 matters I mentioned. I did say that I believed that if these policies—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The right honourable gentleman may state where he has been misrepresented and correct the misrepresentation, but he cannot repeat a speech.

Mr WILLIAM McMAHON—I accept your judgment, Sir. I was hoping that you would be indulgent, but I have not been able to get away with it. I turn to an article in the Melbourne Sun—News Pictorial headed ‘McMahon—Cut Interest Rates’, which reads:
A former Prime Minister and Treasurer, Mr McMahon, yesterday called for a 3 to 4 per cent cut in interest rates. I did no such thing. I was asked by somebody whether I thought interest rates should now be cut and, if so, by how much, and whether that could be done immediately. I said that nobody in his right senses could now advocate that interest rates ought to be cut and state the quantity and the size of the reduction that could take place because nobody knows the extent of the deficit and the method of funding it and therefore the effect that the cut would have on the money supply. Equally, nobody would know what would be our balance of trade on current account or what would be. This makes the job well nigh impossible.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! I must draw the right honourable gentleman’s attention to the fact that he can state the misrepresentation and correct it, as distinct from repeating a speech.

Mr WILLIAM McMAHON—Sir, I gave the reasons. I said that at this stage I could not either mention an amount or attempt to say when it ought to take place. That is what I put to the people who were present, Sir, I would like to claim your indulgence on this matter. The report of what I agreed to after lunch is correct. I have to state that I believe the Press had a difficult job in following what was said. It was an address to a group of professional and technical individuals. I could not expect the Press to follow exactly what I said or its implications. I think it would have been difficult for many of the members of this House to have followed it, too. I regret the fact that I had no notes that I could give to the Press. I knew the subject fairly well and I did not need very much briefing. I regret that my speech was reported by the Press in the way in which it was reported and not in the way in which I presented my case to the people who were present.

Mr WENTWORTH (Mackellar)—Sir, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Mr SPEAKER—Does the honourable gentleman claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr WENTWORTH—Yes, indeed.

Mr SPEAKER—The honourable gentleman may proceed.

Mr WENTWORTH—Some weeks ago I circulated among some members of this House and some people outside it a copy of a Treasury paper given to the Labor Cabinet. Doubts have been cast on the authenticity of this document. Therefore I want to make a statement in regard to it.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable gentleman is out of order unless he states where he has been misrepresented.

Mr WENTWORTH—Yes, Sir, I have, for example, a letter from Professor Sir Leslie Melville saying, and I quote it exactly:

I cannot believe that this muddled document represents a Treasury view—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable gentleman will resume his seat.

Mr WENTWORTH—Sir, I want to establish the authenticity of this paper. My veracity in the matter has been questioned and I think I am entitled to make an explanation.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable gentleman is able to take advantage of other parts of the proceedings of the House, but the making of a personal explanation on the basis of a misrepresentation is not a vehicle for establishing the authenticity of anything.

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY: REPORT OF AUSTRALIAN DELEGATION

Paper and Ministerial Statement

Mr PEACOCK (Kooyong—Minister for Foreign Affairs)—For the information of honourable members, I present the report of the Australian delegation to the Thirty-first Session of the United Nations General Assembly held in New York from 22 September to 22 December 1976. This was the first—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! Is the Minister seeking leave to make a statement?

Mr PEACOCK—Yes.

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

Mr PEACOCK—This was the first Assembly in which I have had the privilege of participating as Foreign Minister and Chairman of the Australian Delegation. I had the honour also to assist the Assembly in the capacity of being one of its Vice-Presidents. I look forward at this time to leading the delegation again this year. Last year’s session has been assessed as being lively but non-contentious. I hope that the Thirty-second Session this year will be the same.

The purpose of my making this statement particularly is to thank and pay tribute to the 2 parliamentary advisers and all members of our mission in New York and other members of the delegation for their valuable contribution to the work of the United Nations and the promotion of our interests and image. As a result of their
participation, the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr Clyde Cameron) and the honourable member for Diamond Valley (Mr Brown) have joined in preparing a separate report. With their agreement, it is appended to the report which I now present. It contains a number of proposals that will be of interest to honourable members generally. I commend both reports to study by the House.

Motion (by Mr Macphee) proposed:

That the House take note of the paper.

Mr BROWN (Diamond Valley) (4.22)—In support of the motion I wish to make a few brief remarks with respect to the report of the 2 parliamentary advisers that is attached to the report of the delegation as an appendix. The House may be wondering why there is a separate report of the parliamentary advisers as part of the delegation’s report. The reason why a separate report has been appended is set out in the first paragraph of the report. I shall take a brief moment to read it out, as it makes it plain why the separate report has been appended. It states:

The purpose of this report is to acquaint members of both Houses of our experience as the parliamentary advisers to Australia’s delegation to the General Assembly of the United Nations. We feel that we have an obligation to report to the Parliament and also to make some suggestions which we believe will improve the quality of parliamentary representation on the delegation in the future.

There are 2 reasons why the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr Clyde Cameron) and I felt that there should be a separate report from the 2 parliamentary representatives. Firstly, we felt that we had an obligation to report to the Parliament. Secondly, we felt that our remarks could possibly improve the quality of parliamentary representation in the future.

Those honourable members who read the report—I commend it to all honourable members—will see that it covers a number of matters. It covers, firstly, the number of parliamentary advisers and suggests that the membership of the delegation should be increased. The second matter referred to is the value of parliamentary representation on the delegation. The view is expressed there by both of us that the presence of members of Parliament on the delegation cannot but improve the quality of the representation that Australia has in the United Nations. The next matter that is dealt with is the preparation that should be undertaken by parliamentary members of the delegation before they proceed to New York. We have put forward the view that further preparations should be made so that parliamentary members of the delegation may prepare themselves properly for the General Assembly and better acquit themselves while they are in New York.

There is also a paragraph in the report dealing with our work with the delegation. The point is made in that respect that both the honourable member for Hindmarsh and I took, we would hope, a fairly active part in the work of the delegation. We venture to express the view that the contributions we made were valuable. The report also makes some remarks about the operations of the mission in New York to which I will come back at a later stage. We make some general remarks also on the value of the United Nations itself and on the facilities which are available for members of Parliament who are members of the delegation. As the report says, we raised that matter with some trepidation because inevitably when the issue of facilities for members of Parliament is raised in any context the accusation, of course, is made that members of Parliament are interested only in their own comfort, welfare or convenience. But the view we expressed was that if members of Parliament are to be part of our delegation to the United Nations and if members are to perform their functions properly, they must be properly equipped and facilities must be provided to enable them properly to carry out their functions. We suggest in that part of the report a number of specific matters that should be attended to before the next delegation proceeds to New York.

The conclusion to the report is probably the most important part. I take leave for a moment to read out that part of the section of the report which states:

We believe it is of great importance that when Australia’s foreign policy is being discussed in public, the people, through their elected representatives, should be present and should participate. It is for that reason that we have Parliamentary Advisers as members of our Delegation to the United Nations. It is for the same reason that we believe strongly that there should be parliamentary representatives at all major international conferences in which Australia takes part. The most obvious one is the Law of the Sea Conference, but there are several others.

The report goes on to say:

The public has the right to be represented at such conferences and to make its own contribution. The only practical way in which this can be done is for Members of Parliament to be members of our delegations to those conferences.

We recommend that the Parliament pursues this proposal with vigour. It would considerably enhance the standing of the Parliament and improve the quality of Australia’s representation at these significant international meetings.

They are the remarks that we make at the conclusion to our report and I want to emphasise
them here. They relate to a tremendously important matter at a time when the argument is being advanced that Parliament is becoming increasingly irrelevant and when it is said that important matters facing this country are being determined outside and not within the Parliament, that members of Parliament should have an active part to play in the determination of the very vital issues which are facing this country. Clearly this is so in respect of domestic matters. We believe it is equally so in foreign and defence matters which of course cannot be determined solely by the Parliament because they necessarily involve negotiations with the representatives of other countries; they necessarily involve participation in international conferences. What can be done is that members of Parliament, who represent the people, can actively participate in those conferences and express a parliamentary view or, if you like, a public view channelled through them.

I have mentioned one case where we think participation by members of Parliament is particularly important, and that is in respect of conferences on the law of the sea. However, there are others which are equally as important. I venture to suggest that members of Parliament probably should have been members of Australian delegations to meetings of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. Future UNCTAD conferences should include parliamentary representation. There are many other international conferences which are taking place and probably more which will take place in the future which are concerned with issues which are of vital and tremendous importance to Australia. The issues in the whole energy area, whether they be uranium or other aspects of energy, of course are probably the most important that this country will face this century. Those matters are of such overwhelming importance that we venture to suggest that Parliament is falling down on its job if it does not give urgent consideration to proper and full parliamentary representation on the Australian delegations that go to these international conferences. We will be failing in our functions if we do not address our minds to that important matter.

There is another particular matter to which I would like to make some brief reference; namely that matter set out in paragraph 6 of our joint report under the heading 'The Operation of the Mission'. The problem arises, of course, from the fact that the United Nations is in New York and our Government is here. As a result the question arises: How does the Government convey its decisions to our delegation in New York? I happen to hold the view firmly that all decisions that are made by this Government and all decisions that are conveyed through the United Nations to the world are decisions which should be made here in Canberra. The view, of course, is expressed by some that the delegation is in New York and therefore is on the spot. Consequently, so it is argued, it is more in tune with what is going on in New York and within the international community and as a result, so it is said, the delegation in New York is more able than are people in Canberra to make decisions as to what Australia's position should be. I do not subscribe to that view. I do not wish to make any aspersions against the very highly qualified members of the delegation that we have had in New York and which no doubt we will have in the future. But I emphasise that membership of the delegation will change. Also, many members of the delegation in New York are officers who, although of course highly qualified, nevertheless have limited experience in terms of time. Consequently I feel that it is very important that issues are referred back to Canberra so that the Government can give full and proper consideration to them before it makes a decision as to what our position will be in New York and before we translate that decision into action in the form of a vote in New York.

Finally, although not the least important, I wish to pay particular respect and regard to the honourable member for Hindmarsh who was, of course, a pleasant travelling companion and a very valuable member of the delegation. The honourable member spoke a number of times in New York and impressed delegations from other countries and the other significant international figures who were present at the time. In fact they were so impressed by the honourable member that they must have asked themselves a few questions about his Leader because there is no doubt as to the quality of the representation which the Australian Labor Party sent to New York in the form of the honourable member.

Also I would like to reiterate the remarks we made in the report by way of acknowledgement and thanks to the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Peacock) for his excellent leadership of the delegation and for the high quality of the speech which he delivered to the General Assembly, it being one of the comparatively few interesting speeches delivered in the General Assembly, and for the hospitality he extended to us on a number of occasions. As a result of this hospitality we were given the opportunity to meet a number of significant leaders of the international community whom the Minister of course already
knew but whom we did not know. Also, they were given the opportunity to meet us and to listen to some of the interesting views which the honourable member for Hindmarsh had put forward on the structure of the economies of western societies which they found educational and interesting, even if they were not the views which they would necessarily accept.

Although all honourable members are not in the chamber at the moment I commend the report of the parliamentary advisers to honourable members. I urge them to read and consider what we have said because we feel that not only does the report raise some interesting issues about the United Nations and the Parliamentary representation at the United Nations but also it raises some very important issues as to just exactly what is the role of Parliament and members of Parliament in the conduct of international affairs in this country.

Mr CLYDE CAMERON (Hindmarsh) (4.35)—I have much pleasure in joining with the honourable member for Diamond Valley (Mr Brown) in congratulating the Australian Ambassador to the United Nations on the excellent work which he is doing there on behalf of our country. Like the honourable member I share the pride which he felt in the very high standard of the supporting staff which our Ambassador, Mr Harry, has to help him in the United Nations. I join most enthusiastically with the honourable member in complimenting the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Peacock) on the way in which he handled himself at the United Nations. It was a very proud moment for me, as an Australian, to see our Minister for Foreign Affairs being elected by an overwhelming majority as Vice-President of the United Nations General Assembly. He spoke very well. I cannot recall anything in his speech to which I could have taken umbrage. I am sure that my co-delegate joins me when I say that I felt proud to be an Australian at seeing our Minister discharging his responsibilities in a splendid, dignified and efficient manner.

Leaving party politics to one side, I say that the present Minister for Foreign Affairs represented Australia extremely well at the United Nations. He is highly regarded. From watching his meanderings—perhaps that is not a very good word—through the halls of the United Nations, it is obvious that he is well liked, highly respected and highly regarded by the leaders of all the other important countries which are represented at the United Nations General Assembly. He was one of the few men who had the good sense or political nous to detect the very fine trend in American public opinion which eventually resulted in the election of President Carter. I thought at the time I heard the Minister predict a victory for President Carter that it was a rather bold prediction because from what I could read in the newspapers and from what I heard on radio and television I felt, at one stage, it was very unlikely that there would be a change in the presidency. Not only did our Minister for Foreign Affairs accurately predict the outcome of the presidential election but also he had the acute good sense to invite to the Australian Ambassador’s residence for an official dinner the man he predicted would become the Secretary of State to the new President.

I had the great pleasure and honour of sitting opposite Mr Cyrus Vance. I am one of the few Australians who is in a position to say that he has talked with the present Secretary of State. We met other people whose identity it is perhaps best for me, as the representative of the electorate of Hindmarsh, not to mention. But I found them extremely interesting. They found me interesting too. I think they were pleased to learn from me that I would never be Prime Minister of Australia and, consequently, that my views about multinational corporations need not worry them greatly. They showed a sort of gentle amusement about what I said ought to be done for multinational corporations. I cannot speak too highly of the work which was carried out by my co-delegate who was the leader of our parliamentary delegation of two, the honourable member for Diamond Valley.

Dr Klugman—Were you deputy?

Mr CLYDE CAMERON—I was his deputy, yes, but at no stage did he pull rank on me. He behaved almost as if I were his equal. He was a good, generous, interesting, loyal and able companion. We loyally supported each other on every issue which came up for discussion at the briefing sessions for our delegation at the United Nations. We attended those briefing sessions religiously. I cannot remember any of us missing any of those briefing sessions. We found them extremely helpful. I would like to think that the officials meant what they said when they told us that they found our presence, remarks and advice extremely helpful to them. The honourable member for Diamond Valley is quite right in saying that the Parliament ought to pay far greater attention than it has hitherto done to the work of the United Nations General Assembly. It is the most important overseas body with which this Parliament and Australia are associated. Parliament ought not treat trips to the United Nations as mere junkets or as an excuse
to get away from Australia. Such trips can be extremely important to the Parliament and to the delegates who represent the Parliament if they give to such trips the kind of attention which they deserve.

I must compliment our delegation on the esteem in which they are held, particularly by Third World countries. It is quite apparent, from attending the various committees of the United Nations General Assembly, that our representatives are highly regarded by other countries, especially the countries with which we have to deal commercially, economically and perhaps in a geographical sense. It is a disadvantage to the Parliament that it sends only 2 delegates when, I think, there are 7 committees. Most of the other countries which are smaller than we are see this occasion as important enough to send more parliamentary advisers than we send. Not only do they send more, but also they send the delegations in waves so that more than one group attending each year can get the benefit of United Nations briefings and understanding.

Mr Kelly—Do they have any continuity in membership?

Mr CLYDE CAMERON—The honourable member raises an important question. Although I am not a candidate for the next trip, I believe it is very important that someone who attended this year’s conference ought automatically to be an adviser to next year’s conference—that is one member from each side—so that the parliamentary groups can get the benefit of the experience of the previous delegates. It ought to be a condition that somebody who attended one year should automatically be part of the larger delegation which attends in following years.

Staff is brought from other countries. Doctor Merrillees was brought from London to attend the United Nations General Assembly. Delegates were brought from Chicago and another delegate was brought from Jamaica. I understand that a delegate was brought from another country which is a long way away. This is a good idea. It is not necessary to have the full complement of delegates which we need for that year in New York for the United Nations General Assembly meetings.

If we are to call on vigorous young men—Dr Merrillees appeared to be one of them—to come from London to the United Nations for up to 4 months we ought not to expect them to come without their wives. We should offer them the opportunity of bringing their wives to New York and we should pay for their economy class travel, which is how the parliamentary advisers travel.

In relation to economy class fare, I cannot support too strongly the view of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) who has said that Department of Foreign Affairs officials ought to travel overseas on economy class fares. They should not expect to be given first class fares when members of the national Parliament are quite prepared to travel overseas on economy class fares. That is something about which I feel very strongly.

The briefings were of general interest, but of particular interest to me were the briefings given on the law of the sea. I had only vaguely heard the term ‘law of the sea’, and as Ambassador Harry unfolded the complexities of the subject and the enormous consequences it has for the people of this country, it seemed sad to me that this Parliament had never bothered to have a full dress debate on the law of the sea. Australia has a particular interest in the law of the sea in that, prima facie at any rate, we have a claim on part of the Antarctic. If the law of the sea is to be applied in relation to the 200-mile limit from the shoreline of our own country and its territories, Australia’s relationship to the Antarctic and our interest in the riches of the seas surrounding our Antarctic territories ought to be given special attention on its own. Of course, one cannot look at it on its own because we have many thousands of miles of coastline which are also affected. Mr Harry is very well versed in the law of the sea. I did not think I could ever become interested in this thing called the law of the sea until I got a little way into the subject, when I found that it was most fascinating.

That brings me to my next point. I believe that the Minister ought to give consideration to sending one observer from each side of the House to the conferences on the law of the sea. I do not think there ought to be a large delegation of the type for which I have indicated my support so far as the United Nations General Assembly is concerned, but the Parliament ought to have some first-hand knowledge of the law of the sea. I query the advisability of our Minister for Foreign Affairs sticking so closely to WEOG—the West European and Others Group—in the United Nations. We have a much greater affinity with the Association of South East Asian Nations, or perhaps some other new group with close geographical and economic interests, than we have with WEOG. It seemed a bit absurd to me that when we cast a vote on the issue of the French islands off the African coast and, instead of following a policy which would have been more in keeping with Australia’s best interests, we slavishly followed the policy laid down by
WEOG, which is so much further away from these islands than we are. We ought to be independent.

However, part of the trouble is that our delegation at the United Nations seems to be too much concerned with getting on to committees and being elected to various positions of importance at the United Nations. When it is asked to give an opinion on whether there is some national advantage in attaching ourselves to a grouping that is more in keeping with our geographical position than WEOG, the delegation immediately colours its advice to us by considering how the new grouping will affect its chances of being elected to some committee. We ought to pay less attention to committees and more attention to the welfare of Australia. Australia is in the fortunate position of being trusted by the representatives of the Third World. They respect us. I repeat that they trust us to a point where we ought never to do anything to betray that trust. It is a trust and respect that has not been built up overnight but over many years. We ought to value it and be proud of it, and continue to act in the same way as the present Minister did when he was at the United Nations.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member’s time has expired.

Mr GARLAND (Curtin) (4.50)—I take the opportunity on the presentation of this report of congratulating the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Peacock) on his election, which I might say has received all too little recognition in this country. What the previous speaker, the honourable member for Hindmarsh (Mr Clyde Cameron), said about the Minister and the high office he has attained was properly and well said. I also congratulate the 2 delegates who went to last year’s United Nations General Assembly for being able to have attached to this report their own report as appendix. I believe it is a valuable one and makes a number of points which members who have attended the United Nations General Assembly, and I was one in 1973, would support and perhaps in retrospect wish that they had made to this House. In the main, I support the views which have been put to the House by the honourable member for Diamond Valley (Mr Brown) and the honourable member for Hindmarsh. I associate myself with those views and particularly with the statements they made about the quality of the Foreign Affairs officers in the Australian mission to the United Nations. One such officer, Mr Campbell, was equally hospitable to me and to the honourable member for Prospect (Dr Klugman). Mr Campbell is in the chamber today now as an adviser to the Government, and I pay tribute to the hospitality and cooperation which he and his associates extended to us when we attended the 1973 United Nations General Assembly.

Our experiences were similar to those of this delegation. I think it ought to be said that this House pays too little attention to the activities in the United Nations. There are reasons why honourable members, and perhaps Australians generally, have some hesitation about praising the activities of the United Nations, but surely those people must realise on reflection that, as the major international body, it is a body in which we should participate as honestly, as straightforwardly and as actively as we can. The members of this Parliament who have been to the United Nations have had an experience at the most important international body in the world which will help them for all of their political lives. I believe that this House ought to follow the recommendation made by those members in their report. If I might say so to the Minister, I believe that not only members of the House but he and the Government also should take an interest in the recommendations contained in the report.

Debate (on motion by Mr Peacock) adjourned.

REFUGEE POLICY AND MECHANISMS

Ministerial Statement

Mr MacKELLAR (Warringah—Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs)—by leave—Mr Speaker, I wish to make a statement on refugee policy and new arrangements to enable refugee and analogous situations to be dealt with promptly, equitably and effectively. Many of our citizens were once refugees or displaced persons. They have found security and prosperity here and have made a valuable contribution to our country. When we welcomed them, it was hoped that refugees and disabled persons were a temporary post-war phenomenon. Now we have to recognise that this was not so. There still are many people in many parts of the world who can be called refugees. Unfortunately, crises which lead to the endangering and displacement of human beings have become commonplace and it is only the more catastrophic or immediate of such situations which now make the headlines. Despite the best efforts of people of good will and of the international community, we must expect that there will continue to be refugees. Apart from all other considerations, we cannot control the forces of nature. In the past year we have seen the force of natural disasters and their
effects for people with associations with Australia.

As a matter of humanity, and in accord with international obligations freely entered into, Australia has accepted a responsibility to contribute toward the solution of world refugee problems. To this end: It has ratified the Convention on the Status of Refugees; it is a member of the Executive Committee of the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and contributes to the resettlement funds of the UNHCR; it recognises the need through its immigration policy to fulfil the legal obligations required by the Convention and to develop special humanitarian programs for the resettlement of the displaced and/or the persecuted. These steps, taken as an involved member of the international community, must now be complemented by the adoption and application of an ongoing refugee policy and refugee mechanism. We do injustice to previous governments if we do not give tribute to Australia’s contribution in resettlement of refugees in the past. We have done this partly to develop our country, partly to respond to situations demanding a humanitarian response. We have done this without an articulated policy. Such a policy is needed.

If we are to seek to act in the interests of refugees themselves and the Australian community, it is necessary to face up to many practical difficulties. Many refugees are not simply migrants beset by a few additional problems. They are often persons who are distressed and disoriented and who need specialised settlement assistance. Uprooted from their familiar surroundings, they may face the shock of cultural dissimilarities, a language barrier and perhaps the trauma of the discovery that their skills or the occupation they followed in their country of origin are not recognised or have no parallel in their country of refuge.

Those who have in the recent past exhorted the Government to accept greater numbers of refugees must take into account the need to coordinate and develop such Government and community resources as will assist not only in the acceptance, but also in the responsible settlement, of refugees. A fact often forgotten is that many refugees do not want to come to Australia or, at least, they prefer to go to another country where, for instance, they have close relatives or their language is spoken. Moreover, our own capacity to accept refugees is not unlimited. Australia’s present and future capacity to resettle refugees successfully depends on many factors including: The prevailing economic situation; the level of unemployment; the locations within Australia to which refugees wish to go; the background of refugees to be accepted—their capacity for early integration or otherwise; the availability of special post arrival services—language instruction, education, training, accommodation, health and welfare; and the numbers of refugees for which voluntary agencies can care.

The Government’s approach to refugees is based on the following four principles:

1. Australia fully recognises its humanitarian commitment and responsibility to admit refugees for resettlement.

2. The decision to accept refugees must always remain with the Government of Australia.

3. Special assistance will often need to be provided for the movement of refugees in designated situations or for their resettlement in Australia.

4. It may not be in the interest of some refugees to settle in Australia. Their interests may be better served by resettlement elsewhere. The Australian Government makes an annual contribution to the UNHCR which is the main body associated with such resettlement.

It is the Government’s view that the acceptance and settlement of refugees should be a continuum beginning with a quick and decisive response to international crises and concluding, after what may be a long and difficult path for the refugee, with successful integration into the Australian community. We have to recognise, however, that there can be refugees with the sort of background, education and skills enabling them to fit readily into the Australian scene. It may be a disservice to them to continue to single them out for special treatment as refugees after they have arrived in Australia. There are others who may not wish to be labelled as ‘refugees’ over a period.

In situations where refugees are under immediate and dire personal threat, acceptance of people who will face settlement difficulties in Australia is justified. More generally, we have to keep in mind that it may not be in the interests of refugees not under immediate personal threat to accept them for entry to Australia if they will face major long term settlement problems here. It may be preferable for them to be resettled in another country or to be sustained in a more suitable environment, through the UNHCR. This is the responsible approach based on the long view which takes account not only of the problem but also of the best solution.
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Within the range of people who are forced by events to become refugees there will be many variations of circumstances and conditions. Needs will differ. The Government recognises that:

1. There will be people in refugee-type situations who do not fall strictly within the UNHCR mandate or within Convention definitions. Government policy will be sufficiently flexible to enable the extension of this policy, where appropriate, to such people. I shall return to this.

2. Some refugees will be capable of meeting normal migrant criteria concerning family reunion or occupational skills. Where appropriate, such refugees should be selected and resettled in the normal manner under current migrant policies. In accordance with the practice adopted by some other countries, priority in processing will be given to them.

3. Other refugees will not fall within the normally acceptable degrees of family relationship or have skills within currently acceptable criteria. Many may have great social adjustments to make in Australia. In offering resettlement to its fair share of these, Australia should first seek those who have relatives in Australia or associations with Australia and those who will be able to make the necessary social adjustments.

4. The interests of those refugees who, it is assessed, would have extreme difficulty in adjusting to the Australian environment may not be best served by migration to Australia but be better served by action by the UNHCR or other agencies to resettle them in a more compatible environment. I would stress that the Government readily accepts that there will be people in urgent need of resettlement who will have major problems of resettlement in Australia. It would be inconsistent with the humanitarian nature of refugee resettlement not to accept some people in this category.

5. There will also be refugees, some of working age, who will be unable to qualify for selection under these refugee guidelines because of physical, mental or social handicaps. Provided that appropriate institutional care is available, Australia will be prepared in principle to accept refugees in this category. No specific quota will be set but each case will be considered in the light of Australia’s capacity to provide adequate care.

6. Through its ratification of the Convention on the Status of Refugees, Australia has accepted certain obligations in relation to people covered by the Convention. Situations arise from time to time in which people such as those who enter Australia illegally—for example, deserting seamen—or who become prohibited immigrants—for example, by the expiry of temporary permits—claim to be refugees entitled to the protection of the Convention and in consequence request permission to remain permanently in Australia. A standing inter-departmental body will be established to evaluate such claims and to make recommendations on them to me. It is proposed that the Office of the UNHCR will be involved as necessary in these deliberations.

To enable Australia to respond quickly to designated refugee situations the Government has decided that new mechanisms will be introduced. These are as follows:

1. The Government will consider proposals from the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs for designating refugee situations and appropriate responses to them. The designated refugee situations will be kept under regular review. Where it is decided that the Australian response to a refugee situation should be in the form of contributions to the UNHCR or other agencies to resettle or temporarily maintain refugees outside Australia, the Minister for Foreign Affairs will continue to determine the modalities and amount of assistance.

2. A standing inter-departmental committee on refugees comprising a senior officer of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs as chairman, and senior officers of the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Prime Minister and Cabinet, Employment and Industrial Relations, Social Security, Finance, Health and Education with other departments and the Public Service Board to be co-opted as necessary, will be established.

This Committee will advise the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on the capacity for accepting refugees; consult annually, and otherwise as necessary, with voluntary agencies regarding the numbers they would accept for resettlement; recommend co-ordination for arrival and immediate resettlement; and regularly review
the intake of refugees against the capacity of resources in this country to ensure successful resettlement.

3. Voluntary agencies are to be encouraged to participate and indicate periodically, or as the need arises, the extent of assistance they can provide. Early consideration will be given to those refugees who are the subject of adequate sponsorship by appropriate voluntary bodies. In this respect there is a continuing flow of refugees in small groups or as individuals brought to attention by the UNHCR and/or by voluntary agencies in Australia. Provided satisfactory sponsorship is available, a small number of such refugees could be accepted on a case by case basis by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. Some agencies expect they may be able to maintain refugees approved for entry to Australia for 12 months after arrival here. This will be explored.

4. It is proposed to resume the practice of posting an Australian officer to a position in the UNHCR in Geneva and to seek to re-establish formal relations with the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration through observer status.

5. The Refugee Unit of the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs will be strengthened. This will enable prompt and efficient responses by experienced officers to refugee situations in which it is decided that Australia should participate. We now have considerable experience with the task force approach. The capacity to respond to refugee situations in this and other ways will be developed.

6. The first step taken under this new policy will be to locate staff in Thailand temporarily to make a continuing contribution to the resolution of refugee problems there. There will be a regular intake of Indo-Chinese refugees from Thailand and nearby areas at a level consistent with our capacity as a community to resettle them. In this operation we shall be relying greatly on the co-operation of the UNHCR, other Governments, especially the Thai Government, and voluntary agencies in Australia.

It is clear from the foregoing that the object of the Government's initiative is a declaration of a comprehensive refugee policy and the establishment of administrative machinery needed to put it into effect. It will enable us to respond to the needs of those who are displaced, without the constraint of technical definition. The comprehensive nature of this overall approach should not be seen as limiting Australia's options in particular situations. A refugee policy must be capable of coping with crises which arise suddenly and often unexpectedly. It must be cognizant of the fact that in such situations human beings have human needs which are intensified by conditions of danger and distress.

Over the past 30 years, Australia has developed an international reputation for resettlement. It reacted to the plight of displaced persons in Europe immediately after World War II and to the consequences of various events in Eastern Europe, of which the most notable were the Soviet repression of movements towards national independence in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. Australia has played, and is continuing to play, a responsible part in the resettlement of distressed persons and refugees from the Lebanon and Indo-China. I believe that there would be few in this House who would not support a commitment for Australia to play the most effective role possible in refugee settlement. The Government is committed to this view. It is in the belief that there is a community willingness to assist the dispossessed and displaced from overseas in a sensible and realistic way to seek sanctuary and a new life in Australia, that I commend this statement to the Parliament and the people of Australia. I present the following paper:


Motion (by Mr Macphee) proposed:

That the House take note of the paper.

Mr INNES (Melbourne) (5.9)—The Opposition welcomes the statement on the Government's policy on refugees, belated though it is and with all the shortcomings it contains. At least it outlines some machinery for finding some of the facts for investigation in relation to the problems faced by refugees and displaced persons throughout the world. For the most part, this long statement is padded with a deal of rhetoric to embellish it as a dramatic and forward move in dealing with the very serious problems of refugees, quasi-refugees and displaced people. It is designed to cover up the incompetent bungling and the deception by the Government in its inefficient administration in terms of providing details of persons in the categories mentioned in the statement. The Opposition acknowledges the machinery anticipated by the statement. However, all the purple prose and sophisticated machinery in the world will not go one iota towards resolving the plight of the refugees and other
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similarly affected people throughout the world unless the Government applies the spirit of the United Nations convention and the spirit of the report which was presented by the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence instead of, as it has done up till now, paying lip service to the principles of the convention and hiding behind the legalisms and the literal interpretation of the United Nations definition of 'refugee'.

If one takes into account the track record of the Government in dealing with the refugee question and its total disregard for the indignity which people have suffered in certain areas, for people who have been displaced and for individuals who fear for their safety and who are apprehensive about returning to their countries where there have been changes of government and in which they will face intolerable privations if they return, one can be excused for being apprehensive about the sincerity of the Government on this question.

As I have indicated, it is pleasing to see that finally the Government is enunciating an ongoing refugee policy. Unfortunately, the statement of the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar) fails to implement the most significant of the recommendations of the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence. The Government is to establish a standing interdepartmental committee on refugees, as recommended by the Senate Committee; but it totally ignores the proposal to set up an Australian refugee policy council. Paragraph 7.14 of the Senate Committee report states:

The Committee recommends the establishment of an advisory body to be known as the 'Australian Refugee Policy Council' for the purpose of assisting the Government to formulate an Australian policy on all aspects of refugee resettlement and to review and continually assess its implementation and effectiveness. Membership of this body should be drawn from both government and non-government sources. On the non-government side, membership should comprise representatives from the major Australian refugee-receiving and overseas-aid agencies, the Australian representative of the UNHCR (in an observer capacity), Red Cross, other organisations having practical experience in settlement work and post-hostel community support for refugees, and representatives from the academic community.

This is typical of the Government's attitude. It has the bureaucracy determining these issues—a select little club advising the Minister without the direct participation of people who are involved in the matter and who know something about the humanitarian aspects of it. Without this council there is no mechanism for representation of the non-government sector. The major voluntary refugee receiving and aid-giving organisations have been ignored by the Government and will not be consulted in the development of refugee policies. As Australia's past endeavours in this field have depended heavily upon these organisations and representatives of the various ethnic groups in our society, this omission will seriously hamper the development of an adequate and comprehensive refugee policy. It is typical of the Government's patronising view of migrants and their welfare that they will not be consulted. The decisions will be imposed on them by some select group. The Opposition believes that that is not implementing the principles and the spirit of the report.

The Government also has ignored its obligations under the convention relating to the status of refugees. In this respect the recommendation of the Senate Standing Committee was as follows:

As a means of providing refugees (and migrants) with realistic opportunities for obtaining apprenticeships, appropriate employment, admission to tertiary and other educational institutions and opportunities for re-training, the Committee recommends that, irrespective of the current levels of proficiency, financial support be provided to all males and females of working age whilst they attend English language classes.

The attitude of the Government is reflected in what is proposed for the forthcoming year, when there will be restrictions on the capacity to carry out that work. So it is hypocrisy to talk about an intake of refugees while paying only lip service to the principles to which I have made reference. The statement makes great play of the international convention. It says that it has ratified the Convention on the Status of Refugees. It has not ratified the Convention. It has failed to add up to the principles that are spelt out therein. We believe that it is fundamental to any refugee policy for the future.

I have indicated that the track record of the Government in dealing with refugee problems leaves a lot to be desired. I think it is worth repeating a statement made in relation to Chileans by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on 18 November in response to a question which I placed on the Notice Paper some months before. He stated that deportation orders had been signed against 30 Chileans who were illegally resident in Australia. Clearly, there is a total disregard for the safety of people who are asked to return to a situation in which their freedom and even their lives would be in jeopardy at the hands of one of the most corrupt regimes ever to hold power anywhere in the world. The evidence available is totally authoritative. Reports by Amnesty International ought to
be taken into account. I am sure that the honourable member for Parramatta (Mr Ruddock) would be the first to support my contention that that is correct.

Mr MacKellar—What about the sixth point recognised by the Government in the statement.

Mr INNES—That point again adds lip service to this situation. Let us consider the situation of Hishamuddin Rais, the Malaysian student. When one has a look at his background in his own country it is sheer hypocrisy by any reasoning or any reading of that history to say that his safety would not be in question if he returned to Malaysia. As a matter of fact, the Government has recognised this. It has indicated that he can stay in Australia for another 6 months in order to allow some leeway in the country to which he wishes to go. That means we accept that he has a problem. We accept the situation at large. But we are passing the buck. We are getting some other country to take the responsibility and not ourselves. If that is any indication of the principles and the spirit of how this policy will be carried out then it leaves a lot to be desired. As I have indicated, language instruction is a fundamental matter on which the spirit of any refugee policy has to be maintained. It has been undermined by the steps which the Government has taken in the previous Budget. We are convinced by the statements already made that in the months ahead fewer steps will be taken.

With regard to the Government's very sorry record in relation to the Lebanese crisis the Leader of the Opposition (Mr E. G. Whitlam) and myself have raised issues repeatedly in this place concerning the Government's inaction, its deception of the Lebanese community in Australia and its failure to assist the passage of an adequate number of refugees from this sorry nation to Australia. The record speaks for itself. All the Government did was to raise the expectation of the people from Lebanon. When people flocked in their numbers out of the country into overseas posts the Government cut off the very post in which the poorer element from the Lebanon could have left the country and been placed in the same category as anyone else with the same opportunity of joining their relatives in this country. If a person did not have £100 to get across the Mediterranean to Nicosia it was just bad luck. He had to stay. What has the Government done now? It is going to open the post in Beirut. But I understand—I should like the Minister to confirm this one of these days—that it is simply going to transfer the staff from Nicosia to Beirut. What has the Minister to say about the staff ceilings? If we continue to apply staff ceilings in the Public Service, the temporary situation that the Minister mentioned in the statement with regard to Thailand will not last as long as the previous operation. Once again it is patronising to make a statement such as this when the Government takes the very actions that will undermine it from the start.

Whilst we are dealing with that aspect of the statement which refers clearly to the establishment of staff in Thailand temporarily to make a continuing contribution to the resolution of the refugee problem there I ask: What about Cyprus? The statement referred to a whole range of other matters which I acknowledge are very serious and come within the ambit of the refugee problem. The Opposition feels for those refugees as it does for other refugees. The Minister talked about displaced people. He mentioned the situation in Czechoslovakia in 1968 and Hungary in 1956. There was not one word about Cyprus, one of the Commonwealth countries in which there are 200,000 displaced people. The Government did not have the responsibility even to attend a conference convened for the purpose of implementing the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus. I also refer to the situation concerning Vietnamese refugees coming to Australia in boats. Of course, their plight has to be recognised. But what about the people from Chile? Does this statement mean that if they can row across from Chile and land in Australia they become part of our responsibility in a different sense? That is the way it has been administered. All the machinery and all the guff in this statement is just padding out this situation to make it sound nice. If we apply the same sorts of standards and principles which the Minister has applied in the past we will be no further advanced.

The Opposition acknowledges that there must be efficient, effective machinery to deal with the refugee problem. We will not come to grips with it if we pay lip service as this statement clearly does. In relation to people who will be resettled in Australia, we will go through a process of advising the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs on the capacity for accepting refugees and will regularly review the intake of refugees against the capacity of resources in this country to ensure successful resettlement. The Green Paper that has been produced by the Government is a political document. It does not go to the point, nor can it provide the information that is necessary to deal with this problem in an intelligent way. There is need for a comprehensive, balanced inquiry into Australia's population resources and our need for migrants, not
the inquiry which has been held or the political document which has been presented as a Green Paper. There needs to be clear detail of what this means.

Questions concerning these details have been placed on the Notice Paper by the Leader of the Opposition and myself to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser). They have asked for the number of refugees that have landed in this country. They have never been answered. If the Minister would like the question numbers they are 197, 252 and 807. If the Government is to set up machinery to deal with this problem in an intelligent and purposeful way it has to tidy its approach to the problem. Whilst the Opposition acknowledges and welcomes the statement, it is shallow and weak. It needs to be looked at again if it is to be effective.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

TARIFF PROPOSALS

Mr HOWARD (Bennelong—Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister) (5.23)—I move:


The Customs Tariff Proposals I have just tabled relate to proposed alterations to the Customs Tariff Act 1966. The Proposals give effect to the Government's decision on the recommendations by the Industries Assistance Commission in its report on monochrome television receivers and certain electronic components. The effect of this decision is that existing rates of duty applying to monochrome television sets and certain types of electrical capacitors will be maintained. Minimum rates of duty will apply to electrolytic capacitors and monochrome cathode ray tubes for use as original components. The rate for mounted loudspeakers is reduced to 25 per cent while a rate of 15 per cent, or, if higher, 50c each, will apply to unmounted loudspeakers. A comprehensive summary of changes contained in the proposals is now being circulated to honourable members.

Debate (on motion by Mr Scholes) adjourned.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

Mr CONNOLLY (Bradfield)—As Chairman, I present the 163rd report of the Joint Committee of Public Accounts.

Ordered that the report be printed.

Mr CONNOLLY—I seek leave to make a statement.

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

Mr CONNOLLY—As honourable members are aware, after the close of each financial year the Treasurer submits to the Parliament for its consideration and approval a statement of expenditure from the Advance to the Treasurer showing allocations to heads of expenditure made by him from the Advance under section 36A of the Audit Act. The Committee carries out the parliamentary scrutiny of this past expenditure by obtaining explanations from departments for each item of expenditure finally charged to the Advance and selecting the more notable of these for public inquiry. The 163rd report relates specifically to evidence taken in connection with items of expenditure from the Advance to the Treasurer in 1975-76.

In chapter 1 of the report the Committee has stated that, in examining expenditure from the Advance to the Treasurer, it has sought to ascertain whether or not expenditure from the Advance has been confined to urgent and unforeseeable requirements for which provision could not have been made in the original and additional estimates. The Committee has also sought to ascertain whether or not the departments concerned in the inquiry have maintained efficient administration in the expenditure of funds under the items selected for public inquiry. As the report shows, there were cases in relation to the Departments of Industry and Commerce, Prime Minister and Cabinet and Social Security where expenditure from the Advance to the Treasurer was confined to urgent and unforeseeable requirements for which provision could not have been made in the Appropriation Acts. In other cases, however, there was evidence of clerical errors, inefficient estimating procedures, and delays which caused expenditure to be charged to the Advance when provision should properly have been made in the additional estimates. For example, in the transfer of responsibilities for the Australian Capital Territory Police Force from the Department of Business and Consumer Affairs to the Department of the Capital Territory, a number of accounts received and registered in the Department of the Capital Territory were inexplicably overlooked when additional estimates were being prepared. Another example occurred in the Department of Education where it failed to consider the financial and accounting
implications of the introduction of a new pay cycle for beneficiaries under the Tertiary Education Assistance Scheme. Attention has been drawn to these and other similar inadequacies where they have been discovered.

In the report the Committee has emphasised the serious light in which it viewed the action of the Department of Administrative Services in charging expenditure relating to the purchase of Governor Macquarie's sword and dirk to the wrong appropriation. When it drew a cheque for the purchase against an appropriation that had not been approved by the Parliament for that purpose, the Department knowingly contravened a very important principle embodied in section 83 of the Constitution which states:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury of the Commonwealth except under appropriation made by law.

The Committee also believes that when the cheque was drawn, section 34 (3) of the Audit Act 1901 was breached in that the proposed expenditure was not being charged to the correct head of expenditure. The Committee was concerned that departmental witnesses did not seem to be fully aware of the serious nature of the Department's illegal actions.

The Committee has directed the attention of all departments to the letter of the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) of 2 June 1976 to all Ministers on the subject of delays in the payment of accounts and to Treasury Circular 1976/15 of 8 June 1976 which referred to specific paragraphs of the Committee's 151st report which dealt with the same subject. Despite the Treasurer's letter the Committee was concerned that it is still receiving evidence of delays in the payment of accounts by some government departments.

The Committee was dissatisfied with the quality of the submissions presented by the Departments of Aboriginal Affairs and the Attorney-General and has invited the specific attention of all departments to the notes relating to evidence that accompany requests for submissions, which clearly state that the Committee expects that 'written submissions and explanations should be carefully prepared and thoroughly checked for adequacy and accuracy of detail and absence of ambiguity'. The Committee has also pointed out that Treasury Circular 1976/10 dated 11 May 1976 also directs the attention of departments to the necessity for evidence tendered to be of the highest quality. I commend the report to honourable members.

ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AIR FORCE BASE, POINT COOK, VICTORIA
Report of Public Works Committee

Mr KELLY (Wakefield)—In accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, I present the report relating to the following proposed work:

RAAF Base, Point Cook, Victoria.

Ordered that the report be printed.

ASSENT TO BILLS
Assent to the following Bills reported:
Australian Development Assistance Agency (Repeal) Bill 1977.
Commonwealth Teaching Service Amendment Bill 1977.
Agricultural Tractors Bounty Amendment Bill 1977.
Insurance Amendment Bill 1977.
States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Amendment Bill 1977.
New Zealand Re-exports (Repeal) Bill 1977.

PUBLIC SERVICE STAFF CEILINGS
Discussion of Matter of Public Importance

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Mr Speaker has received letters from both the honourable member for Corio (Mr Scholes) and the honourable member for Phillip (Mr Birney) proposing that definite matters of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion today. As required by standing order 107, Mr Speaker has selected one matter, that is, that proposed by the honourable member for Corio, namely:

The reduction and delays in services to the public caused by Public Service staff ceilings.

I therefore call upon those members who approve of the proposed discussion to rise in their places.

More than the number of members required by the Standing Orders having risen in their places—

Mr SCHOLEs (Corio) (5.32)—The Opposition raises this matter because it is of considerable concern. This is added to by the fact that it is fairly obvious that the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and, if he is reflecting the views of his Cabinet, the Cabinet are not aware of the real situation in the Public Service in Australia. Repeatedly, the Prime Minister makes statements which, to paraphrase them, suggest that there are no problems in the Public Service because of staff ceilings. Recently he held up to State Premiers as an example of the Government's efficiency, the cuts that had been made...
without affecting the efficiency of the Commonwealth Public Service. These sorts of statements are not only dangerous; they show a complete lack of knowledge of what is in fact going on within Public Service departments, especially those giving direct service to the public. Some of the answers given by Ministers directly involved—I instance the Minister for Social Security (Senator Gulliford) and her answers in this Parliament and in correspondence—also reflect a similar position. One is entitled to ask in this House whether the Government’s advisers, namely the Public Service Board, are in fact competent or whether they are giving the Government the advice that it seeks rather than the proper advice which should be given.

The Department of Social Security, which obviously is the Department dealing most directly with urgent cases, is almost crippled because of the indiscriminate application of staff ceilings. I point to the fact that any complicated claim for unemployment benefit, pension or other form of benefit, takes a considerable period—up to 12 weeks—to be processed; a period far beyond what could be considered to be reasonable. Persons who have complicated problems or who have difficulty in understanding the complications which surround applications for various forms of benefits and pensions are not able to be given the time for explanation and sympathetic hearing to which they are entitled. Members of the staff of Department of Social Security offices are overworked to the extent that quite obviously mistakes must happen. It is very easy for people to languish behind the old platitude that public servants have nothing to do. My experience with public servants in these areas is that they work extremely hard. Many of the problems which appear simple to the individual where only one problem is involved become extremely complicated when there are multitudes of them, all of them requiring rechecking and the seeking of additional information because the information has not been provided or because the original interviews were not entirely satisfactory.

In the case of the Department of Social Security we have this sort of situation: In answer to a question by Senator Grimes the Minister for Social Security indicated that she was not aware of any problems within the Department of Social Security in South Australia. I should like to point out some of the problems which do not exist in that area. In one case an application for an invalid pension was delayed for 6 months because of complications as a result of which it kept getting put back and put back. The average time from the date of application to when a pension is paid in South Australia is 10 to 12½ weeks. That is excessive and beyond any form of reason. Ten per cent of the national average of the establishment in South Australia is not working because staff members are on long service leave, sick leave and recreation leave. Their positions are not filled and they represent a permanent non-available work force within that Department and other departments. That is a fact.

Mr Ruddock—As a result of what?

Mr SCHOLES—As a result of persons on recreation leave, sick leave and other forms of leave or disability where they are not actually at work. They are still maintained within the staff ceilings and the figure averages out at 10 percent at any given time. Those people are not accounted for.

Mr Ruddock—Ten per cent?

Mr SCHOLES—Ten per cent of the total staff. That is the average.

Mr Ruddock—Away on leave at various times?

Mr SCHOLES—Leave of various sorts at any given time.

Mr Ruddock—That is rather extravagant, is it not?

Mr SCHOLES—I would not think so. If the honourable member takes a course in mathematics he will find that it is not unreasonable. The indiscriminate—I say indiscriminate—replacement of persons or non-replacement of persons can take key personnel out of any department. They are not replaced with another person similarly qualified and someone else is expected to be able to pick up that work load. This causes mistakes and delays. In the Department of Social Security at the moment work is being let out. Computer programming, for instance, is being let to private firms because the work force is not sufficient to undertake that work. I think most members of Parliament have received letters from Public Service unions and from individual members of the Public Service pointing out the extreme difficulties under which they are now working. For instance, the last census results will not be processed in many respects because of the Government’s refusal to provide the wherewithal to the Bureau of Statistics for that purpose.

In the Department of Defence members of the audit staff of at least one of the Services have indicated that some of the files which normally would be put away by persons engaged for that purpose most likely will never be found again after they have been taken out of their normal
jaces. Anyone, especially a member of the pub-
le, who has telephoned a department, and asked
that is happening to his claim will be aware of
be number of occasions on which he is told that
e file cannot be located or that the file is lost.
he sort of confusion and downgrading of
efficiency which is being created by this form of
discrimination will cause additional costs to the
Commonwealth and serious cost to the com-
munity, and it is at present causing serious hard-
ship to individuals.

Do not know what honourable members op-
pose think they are gaining when a person
desperately in need of funds is told that his claim
will be processed in due course, that he may re-
ceive a cheque in six to eight weeks' time. That is
the sort of delay which exists in the Department
of Social Security with complicated claims.
Simple claims usually can be processed without
such a lengthy delay. Nevertheless, the length of
delays is excessive. The delay in the recording of
child endowment changes is 11 to 12 weeks. I
think it more serious problem is in delays in deal-
ing with cessation notices where for instance, a
person is on unemployment benefit and notifies
the Department that he is no longer eligible. In
too many cases the notice cannot be dealt with
forthwith because of the work load of the officers
concerned, with the result that one or two
dates—remember these cheques are paid in
advance—are sent after the notice is received. So
any payment made after the cessation notice is
served on the Department is a payment to which
the person is not entitled. People are receiving
notices of over-payment of $100 to $150. They
do not expect that this will happen after they
have properly notified the Department,
especially persons who have found employment
after a considerable period of unemployment.
They are subjected to serious hardship.

Before dealing with other departments which
do not deal directly with the public I should men-
tion the Commonwealth Employment Service. It
is not possible for the staff of the CES to man the
programs with which they are charged or to do
jobs which are required, if they are required also
to process applications for employment and deal
fairly with persons against whom there are
charges of receiving the unemployment benefit
improperly or of not complying with the work-
test. If they are to perform their duties properly
and not as a pick of a pin proposition, which I
suspect happens too much at the moment—if the
proper process is to be carried out—the staff must
be available to do the work. In at least one State,
possible three, decisions have been taken by the
staff of the Department of Social Security that
they will not deal with representations by mem-
bers of Parliament because that adds to their
work load, makes their normal work load impos-
sible and merely delays the processing of claims.

This is a serious matter. In some sections the
Public Service is close to total break down. It is
all right for the honourable member for Par-
ramatta (Mr Ruddock) to raise his eyebrows. I
suggest that he should go out to talk to some of
the people who really do work in these depart-
ments. He would find that this situation is getting
on top of many members of the staff. In Victoria
the Migrant Information Service is about to
suffer a 30 per cent reduction in staff. Officers
who have worked as dedicated, hardworking
public servants are to be downgraded or trans-
ferred out of the service. This area dealing with
migrants is one of the most needy areas for
specialised information. Migrants are to be
deprived of that information by the action of the
Government.

Staff ceilings involve only numbers. That is all
the Government is using at the moment. It is say-
ing that this year a department worked with
1000 members and next year it can work with
900 members. If one were to take that pro-
gression to its ultimate conclusion we would have
the total efficiency to government departments
achieved with no employees and no output. I do
not know what the Minister for Productivity (Mr
Macphee) would suggest in that case, but my
suggestion is that the public is entitled to efficient
service from the public servant. A public servant
should not be asked to carry an inordinate load
merely to satisfy the whims of the Prime Minister
or any other Minister. If staff ceilings can be jus-
tified—probably in many areas they can—they
should be applied on the basis of the work load
in a department being assessed and persons
allocated to cope with that work load. That is not
the way staff ceilings have worked. They have
been applied altogether indiscriminately. In any
department at which an honourable member
likes to take a serious look he will find the
numbers reduced because of resignations and
wastage. To use an obvious example, if there is a
large paramedical unit and it is decided to reduce
the staff by one by not replacing the first person
who retires, and the first person who retires is the
medical officer who runs the show, all the rest
could stay there as far as the Government is con-
cerned and there would be an efficient operating
organisation because the staff has been reduced
by one. The fact that the unit cannot work at all is
irrelevant. That is the way the Government's
present staff ceilings are being operated.
Public Service Staff Ceilings

Mr Ruddock—Do you have specific examples of that?

Mr SCHOLES—I have specific examples. I do not intend to put them to the House at the moment. I know that the Minister is aware of specific examples and I know that the honourable member for Parramatta is aware of specific examples.

Mr Ruddock—You do not know anything of the kind.

Mr SCHOLES—I think that the honourable member is to speak in the debate. He may say what he wishes to say at that stage. He may wish to explain his attitude to the public servants who live in his electorate. The situation is that a gimmick has been devised. The Prime Minister never worries about whether things will work. We have seen that on too many occasions. We saw it with the wages and prices freeze. He did not know how that was going to operate; he told everyone to comply with the rules when rules did not exist. We saw more recently a more damaging example. Immediately before the March wage indexation case the Prime Minister made a veiled offer of tax concessions if the unions were prepared to accept that there be no increases in wages. But when the proposition was put to him with respect to the next wage case—the one that was heard in April—he said that the Government could not possibly comply with that sort of thing. He thought that he could influence the commission on one occasion; so he put it forward, knowing that he did not intend to comply. When it was put to him as a serious proposition he wiped it out. He does that too often.

Statements that the Public Service staff ceilings have been applied efficiently and are working efficiently are statements of nonsense. The Public Service is not working efficiently. The service it provides to the public is declining. The efficiency and capacity of the Public Service to provide that service are declining. If the policy continues to be applied in the manner in which it is being applied we will find that the service will totally disappear in many areas. Individuals are being hurt in the social services area. The people least able to suffer delays and losses of income are the people who are being hurt in the social services area. A not dissimilar situation applies in relation to the Commonwealth Employment Service. The processing of applications and vacancies is made practically impossible by the incapacity or unwillingness of the Government to provide the necessary staff to do the comparison work between job applications and job vacancies, where vacancies exist—there are not many of them now—and to do advisory work—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Giles)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr MACPHEE (Balaclava—Minister for Productivity, Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Women's Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations) (5.47)—The honourable member for Corio (Mr Scholes) has just finished a most unusual speech—an unusual speech for him because he is known to do his homework and he is known to produce specific examples, although one might not always agree with them. On this occasion he has made a series of generalisations and a series of assertions. It was what one might have called a sob story if there had been a story. He said that he was expressly not bringing to the House any specific examples; yet he claimed that specific examples existed. One would have thought that this would have been an ideal opportunity for him to bring them to the House.

The Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Public Service Matters (Mr Street), whom I am representing at the moment, has informed me that he is not aware of any specific matters that have not been reviewed, monitored and dealt with. The 2 matters mentioned—those concerning the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Department of Social Security—have been attended to. Public announcements have been made. The situation has been rectified. Those matters are still being monitored and reviewed, to some extent at the behest of the Public Service unions concerned. But in all other respects the Public Service unions concerned have not made complaints. This afternoon we have heard for the first time certain allegations being made, but no facts have been produced to back them up.

I think it would be appropriate to go back to taws; that is, to the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) of 9 February 1976, which was shortly after an examination had been made of the position of Public Service numbers. I will not read all of the statement to the House; I will read portions of it. The first 3 paragraphs are particularly important. The Prime Minister said:

As a result of recommendations made to me by the Public Service Board, by the Treasury and by my own Department, further revised staff ceilings have been approved for the Public Service and for statutory authorities financed wholly or partly from the Budget.

These ceilings have been set taking fully into account the services that must be supplied to the Australian public.
They represent staff levels which the 3 departments believe to be appropriate in the light of decisions so far taken by the Government for the efficient and economic performance of the functions of the Commonwealth.

It is important to recognise that that is the framework within which the staff ceilings were imposed. The words 'the efficient and economic performance of the functions of the Commonwealth' are of paramount importance to this Government. No one is more concerned about the efficiency of the Public Service than is this Government. We do not accept anything that has been said here so far this afternoon as an indication that the Public Service is other than efficient in the circumstances in which it is operating. It is important that we examine also a statement that appeared on page 2 of that Press release by the Prime Minister of 9 February 1976, which reads:

Employment under the Public Service Act would have increased by 2.8 per cent during the current financial year as a result of a decision by the previous Government.

Instead there will now be a reduction compared with 1 July last year of 3.3 per cent. This will result in approximately 9800 fewer Public Service Act staff at 30 June than would have been the case if employment had risen by 2.8 per cent.

It is very important to note that, first of all, this policy was set on the basis of wastage, as has been said by the honourable member for Corio; that it was achieved without retrenchments; and that it was achieved and promulgated with demonstrable public support for cuts in government expenditure. There could not be any doubt in the mind of the public. It is curious that the matter should be raised by the Opposition now, when there still can be little doubt in the mind of the public. The very people for whom the honourable member for Corio has said he is speaking when he tries to bring tears to our eyes are amongst the people who complain to me and other members on this side of the House that already there is developing a dual standard between public servants and non-public servants. Those very people, many of whom are pensioners, who are perhaps slightly uninformed on occasions are the people who complain about the discrepancies between their retirement benefits and those of people in the Public Service.

Mr Scholes—What has that to do with the work load?

Mr MACPHEE—It has a great deal to do with the work load. Over the years the Public Service unions have obtained such benefits for their members that the honourable member was able to cite the fact that something of the order of 10 per cent, I think it was, of the members of the Public Service were on leave at any one time.

Those sorts of benefits having been gained, the same Public Service unions then complain that the overheads are such that the Government is not justified in reducing the rate of growth in the Public Service. This bonanza has had to be paid for by someone. In fact it is appropriate that the Public Service rate of growth has been curtailed.

Mr Scholes—It is not only the Public Service. It is the pensioners who are paying for it.

Mr MACPHEE—The honourable member for Corio interjected about the pensioners paying for it. They believe that they are paying for rights of retirement in the Public Service that so exceed those that they themselves are so-called enjoying that—

Mr Scholes—You have just increased someone's salary by $80 a week.

Mr MACPHEE—The honourable member knows very well that the predicament concerning someone on the Prime Minister's staff was caused by his classification as a journalist and had nothing to do with ordinary Public Service classifications. I will not be diverted again by the honourable member's interjections on that point. I wish to quote from another part of the lengthy statement by the Prime Minister because it puts in context the subject of this debate. He said:

Departments and authorities are expected to reach their revised staff ceilings by processes of natural wastage such as retirements and resignations.

Ministers and the Public Service Board have been asked to keep me informed as to any difficulty encountered in achieving the ceilings by June 30.

The Public Service Board, the Treasury and my own Department are being asked to review further the revised staff ceilings in the light of additional information coming to hand in the weeks ahead, as the result of the Government's ongoing review of expenditure, and to bring forward suggestions of further reductions in such revised staff ceilings where appropriate.

This has been done. The review is a continuing one. When information is brought before the Public Service Board or the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, that information is taken into account when the continuing review proceeds. It is strange that the Opposition should bring to this place this afternoon allegations of a broad, sweeping kind and then not substantiate them with specific objections that one would have thought the Opposition would have had if, as it has said, people have raised with it matters which have not been dealt with fairly and properly by the Public Service Board and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. I have given examples already of adjustments which have been made to the staff of the Commonwealth Employment Service and the Department of Social Security. I can only repeat that the
matters are being monitored constantly by the Public Service Board which, of course, is an independent statutory body exercising the authority that it possesses under the Act and which is not in any way trammeled in the exercise of those duties by decisions of the Government.

I would like to quote finally from the Prime Minister’s Press statement. It said:

The new levels for Public Service Act and statutory authority employment have been made necessary by the enormous and unreasonable growth of the public sector over the past three years. As evidence of this, at the end of December 1972 the Public Service totalled 134,465. This was exclusive of the Postmaster-General’s Department which had a staff of 119,709 at the time and of statutory authorities.

At June 30, 1975 the Public Service had reached 160,177 and would have gone on to reach 164,650 at June 30 this year, if policies which then existed had continued. This is a growth of over 25,700 or 19 per cent in 2½ years in employment under the Public Service Act alone.

The new level for June 30, 1976 will be 154,881 in Public Service Act employment and 171,677 for statutory authorities outside the Public Service Act and wholly or partly dependent on the Budget.

It is worth observing that the number of persons employed outside the Public Service Act as a result of the 3 years of Labor Administration far exceeds the number of persons employed under the Public Service Act. In fact in the debate raised today we seem to be confined to a debate upon the Public Service itself as opposed to government employment generally. The attitude of the Government has been illustrated by the extracts I have quoted from the Prime Minister’s press statement of 9 February, 1976. It is worth saying that in the interim the Government has made a number of statements which have carried that policy forth and carried with it the review that the Opposition now complains apparently has not been fairly conducted. This is the first we have heard of that complaint.

The figure as at 30 June 1977 is expected to be 153,675 compared with the figure at 30 June 1976 of 154,881. In fact the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) confirmed in his Budget Speech last August that the provisional ceilings that had been announced the previous June would stand. But in January of this year the Treasurer was able to say that in fact the ceiling would be 700 fewer than the number he announced in August.

It is important to recognise that in making that statement the Treasurer was relying upon the advice of the Public Service Board which said that the objectives of the Government as originally outlined by the Prime Minister could be met. Those objectives were that there had to be government restraint and yet service to the public should not in fact be jeopardised. The Prime Minister has made it abundantly clear that ceilings will be reviewed by him when Ministers believe that they require additional manpower in order to perform particular jobs or that additional staff is needed to maintain a reasonable standard of service to the public. It is important to note that the Public Service Board’s advice to the Government is that those government targets can be met and that they can be met without jeopardising the quality of service to the public.

Sitting suspended from 6 to 8 p.m.

Mr. MACPHEE—In the few remaining minutes which I have I wish to repeat the essence of the Government’s position, and that is that when we came into government we found a Public Service situation which had expanded beyond all cost justification. From the outset we set out very clearly our position regarding Public Service ceilings and the capacity of Ministers to go to the Prime Minister (Mr. Malcolm Fraser) and have that position reviewed according to needs and according to complaints which had been received from within the departments and the community generally, including Public Service unions. To the extent that there have been complaints, they have been monitored and reviewed by the Public Service Board, by the Prime Minister and by the Government generally.

We find it curious that today in what is called a matter of public importance we have assertions, generalisations and, as I understand it, a deliberate statement from the honourable member for Corio (Mr. Scholes) that he did not intend to burden the House with specific examples of matters which, in fact, would have justified the bringing on for discussion of this matter of public importance. We believe that the matter of which the Opposition complains is without justification. We believe that the efficiency of the Public Service has been in no way impaired by the ceilings which have been implemented. We believe that the personal lives of persons employed within the Public Service have not been inconvenienced. In fact, there have not been retrenchments. There has been wastage. There has been no impairment to the service provided to the public. There has been a considerable cost saving to that public. We also believe that within the community there is support for the policies which we have adopted in the setting of limits to the rate of growth which, if the Opposition had its way, apparently would be boundless.

Mr. SCHOLES (Corio)—Mr. Deputy Speaker, I wish to make a personal explanation.
Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Does the honourable member claim to have been misrepresented?

Mr SCHOLES—Yes. I have been misrepresented by the Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee) in his comments on remarks which I made. The Minister said that no instance has been brought to the notice of the Government. I suggest that he should ask the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guildford) for a copy of the letter from the Administrative and Clerical Officers Association of South Australia. The reason specific instances are not given is that to name public servants or to give traceable incidents is to expose public servants to intimidation and loss of career opportunities. This is evident now and it will continue to be evident while the Government pursues its present policy. For this reason I am not prepared to give in this House details of any incident where the public servants can be identified.

Mr FRY (Fraser) (8.3)—I am pleased to support my colleague the honourable member for Corio (Mr Scholes) in this matter of public importance which relates to the reduction and delays in services to the public caused by Public Service staff ceilings. It is a very serious matter to the people of Canberra—both the public and the people working in the Public Service—but I certainly do not want to confine my remarks to the Australian Capital Territory because the problems which have been created are widespread. They are not restricted to Canberra. After listening to the Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee) I am sure that neither the public nor the public servants will get any satisfaction from the platitudes expressed by the Minister who was representing the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Public Service Matters (Mr Street).

Nor will we get any satisfaction from the sorts of answers which the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guildford) gave in another place today. She was asked about this problem and she used terms like 'negotiations are proceeding'. She said she hoped the negotiations would resolve staffing problems and that the Government was looking at ways of re-organising staff rather than getting more staff. These are just platitudes. They mean nothing. The Minister said she was very concerned that members of the staff had withdrawn certain services. If there was nothing wrong with the services we would not have need to ask these questions and we would not get these meaningless responses from the Ministers concerned. I believe that the imposition of Public Service staff ceilings by the Fraser Government soon after it took office was not only a very spiteful and vindictive act but also a very hasty and ill-adviced decision in plain economic terms.

I believe it is a decision which has had a widespread effect in exacerbating the economic ills of Australia. It ensured not only that the high standard of service which the public had come to expect from the Australian Public Service would decline, but also that opportunities for young people to undertake a worthwhile career in the Australian Public Service would be seriously diminished, while the growing list of unemployed would be swelled by the addition of thousands of young school leavers to the ranks of the unemployed. The Government's decision also ensured that Canberra, because of its degree of dependence on government expenditure, suffered more than any other place in Australia because of these misguided economic policies. Of course, the Government's action also ensured that morale in the Australian Public Service would sink to an all-time low. This has had repercussions on the quality of service extended to the public. I wonder whether the Minister will deny that morale is at an all-time low. If it is not, why are people in the Department of Social Security imposing work bans? That is an act of desperation. It is a last resort to try to correct something which has repeatedly been drawn to the attention of the government and repeatedly ignored. We have that admission in answers given in the Senate today.

The reduction in the quality of service and the delays in the delivery of the service have been widely felt over an extensive range of services throughout the whole of Australia, even to the services traditionally available to Australians overseas. I was rather amused that the Minister should question my colleague the honourable member for Corio for not being specific. Of course, the Minister was specific about nothing. He spoke in broad generalities about the total cutback in the Public Service, about how many public servants there were, and about how many there would be at a certain date. The whole problem is the totality of the ceilings. That has caused all the problems. It is the across the board nature of the ceilings.

If the ceilings had been applied in a more selective way I have no doubt that there would have been well justified reductions in staff in some areas and an increase in staff in other areas, but that about by an increase in our obligations because of the increasing workload due to increasing unemployment. But that is not how this was done. It was done in a very clumsy, unscientific and across the board way. It was a clean
cut right across the board and it fell very unevenly on public servants. It resulted in a very uneven standard of service to the public at the receiving end. Unfortunately, the areas in which the standard of service declined most dramatically were those which were concerned most closely with dispensing welfare to people in most need such as pensioners, the sick, the handicapped people and, above all, the people who were made unemployed by the Government's ill-advised economic policy of cutting back government expenditure.

In the area of looking after the unemployed the complaints of delays in the processing of unemployment registrations and in investigating employment prospects have been widespread and persistent right around Australia. They are still going on. I think it was inconsiderate in the extreme to expect the staff of the Commonwealth Employment Service to handle this vastly increased workload without a substantial increase in the staff. It was only very recently that this serious shortage was acknowledged, and something has been done about it. However, despite what has been done the problems have not been solved by any means. There are still grave deficiencies in the area of field service. People who are supposed to be out in the field investigating job opportunities are tied to desks interviewing people and trying to keep records up to date. The records are spectacularly out of date in most cases. It is a very disagreeable job. It is a difficult job at the best of times, but when the work load is doubled and the staff is not the job becomes impossible to perform effectively. That is the sort of situation with which the Commonwealth Employment Service has had to contend.

In the Family Court the advantages of the new legislation have been largely negated by the failure to provide adequate staff. I understand that in Parramatta the number of judges was recently increased from two to four, but there was no increase in the clerical staff. In some places in Sydney delays in the Family Court are up to 2 years, and there is a substantial backlog even in Canberra. In the field of education there is no question that the great advances made during the period of the Whitlam Government have been negated to some degree by staff ceilings in the teaching profession and by the availability of ancillary staff. In a junior college in my own electorate, fifth and sixth form students were unable to undertake any laboratory work in their science course due to lack of ancillary staff. Difficulties are still being experienced in many schools. Class sizes have tended to increase and difficulties have been experienced in providing teachers for children with language difficulties and for other disadvantaged groups.

It is not only private citizens who have been disadvantaged by the staff ceiling. Private enterprise and business and commerce, who should be able to expect prompt responses to a wide range of inquiries for information concerning tariffs and bounties and trade prospects in overseas markets such as the European Economic Community, Scandinavia and Asia, as well as in relation to new technology in manufacturing industries, have not been able to obtain quick responses because the staff ceilings have not enabled the public servants to get on with the job. In regard to Aboriginal affairs, staff ceilings have meant that critical social and rural programs have been abandoned and urgently needed research has not been undertaken. The Australian Development Assistance Agency has lost its autonomy and has been integrated into the Department of Foreign Affairs. This has seriously weakened the independence and integrity of our role in overseas aid.

Closer home, there are all sorts of problems in the Department of the Capital Territory. Accounting and the collection of revenue has fallen behind. The field services and counselling services of the child welfare branch have been delayed. The standard of cleaning in the city, which in the national capital we expect to be of a high standard, has not been maintained. The Department staff's ceilings have resulted in a general lowering of the standard.

I conclude by saying that the Government's policy has failed dismally. The idea of transferring reserves from the government to the private sector has not worked out. The Government's action in cutting back on government spending has effectively reduced consumer demand in the private sector. The Minister for the Capital Territory (Mr Staley), who is at the table, would know that manufacturing industry is now using less labour and will continue to use less labour. Sooner or later the Government must recognise that its policy has failed and that it must get back to a reasonable growth rate in the Australian Public Service. The sooner it does that the sooner economic recovery will get under way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr RUDDOCK (Parramatta) (8.13)—It is a pleasure to participate in this debate, if only to bring back clearly to the minds of the members of this House and of the Australian people the points that ought to be at issue. The staff ceilings
about which we are speaking were imposed by this Government when it first came into office. Now some 15 or 16 months later members of the Opposition are endeavouring to put the question of staff ceilings in some new and different light. They have tried to imply, by the very way in which they phrased this matter of public importance, that the public is suffering as a result of the very proper steps that were taken by this Government when it came into office, steps which were demanded by the Australian people. Members of the Opposition have neglected to mention that there is nothing magic about staff ceilings. If one looks at the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) one will realise that when the staff ceilings upon which we are acting were imposed they merely followed on staff ceilings previously imposed by the Labor Government after its Hayden recant in its last year in office.

The fact is that the Labor Party in office recognised that there was a need for across-the-board restrictions on the growth of the Public Service and it imposed staff ceilings. Those staff ceilings operated in all the ways about which honourable members opposite now complain. When we came into office, faced with a most difficult economic climate, it was quite proper that we should look at that area of government expenditure encompassing salaries and conditions of our own employees, which had grown enormously in a period of 3 years. The Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee), who spoke previously, gave particulars of the numbers by which the Public Service had grown in the 3-year term of office of the Labor Party. When it is appreciated that in that short period of time the Public Service grew by some 25 700 people, or 19 per cent in 2½ years, the enormity of that growth is demonstrated. Everybody would know that when an organisation burgeons and grows like that, it cannot help but be inefficient. It cannot help but have areas in which, if they are looked at properly, savings and adjustments can be made and where tasks and functions can be performed by one person rather than by two.

I acknowledge that in some areas there should be an appropriate and judicious transferring of staff from one area where they might not be required to other areas where there are peak demands brought about by economic circumstances. There is a need for flexibility. I acknowledge that, but that does not in any way cut across the fundamental point that the proper use of staff ceilings is the only way in which a government service that is not motivated by the need to make profits can ensure maximum performance from its employees. Quite frankly, in a situation where members of the Public Service are protected in their jobs from dismissal, have superannuation benefits which are far more generous than those offered to most other people, have comfortable if not lavish premises in which to work, are able to work in a secure situation knowing that they will not be in jeopardy, there ought to be some method by which pressure can be brought to bear upon those people to give of their best. Such a result can be brought about, in my view, simply by imposing staff ceilings. No other way is available.

I believe that there are situations in which individual public servants might quite properly have a complaint. The Prime Minister recognises that, and in his statement of 9 February he invited people to advise him or the appropriate Ministers of any difficulties that were encountered. He said specifically:

Ministers and the Public Service Board have been asked to keep me informed as to any difficulty encountered in achieving the ceiling by June 30.

In answer to a question from the honourable member for Fraser (Mr Fry), who spoke before me, the Prime Minister made it clear once more that the staff ceilings would be achieved by wastage, resignations, and matters of that kind. In the answer he gave to the honourable member for Fraser he added specifically:

In that statement I included a paragraph which indicated that I wished any areas of particular concern or of hardship to be brought to my notice before action was taken involving any particular difficulty, and retrenchment is obviously an area involving difficulty.

The Prime Minister was answering a question from the honourable member for Fraser in relation to the possibility of retrenchments in the National Capital Development Commission. Of course, as all honourable members would know, no retrenchments took place in that area. There was no need for concern. These were alarmists trying to build up that question. However, that same honourable member who received that clear answer came into the House today and along with the honourable member for Corio (Mr Scholes) failed to substantiate in every respect where staff ceilings would be having any injurious effect upon the service given to members of the public.

I know from working in my electorate and the responsibilities that I have as the local member that in relation to the services offered in Parramatta by the Department of Social Security the complaints about delays today are no different to those that I received previously when the Labor Government was in office. I am sure that if I went
around and asked each honourable member whether the situation was any different today to that which existed previously, I would receive the same answer. The only specific case that the honourable member for Fraser attempted to raise involved my electorate. It was in relation to the Family Court at Parramatta.

I must say to all honourable members that I have visited that Court on a number of occasions. I have spoken to the staff and no complaints have been lodged with me and no suggestions have been made that staff ceilings were having any effect upon the service offered by that Court. In fact, I was told with pride that the Parramatta Court was able to dispense with matters much more quickly and judiciously than other courts in the family law area. Of course, it must be recognised that the honourable member was inaccurate even in relation to the suggestions he made. He suggested that 2 judges had been appointed recently at Parramatta. In fact, if the honourable member had read the Press release of the Attorney-General (Mr Ellicott) he would know as I do that Mr Justice Yuill was appointed to the Parramatta Court and Mr Justice Cook was appointed in Sydney. Those appointments have been the only 2 recent ones. The honourable member was wrong in fact and certainly there have been no complaints brought to my attention about the staff ceilings affecting that area.

Quite frankly, the case has not been made out. There have been no clear statements made which indicate that reductions and delays in the services offered to the public have been caused by Public Service staff ceilings. The case has failed. Specific examples could have been given. But they were not. The opportunity was given. The Prime Minister invited specific allegations to be made when he imposed these staff ceilings. Yet those people who now complain in this House have failed to give the story and have failed to give the specific examples. They put up only the puny excuse that they were worried about intimidation. Anybody would know that if trade unions are good for anything, the one thing they are good for is protecting employees against intimidation. I do not think that was an excuse that would justify the failure on the part of the Opposition to make out the case that they have put to this House today in the debate on this matter of public importance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member’s time has expired. The discussion is now concluded.
changing in response to new circumstances. Whilst recently, in some cases, this response may have been faster and more extensive than desirable, the process of change is bound to continue over the longer term and it is in the national interest that it do so.

A major part of the White Paper is devoted to ways of generating a wider and fuller understanding in the community of the significance of the changing environment for Australian manufacturing industry and to means of establishing through consultation a general acceptance of how to respond to these changes. The White Paper sets out the Government's approach to industry policy both to ensure steady progress towards a stronger and more viable manufacturing sector in the longer term and to meet short term problems. This does not imply that manufacturing is to be given a preferred position apart from other economic activities. There is a strong and complex interdependence between manufacturing and other sectors of the economy. These relationships must be reflected in the manner in which policies for manufacturing industry are integrated with the nation's overall economic and social policies, and with policies bearing specifically on other sectors with strong ties with manufacturing. We have taken these considerations fully into account in the preparation of the White Paper.

Manufacturing industry constitutes an important part of the Australian economy. The manufacturing sector accounts for about a quarter of national production, and about a fifth of Australian exports and employs almost 1,300,000 people. There have, however, been significant changes in the position and outlook of manufacturing industry in recent years. Since the mid-1960s the development of newly identified mineral resources and growth in international demand for these resources have brought a changed balance of payments outlook. Inflationary pressures, lower birth rates, reduced immigration, changing patterns of consumption expenditure as incomes rise and the industrial development of other countries in our region, have all contributed to a major change in outlook for manufacturing industry in Australia. The importance of these factors has been heightened by rapid wage increases in recent years and, in the absence of clearly stated and widely accepted policies, uncertainty as to the substantive direction of Government policy has been a disturbing influence on industry's ability to plan ahead.

In recent years, some manufacturing activities have faced a decline in international competitiveness, with the loss of export markets and increasing competition from imports in the home market. Consequently, businesses have been making decisions which are bringing about changes in the structure of Australian industry. Faced with rising wages and other costs, many enterprises have reduced their work forces, lowered their levels of Australian content and in some cases have set up manufacture overseas. Investment in new manufacturing facilities in some sectors in Australia has been at low levels. Naturally, we must expect that from time to time there will be some degree of conflict between our objectives in the range of areas affected by decisions in regard to manufacturing industry and, in such circumstances, there will be a need to achieve an appropriate overall balance in our policies which will best serve the national interest.

The Government has already taken several initiatives to assist manufacturing industry. A major investment incentive program, with substantial benefits, has been introduced and will be continued. The effect of inflation on company tax has been partially offset by trading stock valuation adjustments. Distribution requirements for private companies under Division 7 of the Income Tax Assessment Act have been eased. Temporary assistance has been provided for those areas of industry most seriously affected by import competition. The Temporary Assistance Authority legislation is to be amended to allow greater flexibility in dealing with questions of temporary assistance. New reporting requirements have been given to the Industries Assistance Commission and the order and timing of references in the tariff review program was reviewed. The Australian dollar was devalued on 29 November 1976 to assist, amongst other things, in improving the competitiveness of Australian industry.

Market sharing arrangements between local production and imports will be considered where necessary as a special measure of short term policy to assist in stabilising activity in sensitive industry sectors, pending full reviews of longer term policies. Such arrangements will only be introduced after appropriate public inquiry and where such action is in line with our obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or other international treaty commitments. Where market sharing arrangements are applied, the Government considers that, where practicable, the companies benefiting from such action should accept appropriate commitments.
on pricing policy to be followed during the duration of such assistance.

The Government will continue to place proper emphasis on short term policies so as to alleviate economic and social disruption and minimise the erosion of employment opportunities. Short term policies will be directed at minimising any disruptive effects which might otherwise arise from changes in the structure of industry. The Government is, however, conscious of the problems which short term measures directed towards a particular industry can create elsewhere in the economy and will exercise the closest possible control over such policies, including limitations as to their duration, consistent with the objective of minimising disruption. The Government will pay close attention to the need to reconcile short term and long term policy measures.

The change in the pattern of industrial activities in Australia which has been occurring is, however, not just a short term phenomenon. It will have effects through and beyond the period of economic recovery. The White Paper therefore addresses the longer term issues of manufacturing industry in Australia. Our policy guidelines, principles and general approach to longer term industry policy are set out in the White Paper. In terms of the future growth of manufacturing industry, Australia’s endowment in capital, labour, skills, natural resources and market opportunities would seem to indicate that the best prospects for manufacturing industry development in Australia in the long term lie in activities which are based on Australia’s natural resources; which are innovative in terms of skill or design; which meet specialised local needs; or which have a high degree of natural protection.

In today’s circumstances and in the changing environment now being encountered, Australian manufacturing industry, over a reasonable period of time, needs to adjust towards a greater degree of specialisation. As a longer term objective the community will be best served by a manufacturing industry with a structure which requires minimum levels of government support. But future industry policy needs to take account of the existing structure of Australian industry. The Government’s future approach to longer term industry policy therefore will be concerned principally with dealing with long term changes in the structure of Australian manufacturing industry. Timing and the rate of such change will be important, indeed critical, if disruption caused by the process of change is to be minimised. We are prepared to take special measures, of a recognised temporary nature, to support employment if major changes in the industrial structure threaten unacceptable disruption in times of generally slow economic activity. We shall seek to pursue stable policies which will allow future developments in manufacturing to flow into activities which have good long term prospects for growth.

Policies will be needed to meet the special problems of certain industries, within the Government’s overall objective of providing a general climate for economic growth. In recognising the possible need for policies for a small number of sectors, however, the Government is not setting out to establish a list of ‘key industries’ which would be accorded special treatment of an on-going nature in order to insulate them from pressures of change. Rather the approach envisaged is one of providing support for a sector for a defined period during which real efforts should be made by industry itself to improve its structure and efficiency, thereby helping it to achieve a better and more certain long term outlook. The Government recognises that protection policies can affect the rate of change in industry and cannot be determined in isolation from the ability of the community to absorb change or accommodate the social consequences of any prospective change. A time of lower economic activity, such as the present, is generally not an appropriate time for reducing protection. In such circumstances a cautious approach to tariff reductions is warranted. Temporary assistance measures may be necessary to avoid disruption and contribute to economic recovery.

The Government will also pursue longer term policies which will encourage efficient manufacturing firms to develop and take advantage of new opportunities for growth. Continuing attention will be given to development and extension policies in fields such as research and development, and the Government will continue to monitor the adequacy of existing programs in the areas of export development, investment incentives, small business policies, management efficiency, productivity improvement and industrial financing. These policies will form part of a broader framework of policies aimed at fostering the growth of the economy as a whole so as to create a climate in which new opportunities will exist for business initiatives and employment.

The problems likely to be faced by manufacturing industry in the future will be properly dealt with only if they are understood and appreciated within the community. This will require a greater degree of consultation between the Commonwealth and the State governments and with the many centres of influence and decision making within the community, including
management, the trade unions and consumers. New consultation arrangements will be set up by way of the establishment of an Australian manufacturing council, extension of industry advisory councils and there will be continued consultations with State governments. A major national conference will be convened at an early date at which governments, industries, trade unions, consumers and others will be invited to take part in presenting and discussing papers on new long term directions for manufacturing industry. To contribute to an increased awareness in the community of the problems of industry, the Department of Industry and Commerce will prepare an annual review of manufacturing industry to report on major developments in industry. The Australian manufacturing council will assist in the preparation of this annual review.

The challenges ahead represent a task with which we must all be concerned. Government will play its part in meeting these challenges. We look to management and labour to play their part in a genuine partnership. Productivity must be improved through a greater effort on the part of management and labour to improve their overall efficiency and performance. Wage and price restraint must be pursued because unrealistic increases in wages and prices, especially in those areas of manufacturing most subject to competition from imports, will threaten job security. We should not allow short term difficulties to obscure the great long term opportunities ahead of us. If we tackle the present problems with vigour and persistence manufacturing industry will be better placed to help realise these opportunities in the longer term.

I seek leave to have incorporated in Hansard a list of the organisations, companies, individuals and government departments which presented submissions for consideration in the preparation of the White Paper.

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

The list read as follows—

### SUBMISSIONS ON THE WHITE PAPER ON MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Governments—</th>
<th>Commonwealth Government—</th>
<th>Industry Associations—</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation</td>
<td>Associated Chambers of Manufactures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Department of Defence</td>
<td>Association of Defence Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development</td>
<td>Australian Chemical Industry Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Department of National Resources</td>
<td>Australian Chemical Specialities Manufacturers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Department of Overseas Trade</td>
<td>Australian Confederation of Apparel Manufacturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Women’s Affairs Branch</td>
<td>Australian Council of Employers’ Federations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Science</td>
<td>Australian Council of Furniture Manufacturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Treasury</td>
<td>Australian Electrical Manufacturers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Industries Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Ship Repairers Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Telecommunications Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Valve Manufacturers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conference of National Manufacturing Industries Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diecasting Institute of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federation of Automotive Products Manufacturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grocery Manufacturers of Australia Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy Engineering Manufacturers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Plus two supplementary submissions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Metal Trades Industries Association of Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date received

- New South Wales: March 1976
- South Australia: May 1976
- Queensland: March 1976
- Tasmania: June 1976
- Western Australia: June 1976
- Victoria: July 1976
- Commonwealth Government:
  - Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation: September 1976
  - Department of Defence: October 1976
  - Department of Environment, Housing and Community Development: October 1976
  - Department of National Resources: September 1976
  - Department of Overseas Trade: September 1976
  - Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet, Women’s Affairs Branch: September 1976
  - Department of Science: August 1976
  - Department of Treasury: September 1976
- Industry Associations:
  - Associated Chambers of Manufactures: August 1976
  - Association of Defence Contractors: April 1976
  - Australian Chemical Industry Council: June 1976
  - Australian Chemical Specialities Manufacturers’ Association: July 1976
  - Australian Confederation of Apparel Manufacturers: June 1976
  - Australian Council of Employers’ Federations: June 1976
  - Australian Council of Furniture Manufacturers: July 1976
  - Australian Electrical Manufacturers’ Association: February 1976
  - Australian Industries Development Association: April 1976
  - Australian Ship Repairers Group: January 1976
  - Australian Telecommunications Development Association: July 1976
  - Australian Valve Manufacturers’ Association: February 1976
  - Conference of National Manufacturing Industries Association: December 1975
  - Diecasting Institute of Australia: July 1976
  - Federation of Automotive Products Manufacturers: October 1976
  - Grocery Manufacturers of Australia Ltd: June 1976
  - Heavy Engineering Manufacturers’ Association: April 1976
  - Metal Trades Industries Association of Australia: March 1976
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Date received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Plus one supplementary submission)</td>
<td>October 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Industries Association of South Australia</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Cleaning Suppliers' Association of Australia</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics Institute of Australia</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plywood Association of Australia</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Allied Trades Employers' Federation of Australia</td>
<td>November 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile Council of Australia</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Plus one supplementary submission)</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorian Chambers of Commerce and Industry</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Companies—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrasive Products Pty Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristocrat Leathersgoods Pty Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Pulp and Paper Mills Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Consolidated Industries Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Innovation Corporation Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Paper Manufacturers Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIBA-Geigy Australia Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comalco Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connellan &amp; Son</td>
<td>May 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conzinc Riotinto of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunlop Australia Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulsen Pty Ltd</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Australia Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll Rand (Aust.) Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Venture Corporation Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns and Waygood Perry Engineering Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James N. Kirby Ltd</td>
<td>April 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. J. Littlewood Pty Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco Productions Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. L. Meinhardt and Partners</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NID Pty Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nylex Corporation Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman Vacuum Cleaner Co. (Aust.) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repco Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rover Mowers (Aust.) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>April 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Australia Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithfield Forge and Engineering</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony Keptron Pty Ltd (Mr P. H. W. Jacoby)</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Industries Ltd</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubemakers of Australia Ltd</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickers Australia Ltd</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Unions—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Council of Trade Unions</td>
<td>October 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Architects, Engineers, Surveyors and Draughtsmen of Australia</td>
<td>February 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federated Furnishing Trades Society of Australasia</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Builders and Employees Federation of Australia (N.S.W. Branch)</td>
<td>September 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Producer Organisations—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Farmers' Federation</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Wool and Meat Producers' Federation</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Woolgrowers' and Graziers' Council</td>
<td>May 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rice Marketing Board for the State of N.S.W.</td>
<td>September 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Consumer Organisations—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Federation of Consumer Organisations</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of Management</td>
<td>December 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Plus two supplementary submissions)</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Retailers' Association</td>
<td>April 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Tariff Council</td>
<td>April 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Sydney)</td>
<td>June 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organisations—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Ceramic Society</td>
<td>March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Council of Social Service</td>
<td>September 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Greek Welfare Society</td>
<td>July 1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mr HOWARD—I formally present the following paper:


I commend it to the House.

Motion (by Mr Staley) proposed:

That the House take note of the papers.

Mr YOUNG (Port Adelaide) (8.39)—The Opposition welcomes the tabling of the White Paper. However, there are some comments which we on this side of the House want to make in relation to it. The White Paper has had a very interesting history. It was promised a long time ago, and bit by bit it has been leaked through the Press that new drafts have been sent back to the Prime Minister’s Department so that some day we could look at a final copy. On a very quick perusal it seems to be as devoid of as many points that ought to be made in relation to manufacturing industry as it contains. It seems to me on reading the newspapers this morning that the latest leak in relation to the possible lowering of protection has more teeth than the White Paper has. It is of vital importance to Australia to come to some clear understanding of the future of manufacturing industry in this country. Both the statement of the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Howard) and the White Paper itself, from the time I have had to peruse it, show that there are still great contradictions in the thinking of the Government in relation to what lies ahead. There are on some occasions—I shall go through them very briefly—statements that in the long term tariffs may be reduced and efforts will be made by the Government to identify the viable industries which have some future in the long term. At the same time it refuses to identify what the Government calls key industries based on the recommendation of the Jackson Committee report.

Nevertheless, a number of things in the White Paper seem to deserve comment. Firstly, as has been pointed out from this side of the House
recently—not by myself but by other speakers—the relationship between the changing industries in Australia and the emergence of the mineral industry has had a grave impact upon manufacturing industry. The changes that have taken place in manufacturing industry have occurred to a large extent without any observance by government and without any government guidance. Perhaps some changes have taken place which, if government had considered them, might have been reversed. I do not refer to the present Government. I refer to long term governments in Australia which, as a result of 25 years of what may be described as industrial development and peace in Australia following World War II, believed that it was not part of the charge of a national government's responsibility to involve itself in what would occur in the long term to our industries. Of course, the emergence of the mining industry with its effects on manufacturing industry was for a long time misunderstood and ignored.

The strong and complex interdependence, as the statement says, is there and ought to be worked on. There ought to be guidelines about what happens in future, so that some of the human misery that comes with the change in the make-up of the sectors of industry in Australia can be avoided. I agree with the statement both here and in the White Paper that at the moment in the economic circumstances in which we live, to talk about the immediate disruption of industries or the immediate lowering of tariffs to any significant extent is, of course, to throw pressures and problems on to a small sector of the Australian community, both the employee and employer, without taking into account the hardships they may have to carry in relation to the rest of the community. It seems to me that perhaps the White Paper has ignored many of the connecting features of society with which manufacturing industry will be related.

The lower birth rates, the reduced immigration, the changing patterns of consumption expenditure as incomes rise, and the industrial development of other countries in our region have all contributed to a major change in outlook for manufacturing industry in Australia. This is part of what the Minister has just said. In looking through the White Paper I find that it totally ignores the relationship between our manpower needs and our education ideals. I cannot find anywhere in the White Paper the relationship between the emphasis we are putting on education by virtue of spending millions of dollars through this Government and/or the State governments and what we may need in industry. Some people assume that the very fact that we have a certain number of people leaving school means that we can continue to service the industries we have at the moment. If we are spending millions of dollars to uplift the educational standards of Australian children there seems to be some contradiction between the ideals we are setting at the schools and the requirements we may have for people after they have left school.

One of the features of the Australian educational system which will obviously undergo change is the concluding matriculation figure. In Australia only 35 of every 100 children who commence high school complete their matriculation. When one compares this figure with Japan where 91 out of every 100 children complete high school, one can see that the greater emphasis on education which has taken place in Australia over the past 10 years will lift that figure enormously. Obviously a lot of young people without a higher education who now go into manufacturing will perhaps in the future refuse to do so. The Government ought to have explained this in the White Paper. It ought to have gone to some length to explain to industry the difficulties in attracting a work force in the future. I refer, of course, to the major labour-intensive industries in this country.

The same thing applies to migration. If agreement from both sides of the House can be reached in relation to the number of migrants that will be received in Australia it will be a substantial direction to industry as to what manpower will be available for it to continue. Figures—there are pages of them in the White Paper—will show that in many labour-intensive industries the vast majority of employees are migrants. They came into the work force at the time that we were bringing a lot more people into Australia than we are today. To a large extent the White Paper has ignored the importance to industry of knowing exactly what the future policy of the Government is with regard to the net migration intake. If it is to be a net intake of 50 000 that will be a very different circumstance to industry than if the net intake is to be 100 000. This is not to add weight or to give credence to the suggestion made by some that the Labor Party is part of a scheme to bring migrants in merely to fill the gaps in some of the industries where Australians in future will not work. But it has been our experience in the past and it is a fact today that many of the migrants make up the work force, in some instances women, and we have to look to what will affect manufacturing industry in the future.
I am pleased also that in the White Paper the Government has, for the time being, stopped its onslaught on wages alone as the major problem of industry. It has pointed out to industry that there are a number of other problems inherent in continuing with manufacturing industry as it is in Australia. It would do well for industry to look at these things. The White Paper hopes that industrial disputes can be reduced. I think it is incumbent upon the Government to look seriously at its thinking at present in relation to the way in which it may be provoking industrial disputes. There can be no doubt that in the 2 weeks when the Parliament was not sitting prior to the referendum a certain amount of common sense prevailed between the trade union movement and the Government in reaching an agreement about the powers of the Industrial Relations Bureau. Had that come into being and had that legislation incorporated all the penalties which were envisaged by the original Bill we would have seen far greater industrial disputes in Australia than we have seen in the past. Undoubtedly, this would have had a grave effect upon the continued viability of manufacturing industry. To a large extent that responsibility belongs to those in power. All we can do on this side of the House is try to persuade the Government from time to time that the actions it is taking will bring about greater injury to industry than assistance. The same thing applies to the measures that have been taken with regard to trade practices. That matter ought to be discussed with the revitalised National Labour Advisory Council. I hope the Government has taken the advice in the submission from the trade unions on that matter.

I noticed that the Government has said—so did the White Paper—that it refused to adopt what may be considered key industries. Nevertheless, the White Paper goes on to say that some industries have special problems. It lists the industries as being the automobile industry, the electrical appliance industry, the footwear industry and the textile industry. So, in its own way, the White Paper has identified industries, all of them labour intensive. There may be other reasons why one would put industries such as infant industries or defence capacity industries in a special section. So to a certain extent, although denying the adoption of the policy, it is very difficult when writing guidelines or a policy of a future for the manufacturing industry in Australia not to identify industries which, if they were not assisted specifically, would cause major disruption or a loss to Australia.

One of the number of other matters to which reference needs to be made is the question of overseas companies that operate in Australia. There are about 2 paragraphs in the White Paper concerning the role of multinationals. They say that we in Australia abide by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development scripture on the activities of multinationals in other countries—and that is the end of that. I put it to the House that what the Government ought to have looked at in the White Paper is the extent to which Australian technology is dependent upon overseas companies operating in this country. Jackson pointed out in a specific chapter in the Green Paper turned over to the influence of overseas technology, that Australia receives enormous benefit from the activities of multinationals in this country, that we derive a great deal of our technology from their activities here. But he also pointed out that it is possible that a ceiling could be put on that technology by the parent company so that the company's subsidiary operating in Australia does not become a competitor with the parent company operating in or near Australia. So the Government ought to have expanded on this question of the role of multinationals in Australia as far as technology is concerned. They have lent some weight to and laid greater emphasis upon the role of research and development, as far as the Government is concerned. As I warned during the Budget debate of last year, it was a false economy for the Government to cut back on research and development in this country. There are some areas, even at times when government expenditure is being cut, that should never be interfered with. The long term benefits far outweigh the short term benefits in relation to questions such as research and development.

There is some mention of relocation in the White Paper but I believe that it could have gone a lot further on this matter. What is going to occur in regard to industries that are placed in these regions, in some of the major towns around Australia, will be an enormous problem for Australia. As I have said, the Government may say 'We are not going to adopt a key industry approach', but it might have to adopt a key geographical area approach. At the moment in Australia we have substantial unemployment. We have a very high figure of unemployment in the Newcastle area. It would seem that industry there, with the closing of the shipyards, is on the decline. How are we going to get 13,000 people back to work in the Newcastle region? The relocation schemes, as it should have been
pointed out in the White Paper, should be concerned with making an exhaustive analysis of what is required in this country so that we can put people back to work. The structural adjustment programs which are referred to rather fleetingly in the White Paper, are permanent government measures as we on this side of the House see them. They should be there continually. We no longer live with the fact that everything is going to return to normal as it may have done in the 1950s and 1960s.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member’s time has expired.

Mr Young—They were not going to stop it.

Mr Donald Cameron—I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

Mr Young—I had an assurance that there was no going to be any time limit on it.

Mr Donald Cameron—The motion was that we take note of the paper.

Mr Young—When is it coming back on for debate?

Mr Donald Cameron—I cannot give guarantees on that at this point of time. It is up to the Leader of the House (Mr Sinclair). I have been instructed to move that the debate be now adjourned, and that is what I have done.

Mr Young—I do not blame you for not wanting to discuss it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The question now is: That the debate be now adjourned and the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for the next day of sitting.

Mr Young—Mr Deputy Speaker, I should just like to point out that the promise was made from the other side of the House that there would be no restriction of time. The Minister has now left the chamber, but I accept the order of the House.

Mr Donald Cameron—By whom?

Mr Young—By the Minister, not by one of you pups sitting up the back of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The question now is: That the debate be now adjourned and the adjourned debate be made an order of the day for the next day of sitting.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1) 1977-78

Message from the Administrator recommending appropriation for proposed expenditure announced.

Bill presented by Mr Eric Robinson, and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ERIC ROBINSON (McPherson—Minister for Post and Telecommunications and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (8.56)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On behalf of the Treasurer (Mr Lynch), I present Supply Bill (No. 1) 1977-78. This Bill, together with the companion Bill, Supply Bill (No. 2) 1977-78, seeks interim appropriations for the services of the Government for the period 1 July 1977 to 30 November 1977, by which date it is expected that the Appropriation Bills forming part of the 1977-78 Budget will have been enacted.

Supply Bill (No. 1) seeks appropriations totalling approximately $3,512m for the ordinary annual services of the Government. This is only $100m, or less than 3 per cent, greater than the amounts provided in Supply Act (No. 1) 1976-77 and, taking both Bills together, the increase over last year is only $27m or approximately 0.6 per cent. This reflects the Government’s continuing policy of expenditure restraint. The Bill includes $100m for the Advance to the Treasurer, a reduction of $10m compared with the provision in the Supply Act (No. 1) 1976-77.

I wish to emphasise that the Supply Bills are not to be interpreted as in any way anticipating what amounts might be included for any particular service in the 1977-78 Budget. The provisions in them are based wholly on current expenditure levels and have no regard whatever to policy decisions to be taken in the context of next year’s Budget. When the Budget is passed the appropriations in the Bill will be subsumed by the appropriations in the Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1977-78. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Debate (on motion by Mr Hurford) adjourned.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2) 1977-78

Message from the Administrator recommending appropriation for proposed expenditure announced.

Bill presented by Mr Eric Robinson, and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ERIC ROBINSON (McPherson—Minister for Post and Telecommunications and Minister Assisting the Treasurer) (9.1)—I move:
That the Bill be now read a second time.

On behalf of the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) I present Supply Bill (No. 2) 1977-78. This Bill seeks interim appropriations for capital works and services, payments to or for the States and certain other services totalling, in all, approximately $745m for the period 1 July 1977 to 30 November 1977. The effect of the Government's continuing policy of expenditure restraint is reflected by the fact that this Bill seeks appropriations some $73m or 9 per cent less than those in the Supply Act (No. 2) 1976-77. The Bill includes $100m for the Advance to the Treasurer—the same amount as was provided in last year's Supply Act. As I emphasised when introducing Supply Bill (No. 1) 1977-78, the provisions in the Bill are not to be interpreted as in any way anticipating what amounts might be included in the 1977-78 Budget. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Debate (on motion by Mr Hurford) adjourned.

HOUSING LOANS INSURANCE AMENDMENT BILL 1977
Second Reading

Debate resumed from 5 May, on motion by 
Mr Newman:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Upon which Mr Uren had moved by way of an amendment:

That all words after 'That' be omitted with a view to substituting the following words: 'whilst not declining to give the Bill a second reading, the House is of the opinion that the Government by reducing the present and future capital available to the Corporation has ignored the opportunities available to it to influence the policies of lending institutions in the housing and land fields'.

Mr CADMAN (Mitchell) (9.2)—The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Uren) has proposed an amendment to the motion for the second reading of the Housing Loans Insurance Amendment Bill 1977. The Government cannot accept the amendment because it is trifling, petty and inoperable. The Housing Loans Insurance Amendment Bill proposes to make changes to the role of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation so that the Corporation becomes a competitive and more effective body. The amendment proposed by the Opposition puts it before the House that the Opposition grudgingly supports the Bill and the changes to be made to the Corporation but that if only given the chance the Opposition could have made a series of amendments that would have been truly visionary.

What is the Opposition suggesting? Firstly, that the Government is reducing present and future capital of the HLIC. Since it began in 1965 the Corporation has accumulated roughly $12.7m in its general reserve. This is about only 0.6 per cent of the face value of all contracts that are covered by the Corporation. The Bill proposes that the Corporation pay income tax, as do its 3 competitors, for the year 1976-77, that the Corporation pay an interim dividend and, finally, that the Corporation pay an initial advance repayment to the Treasury. The tax bill for the Corporation in 1976-77 will be $4.5m. The dividend that it will pay to the Treasury—at this stage it is of an interim nature—will be $300,000 and is likely to be $500,000 for the full financial year. The repayment to the Treasury, which is the establishment cost of the Corporation, is to be $200,000. In all, these payments that are proposed under the Bill total $4.5m and when made will leave $8.2m of capital reserve in the capital account and general reserve of the Corporation.

I cannot understand or follow the proposition put by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Does he propose for instance in his loosely worded amendment that all of the capital be used so that $12.7m is paid out? I suggest to the House that then there would be no contingency fund left for the Corporation to cover some of the claims that may be made upon it. The $12.7m would build about 630 homes only. Would these 630 homes be constructed by the 34 employees of the Corporation or is the Opposition proposing by its amendment and instead of paying the $4.5m to the Consolidated Revenue Fund, this amount alone should be used in a different capacity? The $4.5m would indeed build 225 homes—not a very significant contribution to the home building industry in Australia. This is not a significant amendment. It is not one that would achieve a great deal for home builders in Australia, nor would it lift the status of the Corporation if implemented in the way the amendment outlines.

I do not know whether in fact, as the Opposition intends it, the amount to be paid out by the Corporation were used in housing construction, or whatever its proposals are, it could contribute much at all. For instance, in this year's Budget total payments to the States in the housing area alone are something like $349m. Is the Opposition seriously proposing that $4.5m to the States in the welfare housing area is a significant amount of money? Is the Opposition proposing that the Corporation should have no reserves to call on in a time of emergency? Is it proposing, according to the words in the proposed amendment, that the actual cash in hand or surplus
gathered by the Corporation at the rate of about $1m a year—over the 12 years the Corporation has put together $12.7m, which is roughly $1m a year—be used to assist in the housing industry or does the proposed amendment suggest that because of the Corporation’s future capacity it would be able to influence the direction of capital? Is the Opposition seriously putting to the House the proposal that the HLIC should say to those people lending money that they should lend it and be insured by the Corporation only under certain conditions? Does the Opposition want the Corporation to set the limits of capital to each individual, to set the interest rates and the terms of payments? Is this proposal of the Opposition for the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation?

This would be one of the woolliest amendments that this House has seen. It is so generalised and unspecific that I would suggest that it has been proposed for the purpose of moving an amendment, not to make a constructive contribution to the housing industry and the capacity of people to buy their homes in Australia today. Does the Opposition seek to have the HLIC deal in the market? Does it want the Corporation out in the market place calling the shots and in some way settling completely the financial scene in regard to interest rates and capital in the housing area or is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition confusing this Corporation with the previous corporation that he established? The role of the 2 bodies is completely different. There is no way that this body that we are talking about tonight in relation to this Bill can do what it was proposed the Australian Housing Corporation would do. I really believe that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition thinks the Corporation can control funds and interest rates and can tell lending institutions how much and on what conditions they may lend. It is a most impractical approach. Perhaps the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition seek to set up another organisation, of which we have seen so many, which would fiddle with things, build about itself a huge bureaucracy, go into all walks of life and seek to confuse and to duplicate.

The HLIC basically has been established for specific purposes. It insures lenders against losses on housing loans. In general, the HLIC insures a contract and covers a lender against the loss of all amounts secured by mortgage. That includes unpaid principal, accrued interest, the cost of repairs and maintenance and selling and legal expenses. The cover also enables a lender to make loans above conventional loan on valuation ratios without risk of loss. The Corporation also assists lenders to make loans that fall outside of normal lending limits because of the location, age or type of construction of a house. The Government is intending to extend the capacity of this Corporation in those areas. By these amendments to the legislation it will achieve that. The woolly-headed type of approach that the Opposition has adopted in this instance will contribute nothing to the capacity of the organisation. There is no way in which the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation could do what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition’s amendment proposes. The Government intends to press forward. In fact, it intends to increase the capacity, the influence and the efficiency of this Corporation.

Let us talk about the efficiency of this fine body. It has a staff of something like thirty-four. It is Australia’s largest insurer of housing loans. Since commencing business the Corporation has insured 215,000 loans valued at almost $3,000m. It is a small organisation that has been set up effectively, that has operated efficiently and that has had a great impact upon the housing industry in Australia. The Government is now moving forward to make it competitive in the real sense of the word and to extend the capacity of the organisation. In 1975–76 the HLIC established a record in the value of loans insured. The total of $801.1m was over $200m greater than the previous peak, which was achieved in 1972–73. That previous peak was $586m. To give some indication of how effective this organisation has been, I point out that it took 7 years to do the first $1,000m worth of business; it took 2½ years to do the second $1,000m worth of business; and it took only 17 months to do the third $1,000m worth of business. It would seem that the demands upon this organisation and its effectiveness have demonstrated its usefulness in the Australian housing market.

When looking at the huge turnover of the organisation one must also take into consideration the outlays or losses incurred. In 1975–76 the Corporation outlayed $624,856 in the settlement of claims on only 26 properties. For only 26 properties in the whole year were the mortgages taken over by the HLIC as an alternative to the selling of those properties by the lenders. Some of those loans could result in losses if the properties have later to be sold. Provision has been made for that in the amount of $385,000. The Corporation has a huge turnover; yet its losses are comparatively small. It is a very effective and successful organisation. The HLIC covers mortgages and in that way gives greater confidence to borrowers and the market place. It brings about
stability and provides a better capacity for people to purchase. The small staff and the capacity of the organisation have been proved time and time again since the organisation's establishment in 1965.

The amendments contained in this Bill propose that the HLIC be authorised to insure, first of all, loans made by the Commonwealth or a State or by an authority of the Commonwealth or a State other than a bank. They also extend the capacity of people to borrow for home improvements, which loans are not secured by mortgage. There will be a real capacity for people wishing to extend their homes and to make renovations and improvements, of which there is a great deal going on at the present moment. There will be protection for the lender and protection for the borrower; so that there will be real stability, effectiveness and confidence within the market place. The amendments to the legislation will permit the advance of loans to buy land where the Corporation is satisfied that a borrower intends to construct a dwelling on the land. That is not possible at present. The changes that are to be made in this area will have widespread effects in the housing and construction industry of this country. Loans made by investors that are subject to management by a lender will be approved by the HLIC and loans made against residents' licences in Victoria also will be covered. They are improvements and extensions.

The Corporation must have a capacity; yet at the same time we have the Opposition seeking to take away all of that capacity and seeking to take away all of those profits and the substantial base upon which an organisation such as this can grow. I think that the Opposition's amendment is one of the most incredible and most thoughtless amendments that we have seen, because it does not come to grips with what this organisation does and what it will be doing under this proposed legislation. In keeping with the policy statement made by the coalition parties at the last election, the HLIC will be able to underwrite a higher percentage of a mortgage. The amendments to this legislation propose the elimination of the limits on insurable loans. Therefore, people will have the capacity to go out and borrow as much as they need and be protected. Lenders will have confidence in the fact that their security is established and protected by the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation.

At the moment the Corporation may not insure loans in excess of 95 per cent of valuation. Whether lower income borrowers will be able to obtain 100 per cent loans will depend upon the willingness of lenders to make them rather than upon the availability of insurance; but the Corporation will cover 100 per cent of money borrowed on the valuation of a property. These amendments are highly significant. They are sure to have a widespread impact upon the housing industry. They fit in with the Government's general policy in the housing area. The Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Newman) has taken many fine initiatives that have been of benefit to the home buyers of Australia.

Government supporters—Hear, hear!

Mr CADMAN—I can hear support coming from this side of the House, but honourable members opposite are completely silent. They know that they have no answer to the proposition that I have put to the chamber; that is, that the Minister has just put another very fine feather in his cap with these amendments to the legislation covering the HLIC. The homes savings grant scheme, for instance, was a commitment at the last election. It came into operation for the first time in January. The House will remember that it was established by Senator Ivor Greenwood soon after this Government came to office. The scheme contained very persuasive and very generous provisions for first home buyers.

Mr Baillieu—Restoring home ownership.

Mr CADMAN—It is restoring home ownership, as my honourable friend has said. The scheme not only restores home ownership but also backs that up with tax deductibility for interest paid in the first 5 years. A double package has been most thoughtfully provided by this Government. The HAVE scheme—the housing allowance voucher experiment scheme—is about to commence. This program will allow government to assess what is happening to renters. The Government will be able to provide, more sympathetically, welfare housing. More importantly the program will allow such housing to go to those people really in need. Henderson, in his report on poverty, has demonstrated that probably only a small fraction of those people in welfare homes have the capacity to pay for such cheap housing. We need to find out exactly what is happening. What does happen to funds paid to renters? The housing allowance voucher experiment will be a thoughtful program that will allow people a freedom in the market, a freedom to go out and rent the place they want and not to be squeezed into some suburb or home which is desided for them by their housing trust or housing commission. This is what dignity is all about
and this is what the capacity to make new suburbs really work is all about. The Government recognises this requirement and has done something. It has seen the need for a good program, a large program, albeit an experimental program, which will lead to lasting results in the welfare housing area.

I think that the Home Builders Account and the general housing agreement will be coming up for discussion in the next few weeks. The Minister has had his first talks with State Ministers. The proposals that I know he is dealing with and the discussions that he is having with State Ministers will also reflect his capacity to bring forward effective programs in housing and welfare for the home builders, the home buyers and the home renters of Australia.

It seems to me that the proposition put by the Opposition is thoughtless and badly considered. It is one that this side of the House completely rejects. The Opposition would seek to destroy this fine organisation rather than to expand its capacity to help people putting blocks of land together, for people putting extensions on their homes and for people seeking to borrow and to be protected in their future. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Uren) ignored this matter completely in his speech. In fact members of the Opposition have not grasped the problem of home building in Australia. When they do grasp this problem perhaps they will have something to say that will be worth listening to. So far they have said nothing.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Giles)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr LES JOHNSON (Hughes) (9.23)—The honourable member for Mitchell (Mr Cadman), who has just concluded his speech, talked about the prowess of the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Newman) and gave the impression that the Minister was one of the great achievers in the Fraser Ministry. I am not prepared to argue against the honourable gentleman. I should think that the Minister, who is sitting at the table, probably has achieved as much as any other Minister in the Fraser Government. Nevertheless, the facts are that he is regarded and is known in this Parliament as 'the undertaker'. That is in fact the nickname that is given to him here in respect of matters associated with housing, urban affairs and the environment.

Mention was made about tax deductibility on mortgage interest rates. It was put as a virtue that this scheme has now been cut back and confined to those people who are entering into a contract to buy their first home and for the first 5 years of their loan. This is a situation which contrasts greatly with that which prevailed under the Labor Government when all home buyers were able to qualify for tax deductibility. So here is the first mutilated program.

Then, of course, there is the question of growth centres. This program has also been cut apart. There is the abolition of the Australian Housing Corporation which was the vehicle by which the Australian Government for the first time in its history was to have a capacity to do something effective about the housing needs of this community. Rather than accept that challenge this Minister was responsible for jettisoning the Australian Housing Corporation. The urban improvement program was a scheme that was favoured by members from both sides of the House. But, of course, as things stand that is nothing more than a memory.

The defence service homes scheme is another program that is under review. I am sure—and I confidently predict—that it will not be long before we hear about the dire consequences of interdepartmental committees which are considering raising interest rates and disposing of defence service homes estates and so on. Then there was the States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act which we debated a short time ago. Of course, we heard the announcement by the Minister that this is the last year that the States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act is to receive any funding from this Government. There is no point in the Minister shaking his head. That is the fact of the matter. If the Minister cannot remember, he should just refer to the Hansard record. The Minister would not be prepared to tell me in reply—

Mr Baillieu—Tell the truth.

Mr LES JOHNSON—... that there is going to be another allocation of funds after the end of this financial year under the States Grants—

Mr Deputy Speaker—Order! The honourable member will resume his seat for one moment. The honourable member for La Trobe must not say that something is untrue or an untruth. Any honourable member in a debate is entitled to his own point of view.

Mr LES JOHNSON—Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Of course much more has happened and much more will happen. We have yet to feel the full effects of the report of the Holmes and Bailey task force which is proposing the abolition of the Aged or Disabled Persons Homes Act. The Minister is shaking his head. Apparently he has
not even read that report. I can tell him, in case he does not know, that there is very serious conjecture and contemplation taking place in the Cabinet of which he is a member. The aged people of this country should be very gravely concerned.

Apart from those matters, which are in themselves of great significance, there is the question of land commissions. There is the whole question of the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement.

Mr Baillieu—I rise to order. I draw your attention, Mr Deputy Speaker, to the fact that the House is debating the Housing Loans Insurance Amendment Bill. The honourable member who is now addressing the Chair has not referred to that Bill once since he started speaking. You called me to order, I think quite rightly, on a previous point. I would like to raise the point of order that the honourable member should be required to address himself to the Bill before the House and nothing else.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member has made his point of order. I invite the honourable member for Hughes to get to the substance of the Bill if he has not already done so.

Mr LES JOHNSON—Let me just tell the honourable member for La Trobe, who is famous for disrupting other people’s speeches rather than making his own, that the Housing Loans Insurance Amendment Bill 1977 is a Bill to amend the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. As I said, the provisions of this amending Bill are a reflection of the political philosophy of this Government.

This Bill has the effect of maintaining high premium rates at unnecessarily high levels. I will expand that point in just a moment. The Bill, of course, is exploiting the housing needs of the community because it is being used as a process for deriving government revenue. This is being done at the expense of the home-seeking community. Let me explain what I mean in this regard. The honourable gentleman says that I do not know much about the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation which I had the privilege of administering for some time. I will tell him something about the Corporation and something about the real intent of this legislation. In my view the Corporation is to be used as a tax collector because $4.5m of its surplus is to be transferred to the Commonwealth’s general reserve, $5m is to be transferred to Corporation capital, and hereafter the Corporation is to be subjected to tax on its 1976-77 income. Over a period the capital made available to it is to be repaid. It will have to pay stamp duty on insurance commitments entered into after 1 July 1977. Through this Bill it will be able, and no doubt it will be encouraged, to extend its investments beyond Commonwealth securities, fixed deposits with banks and the official short term money market to trustee investments and private home lending. Building societies could even be used as the vehicle by which the funds and resources of the Corporation could be divested. The final sequel, of course, is that the Corporation will be hobbled and handicapped in competing with its competitors. The home seeking public will be saddled with burdens which it ought not to bear.

That is the general situation applying to the legislation and I have no enthusiasm for it. In the 1965 debate which took place on the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation Bill, as any avid reader of *Hansard* will be able to establish, I was anything but an enthusiast for the idea of establishing the Corporation. I believe that although it is an interesting concept, it is a dubious one. I have had many discussions with departmental people along these lines. I might have a tendency to wax a bit philosophically about the Corporation tonight. I think some honourable members ought to stop and think and have a look at where they are going and at what these processes are about. The stated purpose of the Corporation is to insure lenders against loss on housing loans. The annual report points out that the Corporation covers a lender against loss of all amounts secured by the mortgage. This includes unpaid principal, accrued interest, cost of repairs and maintenance and selling and legal expenses. The report goes on to point out that the cover enables lenders to make loans above conventional loan to valuation ratios without the risk of loss.

I do not know whether honourable members opposite have established that that objective is being fulfilled. I shall have something to say about that in a moment. A stated objective is for the Corporation to assist lenders to make loans which fall outside normal lending limits because of the location, age or type of construction of the house. The fact is—the report shows this if one studies it carefully—that loans are fairly orthodox and they probably would have been made anyway. I see the Corporation’s business as being extremely lucrative. We find in the 1975-76 report that 38 355 loans were insured under the full cover insurance program and 17 704 loans were insured under the restricted cover program. A total of 56 000 loans were
insured under full cover and restricted cover programs to a value of $801m. The claims for the year against the Corporation, including provision for impending claims, totalled only $385,000. That is certainly not a very big incidence of claims in respect of such a large incidence of insurance and such a large insurance value. That is only $385,000 in that enormous $801m insurance coverage program.

Of course, other insurance is taken out against the same houses. If the houses are affected by natural disaster then often payments are made by government authorities. I ask honourable members to contemplate whether in fact there has been a very serious risk on the part of people who have been lending for housing in recent years. The figures do not demonstrate that there is. The fact is that capital gains on housing have exceeded the inflation rate. The fact is that if the mortgagee defaults in any housing situation the mortgagee gets the benefit. He holds all the deeds and he has a property with an inflated value. When the property reverts to him he is in an advantaged situation. It is very unlikely that any serious loss would have been incurred. In fact, New South Wales building societies were indemnified against loss for the best part of a quarter of a century. As I recall the situation, no claims were made because the lenders were not losing. That was during a period which was less inflationary and when there were many more hazards than there are today. The fact is that lenders do not mind if people borrowing for housing have to insure the lender against loss because the lender does not have to pay. The burden is shifted on to the borrower who has to pay the premium. This simply amounts to a surcharge on the cost of housing.

I ask honourable members: Why should home seekers be exploited as a means to gain revenue? If the scheme is self sustaining, well and good. An honourable member opposite laughs. It is a pity that he could not follow my argument because I shall indicate in a short time the extent of the surplus and what could be done apart from the proposals which are before the House at the present time. I shall look first at the competitors to the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. The Australian Mortgage Insurance Corporation is a major competitor as is the Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Corporation of Australia Ltd. Today I had a look at the stock exchange research service report on this instrumentality. I established that the Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Corporation is part of the parent body, the MGIC Investment Corporation of the United States of America. Its authorised capital is $2m.

Its issued capital is $1.16m. Its profit for 1973-74 was $1.009m. So its profit is not far behind the issued capital. That obviously indicates that this is a lucrative business, certainly for those in the private sector, as I shall show it is for the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation, the component in the private sector. The total net premiums written amounted to $1.53m. One wonders how much of the profits were repatriated to the parent company overseas.

It is the endeavour of the present Government to cut down the competition which the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation—a public instrumentality—represents to the private organisations. One wonders why there has to be a proliferation of organisations of this kind. Obviously, if there is a need for any at all one would be sufficient and we would be able to minimise the overhead. This has been established in relation to organisations like hospital and medical benefits funds. Of course, this could apply in the housing insurance field as well. The figures which I have indicated in relation to the Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Corporation show that the whole industry is a virtual goldmine. It is a licence to print money. If the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation is to continue in operation, I believe it should be given full rein and enabled to operate in the area of motel, guest house and holiday accommodation insurance. Instead of that, we have this declared objective of rationalisation and we are going to see the hoppling of this public instrumentality.

Let me refer quickly to the surplus of the Corporation itself. The surplus exceeded $1m in each of the 3 years to 1973-74. It rose to $2.4m in 1974-75, and in 1975-76 the surplus was $3m. The total surpluses now amount to $12.7m. The Minister has said:

There is a limit to the level to which premiums can be reduced further.

The fact is that there have been 3 reductions in premium rates, and I cannot see why at the present time we should not further reduce the premium to the home-seeking public. In 1973 the Labor Government reduced the premium rate, and the Corporation's report for 1973-74 stated:

The new premium rates and the wider range of refunds together represent a reduction of about 25 per cent on former rates.

What do honourable gentlemen opposite have against reducing the premium rates? Is it not difficult enough at the present time for people to get housing? Why does the Government have to subject this organisation to stamp duty and the various government taxes? Why does it have to
pay back capital into consolidated reserves? The report further stated:

Overall gain to the home buying public would be of the order of $2m annually.

That was in respect of the last reduction in premium rates. I put it to the Government that that is the process which should be given further currency.

When one looks at the loan-to-valuation ratios, it can be seen from the annual report that no great benefit accrues to the home purchasing public. In 1975-76, in the 91 per cent to 95 per cent ratio area there were only 4419 insurable loans out of a total of 37 882. So very little progress has been made in that regard. If one looks further at the report it will be seen that the Corporation is not effective in encouraging new homes and that only 39 per cent of the loans insured were for buying or building new homes or units. I believe that the objectives of this legislation are quite misfounded, and I charge the Government with using this instrumentality as a revenue raising process. The Government has neglected the opportunity to reduce insurance rates and, as a result, it will increase the price of houses for the home-seeking public.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Jenkins)—Order! The honourable member’s time has expired.

Mr NEWMAN (Bass—Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development) (9.43)—I do not want to say much but I do wish to pick up some of the more pointed criticisms made by the spokesmen for the Opposition. I think that the nub of the problem as it affects Opposition speakers is that they do not believe in free enterprise, they do not belong to a capitalist oriented party, and when they see an organisation being put on a competitive basis so that free enterprise has a chance to flourish properly, they bridle. The effect of this amendment is to put the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation on a competitive basis. We make no secret of that effect. In fact, I believe from my advisers in HLIC that it is something they have been trying to do for many years, particularly during the period when the honourable member for Hughes (Mr Les Johnson) was in charge of housing. It was a move which he resisted because he is socialist oriented and anything that smacks of capitalism must be put down.

Let us consider some of the points made by the honourable member for Hughes. He said that the Bill encouraged HLIC to keep rates at high levels. Let me assure the honourable member, and anybody else who happens to be listening to this debate, that despite the fact that HLIC is being put on a competitive basis in the open market, it will be required to make sure that its premiums are kept at the lowest possible level. The honourable member also spoke about claims on HLIC and said that the claim rate was running at only $385,000 for 1975-76. He tried to draw some conclusions from that. Let me explain to the honourable member, who claims to have some expertise in this field, although when listening to him one doubts that very much, that mortgage insurance is on a long term basis and one does not look at the short term to decide how the rates should be fixed. The rates are fixed on the total time for which the mortgage will run. The mortgage insurance rates are fixed at the point where the risk is greatest in the long term. For the honourable member’s information, I might add that this year claims are running at twice the rate of last year, which highlights the point I have just made.

Mr Baillieu—he said it was a dubious concept.

Mr NEWMAN—he would, and I think I have explained why he said that. As to the Corporation’s competitors which are quoted on the stock market, I do not know where the honourable member gets his information but I am advised that the $1.25 shares of Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation of Australia, for example, are presently running at about 92c, which hardly indicates that the investing public thinks the industry is yielding some sort of gold mine.

I shall deal now with the points made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Uren). He criticised the liability of the Corporation to pay income tax and stamp duties. Let me explain it once again and make the matter quite clear to honourable members. By virtue of its charter, HLIC alone should not have the potential to force its competitors out of the market. As I have said, we are a free enterprise government and we believe that there should be fair competition. It is reasonable that the Corporation should be placed on a comparable financial footing with its competitors. Other statutory authorities in competition with private enterprise are liable to pay Commonwealth and State taxes, and I point to Trans-Australia Airlines. While the Bill places HLIC on a commercial footing, it also enables the Corporation to be more competitive with the private companies in insurance operations. It expands the areas where HLIC may operate, and I refer to such things as front end lending, loans made by government authorities, and the removal of legislative restrictions.
The Deputy Leader of the Opposition spoke also about the repayment of $4.5m to the Commonwealth. He said that this money should be kept within the housing industry and that somehow or other the Government has confiscated $4.5m. Let me examine that proposition. We consider that $8.2m, which is made up of $5m in capital and $3.2m in general reserves, is more than adequate to meet the Corporation’s needs. Excess reserves have been accumulated by the Corporation over the years, and that points to its very competitive nature over the past 11 years. This has been due in part to the fact that the Corporation has been free from income tax and profit payments. It is reasonable therefore to expect that beyond its normal reserve requirements HLIC should repay to the Commonwealth these excesses which it does not need, and they amount to $4.5m. Again I point out that the investment powers of HLIC have been widened and will permit a higher level of investment with institutions which lend for housing. One of the provisions incorporated in this amendment is that the Corporation will be permitted to invest in permanent building societies. I have to say that the honourable member for Hughes when he had the opportunity to bring in such an amendment failed to do so. But this Government has done so, and that provision will mean that more funds will flow to the housing industry.

Those are the main points I wished to pick up and I have nothing more to say. I believe that this amendment has been overdue for many years. I believe that the Bill will enhance the operations of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation in a free enterprise situation.

Amendment negatived.

Original question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Leave granted for third reading to be moved forthwith.

Bill (on motion by Mr Newman) read a third time.

TRADE PRACTICES AMENDMENT BILL 1977

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 3 May, on motion by Mr Howard:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr YOUNG (Port Adelaide) (9.52)—The Opposition opposes the Trade Practices Amendment Bill for a variety of reasons as expressed previously when the Bill was introduced in December 1975 and lapsed due to the proroguing of Parliament. We felt that the proposed laws inherent in the new Bill set out to defeat the concepts of the Trade Practices Act as it had been established by the Labor Administration in 1974. It is not that we are completely opposed to all the changes. But the massive change which will take place in the Act as a result of this Bill provokes our total opposition. In addition, this Bill contains what we would describe as ‘the writing into the laws of Australia of a bad law’. By that I mean that it is a law that could bring Parliament into disrepute. It could be looked upon suspiciously by the community and it could bring about total non-compliance. Of course, I refer to proposed new section 45D, a unique section so far as trade practices are concerned. Unfortunately, proposed section 45D, has tended to submerge the importance of other alterations that have taken place in the Act as a result of this Bill.

No doubt, a number of speakers from both sides of the House will express their views as I will myself later in my speech upon the involving of trade unions in the trade practices law.

The original concept of trade practices, as far as the Labor Party was concerned, was as follows: That people in Australia and business houses should compete and should do so fairly within the rules. We take great comfort from the reports of the Trade Practices Commission presented in 1975 and 1976. They are the only two reports published since the establishment of the Commission. From what the Commission has had to say about its operations not only in those two documents but also in its remarks on the recommendations of the Swanson Committee, we can see that the Commission itself believes that the trial period of the Trade Practices Act has not been sufficiently long to warrant the massive changes that are taking place in this Bill. It would be interesting to foresee the third annual report of the Trade Practices Commission in relation to the changes that will take place. I think it is worthwhile to note that a future Labor Government obviously would move to strengthen the Act where it believed this Bill tends to weaken it.

A reading of the annual reports shows that the contents of this Bill fly in the face of everything the Commission has had to say about its operations. It has always seen the Act as a long term influence on the activities of business in Australia. It did not see itself as being able to push amendments or changes in the business styles of Australia or to try to crush moves that may have been to the advantage of Australian
business in a way which may have been peculiar to the thinking of some people. It has indeed defended itself against these accusations. I want to look at what the Commission has had to say in its first annual report about the approach of the Trade Practices Act in relation to the 1974 Bill. The Commission stated:

The present Act is in sharp contrast with the law it replaced. It covers matters not previously touched, for example mergers, price discrimination, exclusive dealing, and consumer protection. It starts from a general principle instead of case by case examination.

I think it important to understand that the Trade Practices Commission saw its role as being, in the long term, laying down general principles which people would abide by. We will see as we go through this Bill that we are reverting to the old system of case by case examination. Whilst there has been some argument that perhaps we are over-using the resources of the Commission in wanting to continue with public hearings—a matter which I want to examine a little later on—nonetheless when it comes to this type of operation the Government does not see itself having a problem in asking the Trade Practices Commission to go back to the old system of case by case examination which could in the long term mean a great deal more problems for business houses in Australia.

Whilst I am on that point and now that the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Howard) is at the table, I want to say in relation to this Bill and in relation to the Bill which effectively introduces the concept of an industrial relations bureau, that I found both the second reading speeches fell far short of the mark in outlining the changes that will take place. I think that the responsible Ministers—the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Steet)—ought to look seriously at the manner in which they present their second reading speeches which are supposed to give us a guide to what is proposed in the Bills themselves. We on this side of the House have noted that the second reading speeches fell far short of the mark in outlining the changes which are to take place in the Acts. Obviously, the approaches of the political parties can be expected to be different. They are determined by economic factors, social and political, and by the business thinking of both the major political parties. What has happened over the past 18 months under this Government—the makeup of the Swanson Committee, its terms of reference which seem to me to be way outside the bounds of the operations of the Trade Practices Commission, and perhaps the tie-up between what the Government wants the Trade Practices Commission to do and its own economic objectives—has to a certain extent exposed its thinking and influences. The Government seems unable to draw the line between its own political relationship with some business houses and the impact on inflation of returning to some sort of laissez-faire approach to the so-called competitive forces in our society.

It is interesting to note a submission of the Graziers Association of New South Wales made recently to the Trade Practices Commission. I would have thought that the viewpoint of the Graziers Association of New South Wales would not be very close to the Australian Labor Party. Nevertheless, the Association had this to say in its submission:

The concern of the Graziers' Association and that of the other primary producer association supporting our submissions is not the ethics of the Stock and Station Agents' Association but the apparent complete absence of price competition in the industry. Further, we are concerned that the collusive price fixing agreement is used to significantly alter the trading terms of the industry and disadvantage livestock producers.

The Association believes that the price fixing agreement administered by the N.S.W. Stock and Station Agents' Association operates to reduce, if not to completely negate, those economic forces which would normally bring about a change in the agents industry. A complete review of the method of remuneration for stock agents seems appropriate.

And so it goes on. Many people and associations are looking very seriously at the weakening of the Trade Practices Act and the effect it may have upon their own economic wellbeing. Matters that will be raised by speakers on this side of the chamber in the second reading debate and in the Committee stage will include public hearings, restrictive practices, boycotts, mergers and exclusive dealing, but I want to refer to what the Commission had to say in relation to the self-enforcing effect of the Act as it is and perhaps the way in which that is now challenged. On page 12 of its second annual report the Trade Practices Commission had this to say:

Subject to the procedures for clearance and authorisation, both the restrictive trade practices and the consumer protection provisions operate by prohibiting specified kinds of conduct having certain specified effects. Consequently, the effectiveness of the provisions depends to a great extent on determinance, and that is difficult to assess. No-one can say how many anti-competitive mergers were never proposed because the parties realised there was no public benefit that would justify them, or how many competitors resisted the temptation to agree on prices because of the risks under the Trade Practices Act. However, there is some striking evidence of results the Act is producing. The evidence presented to the Commission public hearing on building societies tied insurance arrangements showed a substantial decline in insurance premiums over the preceding two years.

On industry predictions it said:
In authorisation cases, it has been pressed on the Commission that industry executives are experts who can best predict what will happen in the absence of the restrictions in question, and that the Commission should accept and act on their predictions and not presume to make its own judgment. If it accepted this view, the Commission would be neglecting its statutory responsibility and resigning itself to a continuance of the status quo.

Naturally, weight must be, and is, given to what experienced executives have to say. But it cannot necessarily be decisive, even if the executives all have the same opinion, which is by no means always so. It needs at least to be tested in point of logic. And some allowance must be made for the possibility that personal involvement in defending restrictions will produce a degree of subjectivity beyond that of experts qualified in the ordinary sense to give opinion evidence.

In defence of their operations, no-one—not even Swanson or the Government—has torn down the arguments advanced by the Commission.

I turn now to the developments in respect of the application of the public benefit test, which again is an important aspect of the changes the Government now proposes. The Government’s changes fly in the face of what the Commission has said and the public benefit test is now under serious challenge. In its second annual report the Commission had this to say:

The Act in s. 90(5) directs the Commission (and, when there is a re-hearing, the Tribunal) not to make a determination granting an authorisation unless it is satisfied that the contract, arrangement, understanding or conduct to which the application relates results, or is likely to result, in a substantial benefit to the public, being a benefit that would not otherwise be available, and that in all the circumstances, that result, or that likely result, as the case may be, justifies the granting of the authorisation.

Further on, dealing with causation, the Commissioner said:

A logical first step when considering an authorisation application is the question of causation: the claimed benefits must be shown to result, or be likely to result, from the conduct in question.

The Shell exclusive dealing case is an illustration of the causation element. Shell had argued that its exclusive dealing system with its dealers and agents produced cost-saving efficiencies which depended on the system and were peculiar to it. Shell argued that if the exclusive dealing contracts were not authorised, there would be a trend towards multi-brand selling from service stations which could cause these existing economies in supply and transportation to be lost. However, from the evidence of an officer of Shell in the United States it became clear that even though it was not lawful in the United States to tie dealers to one oil company by exclusive dealing agreements, single-brand trading had continued because it carried economic advantages for both dealer and supplier.

There are volumes of evidence from the Trade Practices Commission to indicate that these provisions should not be altered. In giving its interpretation of the wording of ‘substantial benefit to the public’, the Commission had this to say:

The phrase ‘benefit to the public’, has been interpreted by the Tribunal as meaning ‘anything of value to the community generally, any contribution to the aims pursued by the society including as one of its principal elements, the achievement of the economic goals of efficiency and progress’.

So, in terms of substantial benefit to the public or of exclusive dealing with which the Commission has had to deal, no real argument has been advanced to support the changes inherent in the Bill.

I do not believe that the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Howard), who is at the table, or the Government believes that all the problems that may be involved with mergers have been overcome. There is substantial evidence from many people who are analysing this Bill to say that the merger section of the Act has been considerably weakened and the role of the Commission watered down considerably. Nevertheless, the question of mergers in Australian industry offers us enormous problems and challenges. People have used this as an argument to say that the Trade Practices Commission is interfering too much with the role set for the Industries Assistance Commission. There has been some argument by the Trade Practices Commission that that is not so and that the roles of the 2 commissions are quite different.

Tonight we had the White Paper on manufacturing industry tabled in this House. We have an enormous problem in Australia concerning this question of economies of scale of international competitiveness. We on this side of the House do not bury our heads in the sand; we recognise the need to continually look at mergers in industries. We do not believe that what the Government proposes in this Bill overcomes that problem. The Government does not argue that the Commission has been unnecessarily holding up mergers. All the evidence in the reports shows that they have been dealt with expeditiously and that very few authorisations have been refused. Nevertheless, it is not just the role of the Trade Practices Commission or of the Industries Assistance Commission to look at these problems. They are problems for the Government, and a great deal more thought will have to be given to the problem of mergers. They do not always take place as a move towards anti-competitiveness or monopoly. In some cases they have done so. Before the 1974 Act a great deal of them were for that purpose. I think that the dropping of the threshold test meets with the criticism made of it by the Commission. It was a shot in the dark by the Government in pursuance of its policy stated at the 1975 election and it would have presented
more problems for the Commission than the Government realised.

In relation to proposed section 45D, the 1976 Bill included provisions to prohibit secondary boycotts. Those provisions were harsh enough. Now they have been extended in a way which will greatly intensify the threat to the unions. The very considerable extension of the secondary boycott provisions is apparent from proposed section 45D. If we look closely at the Act we see that proposed section 45D now has 7 subsections with extensive internal divisions into paragraphs and sub-paragraphs. To establish the effect of any one sub-section it must be read in conjunction with the others. These are very complex provisions yet they are referred to only in passing in the Minister's second reading speech. This is not an isolated example of a blatan
t distortion of the provisions of the Bill which has emerged from the second reading speech. A massive and far-reaching piece of legislation is glossed over in a second reading speech which distorts the real purposes of the legislation. If we want to find out what the Government is on about we have to go to the terms of the Act and analyse it in a very detailed way. This is necess
ary because, as I have said previously, the Minister's speech presents the new Bill as a model of moderation and concession.

When we look closely at the Bill we find that this is not so. We have to try to penetrate the fog and find out what the Bill is really designed to do. If we look at proposed section 45D (1) we find that it corresponds to the original section 45D although it has been recast to include several significant changes. In particular, the impact of this section has been very much hardened. The original provision said that "an employee of a person" was not to engage in certain conduct in concert with others. The new section 45D (1) addresses itself only to a person. The previous approach by which the action of employees was involved has been altered so that the section applies now to the conduct of any person. Several comments should be made about this change. Although the Minister in his speech declares a belief in even-handedness the history of this section does not demonstrate an even-handed approach. In fact, the provisions of the original Act have been very much toughened. We should never forget the basic purpose of the Trade Practices Act; that is to regulate the affairs of employers, not employees. Other legislation, particularly the Conciliation and Arbitration Act regulates those activities.

The Government has made a substantial innovation in trying to extend this Act to employees and, in the process, reviving long dead areas of common law. If we look at the way in which these provisions are framed we find that the main thrust is against employees. Employers and businessmen seem to be included almost as an afterthought. In effect, the whole purpose of this sort of legislation has been turned on its head. This is perfectly plain if we look closely at the effect of proposed section 45D (1). This is not, as I said, an even-handed approach. It is aimed at employees. Let there be no mistake about it. Business seems to have been included as a diversion and as a mask to the true intent of the legislators. This emerges clearly if we look at the change in the wording. The Minister suggests that the wording 'a person' is designed to apply the section to businesses. If the whole of the section is read, it becomes clear that the wording has been changed to apply the section and the consequent penalties to unions and, in particular, to union officers as representatives of their members.

A later provision gives the whole game away. It provides that unions and their officers are liable if two or more members of unions are involved. If the old wording had been retained—I repeat it here, 'an employee of a person'—it could be argued that the section did not prohibit unions from engaging in the conduct specified in concert with their members. This argument would be valid because the prohibition extended only to an employee and unions were not employees. Now the wording has been changed and the unions are liable. Plainly, the revised legislation is part of the extensive battery of legislative measures the Government has built up against the trade union movement.

There is another important change which the Minister did not bother even to mention in the extremely skimpy second reading speech. The prohibition in the original section extended to concerted conduct 'for the purpose of hindering or preventing the supply of goods and services by the employee to a corporation' if that hindering had a substantial adverse effect on the corporation's business. This raises the question of whether conduct aimed at disrupting an employer's business by halting or limiting his production by a strike or go-slow could apply to this provision with regard to a corporation with which that employer dealt. The original wording could be interpreted to mean that where there was purposeful interference with the employer's production the result of this interference, such as
prevention of supplies to customers, would also be purposeful acts within the terms of the Bill.

The new wording does not prohibit conduct for the purposes of hindering supplies to a corporation. Instead it prohibits conduct for the purpose of causing substantial loss or damage to the corporation's business. On the surface, the new wording would seem to limit the argument that the conduct of employees on strike or go-slow would damage the businesses of customers or their employees through disruption in supplies. For example, it could be interpreted as meaning that strikes arising from disputes between workers and their employers, which incidentally injured customers, would not be covered by the provisions. Such an interpretation has 2 weaknesses. Firstly, it cannot be ruled out that this sort of strike is completely excluded. Courts have often accepted much more tenuous arguments. Secondly, we have to look at the effect on section 45D (1) of the proposed new section 45D (3). This sub-section extends to contraventions of section 45D an exemption from liability which by section 51 of the Act applies to all sections of Part IV except section 48 which deals with resale price maintenance. In the original Bill this exemption from liability was denied also to section 45D.

The extension of this exemption to secondary boycotts through the insertion of section 45D (3) was another of the very important changes which was ignored by the Minister in his second reading speech. Its appearance raises some very nasty doubts about the intent of section 45D (1). The matters listed in sub-section (3) of section 45D concern wages, working conditions, hours, etc. They are the issues which would be involved in strikes by employees against their employers—in short, strikes aimed at putting pressure on the employers and not on the customers of the employers. If section 45D (1) did not prohibit that sort of strike, if it were aimed only at strikes involving corporations with whom the employers traded, then the protection given by section 45D (3) would not be needed. Therefore, its inclusion suggests very strongly that the framers of this Bill see section 45D (1) as still applying to all strikes. Interpretation of section 45D (3) raises another problem. Even in the Government's own terms, industrial strikes may be interpreted in a very restrictive way. There are very many matters of dispute between employer and employee which would fall beyond the narrow bands of the sub-section concerning remuneration, conditions of employment, hours of work or working conditions.

Apart from these doubts, the protection is even more limited with regard to the persons by whom it can be invoked. This involves a detailed examination of sub-section (3) in conjunction with sub-sections (4) and (5). I point to the restriction here. I do not want to go into it in any detail. The total effect is to provide that if two or more members of a union strike about wages, hours or conditions of employment and the strike damages the business of a corporation then the union is in contravention of the prohibition in section 45D (1) and is liable to the appropriate penalties.

To summarise, the only point of section 45D (3) is to make it clear that section 45D (1) applies not only to strikes aimed at the corporations in question but to all strikes. Its protective value is illusory because it is the unions, not individual employees, which the section is designed to penalise. There is no protection for the unions. They can escape liability only by establishing the taking of all reasonable steps to prevent their members from engaging in the prohibited conduct as provided in section 45D (5).

Other changes have been made in the penalties that may be imposed. According to the Minister these changes have reduced the severity of the Bill by ensuring that individual employees are not subjected to pecuniary penalties. In fact, if we look closely at the Bill, we find that this is not the case for there are penalties other than pecuniary penalties. The earlier Bill imposed on individual employees possible fines of up to $50,000. Quite clearly, these were impractical and could not be enforced. They would have been disastrous politically. No government, not even the Fraser Government, can afford to put workers and their families destitute onto the streets. It would have been completely impractical to use a $50,000 sledgehammer to crack the nut of an individual worker. Ruling out arguments of humanity and equity, it would have been impossible from an administrative point of view to levy such a fine and recover it from a single worker. The Government is now putting itself on the back for not doing what it could never do. It has sought to shift liability from the individual employee to the unions.

Linked with this proposed Industrial Relations Bureau legislation these penalties are designed to destroy militant unionism. The penalty provisions have been changed to ensure that union funds will be liable to fines of up to $250,000. The watered-down Industrial Relations Bureau legislation which we have yet to see before the Parliament cannot disguise the basic intent of
both pieces of legislation. There was a loophole in the original amendment because it was arguable whether or not unions were bodies corporate. This is a complex argument and I refer only to the broad provisions here. Briefly, the original amendment provided for fines of up to $50,000 for a person not a body corporate and up to $250,000 for a body corporate. Whether a union was or was not a body corporate varied according to the relevant industrial legislation of the individual States and of the Commonwealth. The new version of the Bill has resolved arguments about whether a union is or is not a body corporate by subjecting all unions to a $250,000 fine. This is one way of simplifying a complex law, but we must doubt whether it is an equitable one. Further, we should note that this $250,000 fine is not a maximum; it is a $250,000 fine for each act to which the section applies. It is possible for a court to hold that each day of a strike is a prohibited act and therefore liable to a fine of $250,000 a day.

Again, I do not want to go through paragraph by paragraph the construction of the Act which closes the loophole based on incorporation or non-incorporation. It emerges clearly if we study closely section 45D (6) (c). A great number of other honourable members on this side of the House will be looking closely at this section 45D. It would be in the interests of the Government, as I said earlier, for this section to be taken out of the Bill and referred to the reconstituted National Labour Consultative Council because, as I said during the introduction of my speech, it is a bad law. It will meet with total non-compliance; it will bring the Parliament into disrepute for bringing in a law which one would say has the same smell about it as that of conscription.

Mr SHIPTON (Higgins) (10.22)—This legislation amending the Trade Practices Act is the result of a long process of consideration, consultation and thought. I think we have had before the House legislation in one form or another for some 5 months. The Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Howard) has shown a complete ability to accept submissions to change the legislation after thought and consideration has been given to it. It is a proper approach to legislation before this House. A major provision of the amendment to the Trade Practices Act is to include in it section 45D relating to secondary boycotts by unions. This introduces for the first time in trade practices legislation a provision relating to union abuse of power.

Let me say at the outset that unions are a proper part of the capitalist system. They arose initially in the last century out of abuses of the system, for quite proper reasons. They are, in fact, an essential part of that system. As Mr Justice Higgins said of the arbitration system in 1919:

The system of arbitration adopted by the Act is based on unionism. Indeed, without unions it is hard to conceive how the Act could be worked. Unions are essential for a proper conciliation and arbitration system. Similarly, we recognise that an individual person, as a worker, is often helpless to actually negotiate his particular contract of employment. He has a freedom of labour to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment.

We on this side of the House recognise that—and we are often accused of union bashing. I am quite prepared to be accused of that by honourable members opposite because it suits them to apply that term to people like myself. But in fact they are completely wrong because, as I have said, the trade union movement and the trade unions themselves are an essential and proper part of the capitalist system.

Mr Les McMahon—Are you a member of one?

Mr SHIPTON—I have been a member of a union. The trade union movement is important for the future of Australia. I think that honourable members on the other side of the House ought to look at and have a little bit of common sense when talking about these matters. We are not union bashing in this legislation. We are injecting into it the public interest. We are injecting the public interest into the legislation to counter abuses of power and position by the trade unions. That is all we are doing. This legislation before the House, this section 45D, in many respects is more important than the Industrial Relations Bureau legislation to which reference has been made in the debate. The people of Australia know that they are on a good double with these 2 pieces of legislation. The people of Australia know that the abuses of union power have to be curtailed in the public interest. The trade unions have abused their power. They enjoy enormous immunities and privileges that others in society do not have.

Mr Willis—Rot!

Mr SHIPTON—If the honourable member for Gellibrand were to exceed the speed limit when he was driving his car home tonight—I am not suggesting that he would do so—he would be apprehended and prosecuted. But the unions, in regard to abuses of power, are subject to no law at all and the honourable member knows that as well as I do.

Mr Young—Knows it better.
Mr SHIPTON—The honourable member for Port Adelaide knows it better. The union bully boss comes here tonight and tells us that this law is a bad law and that it will bring the Parliament into disrepute in the community. It will do the opposite. It is a good law and it will re-establish the supremacy of Parliament, the supremacy of the people and the supremacy of public interest over abuses of union power. The honourable member knows that as well as anybody else. The unions, by exerting power, have injured trade unionists. They have injured members of trade unions, fellow workers, and they have in fact threatened the economic and political structure of society itself. They have used mass economic power and have made it necessary by these abuses for the Government to inject this section into the legislation in the public interest.

Trade union activities are legitimate in respect of industrial matters such as negotiating terms, hours, conditions of employment, holiday pay, etc. Those are its proper functions. We recognise that and the community recognises that. One of the troubles with the union movement as a socialist in Britain, Paul Johnson, has pointed out is that it has outlived its usefulness and is in fact looking for somewhere to go. Because of this, it is abusing the power that it has.

Mr Sainsbury—is that the New Statesman?

Mr SHIPTON—that is the former editor of the New Statesman. At present unions are exempt from civil laws or wrong doing. Perhaps some area of civil law applies to them but it would be a very small area of that law. Here we attempt to redress this abuse.

I should like to look at section 45D which was introduced by the Minister. This has been criticised on 2 grounds: Firstly, that it has no role to play in union activity and, secondly, that it is too wide and goes beyond secondary boycotts. The Government is completely correct in rejecting the argument for the reasons I have stated, that there is no role for trade practices legislation in union activity. I stated earlier that the government role is to protect the public interest. Corporations and companies are subject to legislation. There are company laws controlling the activities and incorporation of companies. There are safety laws concerning the safety of the work place. There are trade practices laws—which This Trade Practices Act with monopoly provisions, exclusive dealing provisions and consumer protection provisions. There are consumer protection provisions in State law and there are Prices Justification Tribunal laws. Employers and companies are subject to laws in the public interest. I do not see for one minute why the union movement should not be subject to laws in the public interest. I feel that the Minister has shown common sense in accepting the argument that the original draft concerning boycotts was too wide. He has drafted it to put it beyond doubt that the legislation applies only to secondary boycotts. This is evidence of the sincerity of the Minister and the Government in these matters.

Let us look at secondary boycotts. A secondary boycott involving employees is where employees together hinder or prevent commercial dealings between their employer and another business with the aim of influencing the conduct of the boycotted business. I believe that there will be aspects of this legislation that will benefit the community in the short term. One of the provisions of secondary boycotts in practice is where employees decide to apply pressure on a single company to force that company to implement some particular policy. An example of this is where unions cut off supplies of raw materials—

Debate interrupted.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! It being 10.30 p.m., in accordance with the order of the House of 10 March, I propose the question:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr Howard—I require the question to be put forthwith without debate.

Question resolved in the negative.
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Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr SHIPTON—I was saying that an example of a boycott is where unions cut off supplies of raw materials to a firm in order to enforce the unionisation of that firm’s work force or to support the employees of that union in an industrial dispute. I believe that this provision will be particularly acceptable to the Australian public and may in the short term have an effect, for instance in Victoria in relation to the building of the Newport power station. I am pleased that the Victorian Government has started work on that project, but I understand that there have been threats by union leaders in Victoria to boycott supplies of material to the State Electricity Commission of Victoria or to the contractors. I believe that this legislation should be taken notice of by
the unionists concerned. I believe it will be welcomed by the Victorian Government and by the people of Victoria and that this planned activity that some union leaders have threatened in relation to Newport can be dealt with by action under this legislation when it comes into effect. Similarly, in relation to the ban on live cattle exports by some unions I believe that would be a secondary boycott to which this provision would apply. I know that the public will welcome the provision in that regard. Similarly, some activities by waterfront and shipping unions in relation to activity on the waterfront and on shipping around the Australian coast—I am thinking of their activity in relation to delaying ships—may also fall within this legislation.

The legislation is extremely reasonable. I turn to the penalties provision of the Bill. The normal penalties for offences against the provision of the Trade Practices Act are $250,000 for a corporation and $50,000 for individuals. The Government has decided that under section 45D individuals will not be liable for pecuniary penalties. Additionally, the liabilities of individuals for civil damages will be limited by a provision which deems unions to be responsible for the boycott activities of their members unless they establish that they took all reasonable steps to prevent the activity.

Mr Young—What are they?

Mr SHIPTON—If a union is deemed responsible for any anti-competitive activity the individuals involved will be protected from liabilities for civil damages. The honourable member for Port Adelaide (Mr Young) interjected and asked: 'What are they?' He showed abysmal ignorance and lack of ability to read legislation when he was whingeing and complaining about the Minister's second reading speech. All honourable members have the legislation before them. We are all able to read and write. I presume that the honourable member tells the people in his electorate that he is here and considers legislation. One has considerable doubt about that in listening to him speak.

Mr Antony Whitlam—The Government had to go away and change section 45D a bit.

Mr SHIPTON—It is nice to hear the honourable member for Grayndler interjecting. Here we have an expert in trade practices law in the House. I welcome his interjection and I look forward to his contribution to the debate. He is trying to interject again. I do not know whether honourable members of this House know that the honourable member for Grayndler has a considerable, distinctive record as a legal adviser to one of the world's largest companies. I hope that the people of Grayndler and the members of the Australian Labor Party in his electorate are well aware of his experience and that he will bring it before the House.

Mr Antony Whitlam—Not just one, several over the years.

Mr SHIPTON—I am glad that the honourable member is interjecting and acknowledging his experience in an international sense. I am sure it will be used to the benefit of the people of Grayndler and the people of Australia.

Mr Howard—He is almost a multi-national adviser, is he not?

Mr SHIPTON—I suppose that is a fair comment from the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, who is at the table. I move on to the general provisions of the legislation concerning the commercial activities of the Commonwealth Government. I welcome the provision which provides that these commercial activities are to be subject to the legislation. As I understand it the legislation will apply to activities of Medibank and the Commonwealth Bank. It is regrettable in some ways that Telecom and Australia Post are not to be subjected to the legislation. They have statutory monopolies. Perhaps in the future the Government will look at areas where the Trade Practices Act may apply to them. I recognise that there are difficulties in drafting legislation but I do not think this is something that we should shy away from.

I turn now to look at the monopoly provisions of the Bill which have been attacked by the other side. I welcome the change which reflects the nature of the Australian economy but still provides for a merger law in the public interest. Section 50 of the Act is now to be changed to provide that a corporation will not merge, that is, acquire assets or shares, if as a result of that acquisition the corporation would be in a position to control or dominate a market for goods or services. This is a change from the previous section which had a competitive test of whether a merger had the effect of a substantial lessening of competition. I welcome that change because there is a new thrust. It recognises in part the nature of the Australian economy. I congratulate in sincerity some comments of the honourable member for Port Adelaide when talking about problems Australian industry faces regarding conflict between trade practices law on the one hand and Industries Assistance Commission reports or tariff policy on the other. There are problems here. I mean sincerely that I was pleased to hear him recognise that, although he
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I should like to make some brief comments about monopoly in Australia. I think it is often misunderstood in debate. I think the degree of monopoly often tends to be overstated. Often the function of import competition and its place in the economy is overlooked. The 1975-76 annual report of the IAC states that 20 per cent of the Australian market supplies of manufactured goods came from imports. The decline in the manufacturing sector that I think was referred to in the White Paper on manufacturing industry today, which over 10 years has seen the percentage of the Australian work force employed in that sector go from something like 29 per cent to less than 21 per cent, is serious and has to be looked at in relation to merger provisions and trade practices law. One assumes that the problems that manufacturers face can in some way be overcome by merging so that they can become more economic and efficient and compete with imports. I think efficiency needs to be considered. One assumes that manufacturing industry will have to rationalise in many respects to survive competitive pressures.

I also look at the effect of the Prices Justification Tribunal in relation to the abuse of monopoly power. Monopoly provisions are still contained in the legislation. We must not forget that. But one has to remember that monopolies or companies with large market shares and in dominant positions in the Australian economy by and large have to apply to the Prices Justification Tribunal or are subject to its general overview in relation to their prices. So there is in fact a profit control over many companies that have substantial positions in the Australian economy and which have perhaps a position of dominance in terms of section 50 of the Act. I think that is something that one needs to look at. One also needs to examine the point that when a merger takes place the unit costs of production will usually fall. Hence there will be no need for a price increase and, accordingly, there will be a benefit for the Australian economy and community at large. I think this needs to be clearly and plainly understood. In other words, mergers can lead to lower prices and benefits to the Australian consumer. That has to be recognised. One also hopes that in administering these laws—this section of the Act and the others—the Trade Practices Commission will show a sensible and practical approach to the problem. I think it ought to understand the nature of the Government's amendments in this light.

I congratulate the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs on his approach. I understand that there will be a debate of some length in the Committee stage on the complicated technical nature of this legislation. I welcome that.

Debate (on motion by Mr Willis) adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Public Service—Simultaneous Elections Referendum—Local Government—Death of Mr Don Whittington

Motion (by Mr Howard) proposed:

That this House do now adjourn.

Mr JENKINS (Scullin) (10.41)—Allegations have been made that I have been party to the subversion of a public servant in his duties. Having read the Press, I gather that these allegations refer to an officer of the Attorney-General's Department. Let me say firstly, that as far as I know, I am not acquainted with any person working in the Attorney-General's Department, nor have I attempted to subvert either directly or indirectly any person working in that Department. Two matters are referred to in the Press. The first refers to questions asked in the House. With regard to questions on notice, honourable members can ascertain that I have placed one question on notice during this Parliament, and that that question arose directly out of a question asked of the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) without notice. Further, if honourable members examine the questions without notice that I have asked, they will find that they are of a nature that certainly does not require any assistance from any public servant or other person, nor do they refer to material pertinent to the Attorney-General's Department.

This leads to the second allegation, namely, that with regard to the drafting of a notice of motion referring to the honourable member for Macarthur (Mr Baume). My interest in that honourable member and his role in Patrick Partners was mentioned by me in the Address-in-Reply debate. It had been a matter for discussion among members of the Australian Labor Party. I agreed to take further action to have it discussed in the House. A draft notice of motion was presented by members of staff working for the Parliamentary Labor Party. This was discussed by several members of the Parliamentary Labor Party and some minor alterations were made. The notice of motion referred to no confidential material; the matters noted in it were freely
available to any person. That motion was subsequently moved in the House by me, when I addressed myself to it in my own words and in my own way. It was, as is recorded, defeated on party lines. So much for the despicable allegations against me.

This matter does lead to a question now in the minds of honourable members and public servants. I now deplore the situation when public servants leak confidential information they obtain in their work, just as I did when members of the Government Parties, when in Opposition, used such material—for example, the leaks from Treasury by one individual under the alias of Mr Williams, and other matters which could be mentioned. Is a public servant allowed to have political opinions in his private life? Is he allowed to deal with political matters and writings in his private life? Or is he threatened by discipline if he departs in his private life from the government line? The Government should answer those questions. Perhaps this is a further step in the Public Service bashing it has carried out over the past 18 months.

Mr HAMER (Isaacs) (10.44)—Of the 4 referendum questions put to the people last Saturday the most important one—the one for simultaneous elections for this House and the Senate—was lost, despite being unanimously endorsed by this House and, incidentally, endorsed at the Hobart Constitutional Convention by the Premiers of the 3 States which rejected it last Saturday. But last Saturday is history now and we have to accept the result, whatever we think of the referendum as a method of modernising the Constitution. But the problems which the simultaneous elections referendum sought to overcome are still with us, and these problems are serious.

One can make a good case that the present 3-year term of the House of Representatives is too short. The term is 5 years in Britain and Canada, for instance. The trouble with a 3-year term is that governments often have to take—or should take—long-term decisions that may be unpopular in the short term. The danger with a short term for this House is that governments will be reluctant to put forward long-term policies that they know to be right, because of the imminence of an election. The situation is made much worse if the already too short interval between elections is further shortened by a separate intermediate Senate election. That is a perfect recipe for short-sighted government, and short-sighted government is bad government. The suggestion that under the present system elections could be kept in line by shortening the term of the House begs the question, for it offers the problem as a solution. Perhaps even more serious is the fact that, under the Constitution as it stands, the Senate by blocking Supply can force this House into an election without itself facing the electors, unless the Senate has separately given grounds for a double dissolution.

I supported the proposal put to the people last Saturday, because it would have improved the present situation; but I do not pretend that I think it was ideal. It was produced by the Joint Select Committee on Constitutional Review in 1959 and was endorsed by the 1976 Hobart Convention. It was proper that it be put to the people. But I do not believe that it was the best possible solution. It suffered from 2 defects: Firstly, it raised the possibility of shortening the terms of senators, which was justly criticised. Secondly, if the Senate, by blocking Supply, forced an election on this House, only half the Senate would have to face the electors.

I think the problem has been tackled the wrong way round. Instead of bringing the Senate's term into line with that of the House, we should have brought the House into line with the Senate by giving the House a fixed 3-year term. Then the Senate and the House would always be in line. There would, of course, be one consequential problem. The fixed term would remove the power, effectively given to the Prime Minister, to dissolve the House before the expiration of its term. I know of nothing in the theory of responsible government that necessitates giving a Prime Minister the power to dissolve the House to suit his own political advantage. All that is needed is to have a constitutional provision that if a government cannot be formed in the House there should be an election. In these circumstances a double dissolution would be appropriate. The constitutional amendment could also conveniently cover another problem; it could provide for a double dissolution also if the Senate rejected Supply. The Constitution could simply provide that if a government cannot get Supply out of Parliament—that is both Houses—the remedy is a double dissolution. I commend this suggestion to the delegates to the Constitutional Convention to be held in Perth later this year. They must tackle this problem. It is too important to give up.

Mr CLYDE CAMERON (Hindmarsh) (10.49)—This afternoon I spoke in the debate on the motion to take note of the report of the Australian Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly. According to information given to me, an officer of the Department of Foreign Affairs who was listening to my remarks
about first class travel for public servants, especially those in the Department of Foreign Affairs, thought that it would be a good thing to spend his time during working hours on penning a few words about himself and his colleagues. I have now the result of that hour of toil. It is a song called 'Song of the Public Service', and is as follows:

We're happy little vegetables
with our BA degrees,
We allow ourselves to vegetate
with breaks for cups of tea,
Because we love our circus life
We all enjoy backstabbing strife,
It puts a rise in every cheque.

It is to be sung to the tune of 'We're happy little Vegemites'. Then he thought it would be a good idea, since I had mentioned first class travel for public servants, to have something to say about this important subject. This was the result from this $15,000 a year public servant:

I like aeroplane travel,
First-class travel for me,
I like it for lunch and I like it for tea
its so much better than e-con-o-my,
The quality's high as the name would imply: it supplies us free booze—
one more good reason why,
I like travelling first-class
Aeroplane first-class for me.

It is sung to the tune of 'I like Aeroplane Jelly'. I have read this little ditty because it represents the cynical approach which some public servants have towards the perks of office. It reminds me too that the people who have to pay for first class travel warrants for public servants are the ordinary taxpayers.

I am told that 87 per cent of all travellers out of Australia travel economy class and most of the balance are public servants or people who are travelling on someone else's account. If it is good enough for private members of this Parliament and for their wives to travel economy class, as most of us do, it is good enough for public servants to travel economy class too. I am prepared to support publicly the attitude that the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) has taken towards bringing these people back to the field. It is about time—

Mr Donald Cameron—You were the pace setter, Clyde; remember that.

Mr CLYDE CAMERON—No I was not. Never at any time did I say that public servants ought to be given the right to travel first class when they went overseas when the ordinary taxpayers whose money provides them with their flash salaries and their rich superannuation schemes and the like are, of course, the ones who have to travel economy class.

I would say something else. I am told that under Public Service union regulations a public servant is not allowed to travel more than 12 hours without having a rest for the night. Yet he demands first class travel. How many members of this Parliament who have travelled overseas have been able to enjoy the right or the luxury of first class travel with no more than 12 hours flying at any one time? How many of us have travelled from here to London in one trip subject only to stopping over for refuelling. How many of us have travelled from here to New York or to San Francisco without breaking our journey? We do it and think nothing of it. We travel economy class and so do our wives. I am sick and tired of the way public servants seem to elevate themselves to a position of importance far above the ordinary taxpayer whose money it is that has to find—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lucock)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr YATES (Holt) (10.53)—I do not wish to take up the time of the House on the subject of first class travel for public servants. I want to deal with some of the more first class problems that affect some of the more moderate people in my own electorate. The Shire of Cranbourne was created in 1868 and by 1967 it had a population of 10,000. It is surprising to note that today it has a population of 25,000. The average annual increase in population is 8 per cent. Last year the increase was over 10 per cent. A total of 500 houses were completed last year—a 400 per cent increase from 1967. These facts alone show the speed of the development in the shire and naturally it has brought some serious problems to local government administration.

Mr Baillieu—It has a racecourse, too.

Mr YATES—Yes, a very fine racecourse. The town plan prepared in 1975 deals with all stages of development up to 1980 and beyond. The shire council is trying to work on this plan. What a wonderful idea! But I know how complicated this matter is for them because for planning purposes the shire is neatly divided into sections and has 2 planning authorities. The northern half is controlled by the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works and the southern half by the Western Port Regional Council Planning Authority. Who would like to be in an area that has 2 overall planning authorities?

The list of responsibilities of the shire are planning roads, sewerage, drainage, pre-school and infant welfare, libraries, social services and recreation. The shire council has an indirect
interest in transport and the rail service. The rail service should not be called a service to Cranbourne—it should be called a hazard. It is obvious that the financial implications are so complicated that the Council has been able to complete only the first section of the sewerage plan alone and has had to go to its bankers for an extra $1m on loan account. It must be added that the council is also responsible for all the drainage as far as Koo Wee Rup and Tooradin as well as Langwarin and it is obliged to respect yet another planning authority—the State Environment Protection Authority which looks after all effluent discharged into Western Port Bay. Owing to recent wage increases the council must now seek yet another $1.65m from its bankers in order to proceed with its town plan at the present moment.

I would draw to the attention of the Government the fact that this area is in need of help. Firstly, I refer to the roads in the new town area from the town to Western Port Bay. In passing I must thank the Minister for Transport (Mr Nixon) for some of his help. But what we need is more money. Secondly, I refer to funds that are needed for recreation and youth and a sporting centre. So far money has been raised locally but not enough has been forthcoming from the Victorian Government even though we invited the Premier of Victoria recently to have a good dinner in Cranbourne. Help will also be required in funding social services for the aged.

Finally, I must draw the attention of the Minister for Post and Telecommunications (Mr Eric Robinson) to the fact that Australia Post has been trying to resite the Cranbourne Post Office over the past 5 years. I would suggest that Australia Post should relocate the post office in the new shopping centre. It should not locate the post office on a road with cul-de-sac parking with one entry to the Gippsland-Heathway. I recommend that the town plan be adopted and that the post office be located in the new shopping centre.

Further, I recommend that the old building become the community centre and civic museum.

Cranbourne has a devoted and hard working council. The great team of council officers and the local people show great civic pride in their town. I am therefore asking the Federal Government to give them the help that they so richly deserve. I call for a summit meeting between the Federal authorities, the State authority and the shire council as soon as possible. I am grateful for the opportunity I had during the recent recess to examine all the problems at first hand with the shire secretary and the civil engineer, Mr Clydesdale, at the request of the shire president and his very excellent council.

Mr YOUNG (Port Adelaide) (10.58)—A few weeks ago a chap who served the Press Gallery for many years passed away. I refer to Don Whittington. I think he was known to most parliamentarians or people who had served in or around the Parliament. I know that at times each of us had cause to argue with his writings. Nevertheless he covered the activities of Parliament and the personalities of Parliament very comprehensively for more than 2 decades. He wrote a number of books. Of course, he also published his own newsletter and he had contributed syndicated columns to various regional centres throughout Australia. I always found him a very decent honourable person—a very convivial bloke. I am very sorry he had to suffer such a long illness. I was shocked by his death. I always regarded him, in spite of some of the things he wrote at times—although on other occasions I think he was over-generous—as a very decent person. I am sure the Press Gallery and the Parliament will be sorry for losing Don Whittington. I would like to express sympathy to his wife, Helen.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! It being 11 p.m. the debate is interrupted. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2.15 p.m.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS UPON NOTICE

The following answers to questions upon notice were circulated:

**Age Pensions: Income Test**
(Question No. 5)

**Mr Connolly** asked the Minister representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

What would be the net cost to revenue after taxation if the income test on age pensions was abolished for each of the following categories of pensioners: (a) age 69, (b) age 68, (c) age 67, (d) age 66 and (e) age 65.

**Mr Hunt**—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

The exact net cost, after taxation, of abolishing the income test on age pensions is not available. The following full year costs are gross additional costs based on the estimated population and the number of pensioners at the end of June 1977, and the pension rates applicable from May 1977.

(a) 69 years: $39m.  
(b) 68 years: $45m.  
(c) 67 years: $58m.  
(d) 66 years: $68m.  
(e) 65 years: $89m.

Although it is not possible to reliably estimate the increase in taxation collections that would result if the income test on age pensions was abolished, the Taxation Office has advised that the additional tax would probably be to the order of about one third of the additional pension outlay.

**Community Youth Support Scheme**
(Question No. 8)

**Mr McLean** asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) Within which electoral divisions have community committees been established in order to implement the Community Youth Support Scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Committee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Community Service Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Community Youth Support Management Group (Bass Electorate)</td>
<td>Northern Community Youth Support Management Group project</td>
<td>Nil. This is a grant to develop a detailed program of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadmeadows Community Committee (Burke Electorate)</td>
<td>Broadmeadows Youth Resource Centre</td>
<td>Assisting in community beautification exercises, and in local libraries and school reading programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Electorate Committee</td>
<td>Special Pre-employment Centres</td>
<td>Assisting in swimming pool survival course and in community contact centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Burdekin Community Youth Support Scheme Committee (Dawson Electorate)</td>
<td>Lower Burdekin Youth Support Scheme</td>
<td>Assisting in aged people’s home, Blue Nurses, Meals on Wheels and in CWA projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackay/Sarina Community Committee (Dawson Electorate)</td>
<td>3W Program (3W = We Want Work)</td>
<td>Assisting in pre-school centres, erection of community barbecues, Meals on Wheels, assistance to Red Cross, beach cleaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proserpine Community Youth Support Committee (Dawson Electorate)</td>
<td>Proserpine Community Youth Support Scheme</td>
<td>Building community barbecue, helping in children’s hospital ward, collecting disused toys for child care centre, tree planting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Which of these committees have been funded by the Government to date.

(3) How many youths have been attracted to the Scheme on a regular basis.

(4) What community projects have been undertaken by each committee.

**Mr Street**—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Information available to my Department indicates that as at 30 March 1977 community committees have been established in the following federal divisions:


It should be noted that community committees while desirable are not essential to the implementations of the Community Youth Support Scheme. There is therefore no requirement for my Department to be informed about the formation of committees. Funds have been made available to a number of other local committees and organisations in federal divisions irrespective of whether a community committee has been established by a member of the House or his nominee. In many of these cases the federal member has been associated with the local organisations or committee in sponsoring a program.

(2) and (4) As at 31 March 1977, the following community committees have themselves successfully sponsored applications for funds under the Scheme. The projects are named in each case, and the activities in the voluntary community service component of each project are listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Committee</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Community Service Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Brisbane Community Youth Support Scheme Steering Committee (Griffith Electorate)</td>
<td>East Brisbane Community Youth Support Centre</td>
<td>Assisting the aged through Meals on Wheels, upkeep of homes and yards, shopping, reading etc. Assistance at Blind Welfare Centre, pre-school child care in community centre, and weekend supervision of children's activities at community centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Electorate Community Committee</td>
<td>Youth Centre</td>
<td>Mowing lawns for pensioners, Meals on Wheels, rolling bandages, assisting in St Vincent's de Paul clothing store, showing films to crippled children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt Co-ordinating Committee Cairns Community Youth Support Scheme Committee (Leichhardt Electorate)</td>
<td>Grassmere Project Cairns Community Youth Support Scheme</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohuna and District Community Support Committee (Mallee Electorate)</td>
<td>Cohuna Project</td>
<td>Assisting in child care, filling sandbags to fight erosion in national parks, hemming sheets in old people's home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerang and District Community Support Committee (Mallee Electorate)</td>
<td>Kerang Project</td>
<td>Assisting in maintenance of senior citizens' clubrooms and village, minor town beautification, improving bush walking track, shopping for aged pensioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrie Electorate Community Youth Support Scheme Committee</td>
<td>Petrie Youth Support Scheme</td>
<td>Construction of adventure playground at opportunity school and obstacle course at YWCA camp, assistance in welfare work at local hospital, Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Adelaide Electorate Committee</td>
<td>Pt Adelaide Central Mission</td>
<td>Assisting in aged persons village complexes, art and craft groups with pensioners and certain types of hospital activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scullin Community Youth Support Scheme Committee Maryborough Community Youth Support Scheme Pre-employment Program (Wide Bay Electorate)</td>
<td>Preston Employment Action Group Maryborough Pre-employment Program</td>
<td>Odd jobs for pensioners and needy families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assisting in National Fitness centre, in retarded children's home, Meals on Wheels, and in minor library activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The actual number of young people expected to participate in each CYSS project is estimated by an organisation when applying for a grant. On this basis it is estimated that about 14,000 young people are likely to participate in those projects approved up to 31 March 1977. Because the involvement of young people in projects is voluntary and not for fixed periods and because projects may provide repeating programs or services, actual participation figures are not readily available at present. However I expect to be able to provide the actual number of participants shortly.

Labour Market Imbalances
(Question No. 52)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) Is it a fact that labour market imbalances due to geographical, occupational and demographic segmentation of the labour market tend to exacerbate inflation and that the traditional approach of economic management cannot overcome the effect of such market imbalances.

(2) If so, what has the Government done to cope with these problems.

(3) Is anything being done to encourage skilled migrants arriving in Australia to settle in localities in which the demand for their labour is greatest.

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

(1) Despite the overall depressed labour market situation and the serious underutilisation of labour, there exist shortages of specific types of labour in certain industries, occupations and regions. Imbalances between different parts may, in some circumstances and along with other factors, exert an influence on the rate of inflation. However, in recent years, the rate of inflation has been determined largely by factors affecting the economy as a whole, rather than such imbalances. Modern macroeconomic policy tools do provide some flexibility to take account of differences in demand conditions in different parts of the economy.

(2) The Government during the past twelve months has introduced a series of schemes to help reduce structural imbalances in the labour market. These include the Relocation Assistance Scheme which assists unemployed persons to move from areas of low labour demand to areas where there is a demand for their skills; the Special Youth Employment Training Program, which encourages employers to employ young and inexperienced workers; and the revised apprenticeship scheme. Commonwealth Rebut for Apprentice
Full-time training, which again encourages employers to train more skilled workers. These new programs are in addition to the existing schemes of NEAT and immigration where there is a strong emphasis on labour market needs.

(3) The Department of Employment and Industrial Relations prepares a list of approved occupations for migration purposes. This list is used to establish eligibility for entry on the basis of qualifications or experience. It specifies the occupations in which migrants can enter Australia, and classifies the degree of demand in geographical areas.

Every attempt is made to encourage migrants to proceed to the areas with Heads of Mission, in each of the years from 1970 to 1976 inclusive.

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Overseas Affairs, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

What was the entertainment allowance given to Ambassadors and other officers with representational duties at each Mission, in each of the years from 1970 to 1976 inclusive?

Mr Peacock—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

Representation allowance is an advance of official funds to assist officers to establish and maintain the contacts necessary to perform their official duties in the manner most beneficial to Australia. Officers are required to account fully and in detail for their use of the allowance. The attached schedule lists representation allowances payable as at January 1977 to Heads of Mission. Representation allowances payable to other Foreign Affairs officers serving in Australian Missions overseas are set out in Part 7 of the Public Service Board’s Determinations relating to Overseas Service.

Rates payable in 1976 and earlier years are not readily accessible and the extraction of these would require unjustifiable time and effort.

Rates of Representation Allowance for Heads of Mission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Per annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accra</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algiers</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>4,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonn</td>
<td>6,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brasilia</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>5,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>5,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copenhagen</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dacca</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar Es Salaam</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva U.N.</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva S.L.A.</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanoi</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) Are employed persons prohibited from registering for a change of employment?

(2) Are such registrants included in the totals of registrants for employment?

(3) Is there any obligation under the law which requires registrants to notify the Department when they obtain employment or are no longer seeking employment?

(4) Can he give an estimate of the number of (a) unemployed and (b) under-employed persons who are not registered for employment.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) No.
(2) No; only unemployed registrants seeking full-time work are counted in arriving at the totals of unemployed persons that are published monthly.

(3) No. However the Department of Social Security requires persons claiming unemployment benefits to have registered for employment with the CES.

(4) (a) A labour force survey conducted by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in May 1976 showed that of an estimated 243 900 persons then looking for work, 72 900 (30 per cent) were not registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES).

However a number of important facts need to be borne in mind when comparing ABS and CES data. There are differences in definition, coverage, timing and method of collection of the two series. For example the CES data refers only to persons seeking full-time work while the ABS data includes persons looking for part-time work. The May 1976 labour force survey showed that 44 100 (18.1 per cent of the total) were in this category. Presumably many of these would not be registered with the CES.

It should also be pointed out that in a survey, conducted by the ABS, in March 1977, of persons registered with the CES as unemployed seeking full-time work, only 70.2 per cent of respondents were classified as unemployed according to the ABS definition.

(4) (b) No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Commonwealth Employment Service (a)</th>
<th>Looking for—</th>
<th></th>
<th>Part-time work</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>('000)</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>('000)</td>
<td>('000)</td>
<td>('000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unemployment: Registration
(Question No. 86)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) How many labour force surveys has the Australian Bureau of Statistics conducted since 1962.

(2) How did the numbers of persons registered for employment with the Commonwealth Employment Service compare with the numbers of persons revealed to be unemployed by each Australian Bureau of Statistics survey.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The Australian Bureau of Statistics began carrying out quarterly household population surveys in the 6 State capital cities in November 1960. The surveys were extended to other areas in February 1964. The February 1977 survey is the 53rd of these Australia-wide surveys.

(2) The number of unemployed persons registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service for full-time employment, and the number of unemployed persons estimated by the ABS quarterly household population surveys are set out in the Table below.
## Answers to Questions

### Commonwealth Employment Service (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>(’000)</th>
<th>Full-time work</th>
<th>Part-time work</th>
<th>Total (’000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>135.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>109.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>121.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>135.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>144.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>105.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>120.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>115.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>191.0</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>201.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>297.7</td>
<td>240.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>291.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>248.1</td>
<td>202.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>252.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>248.2</td>
<td>198.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>243.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>265.6</td>
<td>217.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>274.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>303.7</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>304.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>258.9</td>
<td>202.4</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>247.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>267.9</td>
<td>222.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>264.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>272.5</td>
<td>213.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>254.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>346.7</td>
<td>266.1</td>
<td>58.17</td>
<td>324.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Registered at the Friday nearest the end of the month in question.

(b) Relates to the average over the four week interview period in the month in question.

(c) From August 1973 the number of registrants shown excludes persons under 21 years of age who at the time of registering were still at primary or secondary school. Figures for earlier periods include such persons if they had notified the Commonwealth Employment Service that they would leave school before the end of the school year if a full-time job were available.

(d) From January 1975 the estimates comprise all those who either

(1) during the survey week did not work and did not have a job, but could have taken one had it been available, and had been looking for full-time or part-time work in the four weeks up to and including the survey week (including persons who would have been prevented from taking a job in the survey week by their own temporary illness or injury, or by their having made arrangements to start after the survey week in a new job in which they would have preferred to start in the survey week); or

(2) were waiting to be called back to a job from which they had been temporarily stood down without pay for four weeks or less (including the whole of the survey week).

Before February 1975, estimates comprise all those who, during the survey week, did no work at all, and who either

(1) did not have a job or business and were actively looking for work (including those who stated that they would have looked for work if they had not been temporarily ill or believed no work was available or had not already made definite arrangements to start work in a new job after the survey week); or

(2) were laid off from their jobs without pay for the whole week.

### Work Force: School Leavers: Migration

(Question No. 90)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) How many employees were there in the Australian work force at the end of each quarter in each of the years from 1970 to 1976 inclusive.
(2) By what percentage did the total number of employees in the work force increase or decrease in each calendar year from 1970 to 1976 inclusive.
(3) What was the total number of school-leavers in each year from 1970 to 1976 inclusive.
(4) What was the total net migration inflow or outflow in each of the years 1970 to 1976 inclusive.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) publishes monthly estimates of the number of civilian employees excluding those engaged in agriculture and private domestic service. The latest estimates at the end of each quarter from 1970 are given in the table below.

Civilian Employees: Australia
(Excluding agriculture and private domestic service)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Total employees (’000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 320.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 340.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 366.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 449.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 479.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June—old series (a)</td>
<td>4 477.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June—new series (a)</td>
<td>4 422.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 415.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 445.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 462.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 467.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 473.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 535.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 588.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 603.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 644.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 735.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 789.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 806.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 765.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 721.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 724.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 752.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 728.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 722.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>4 748.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>4 738.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>4 727.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>4 722.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Data for periods prior to June 1971 are not strictly comparable with data for subsequent periods. Data since June 1971, but not before, have been revised to take account of benchmarks available from the 1971 Census of Population and Housing. Further, data since June 1971 no longer include trainee teachers. Two estimates have been shown for June 1971 to provide some break between the new and old series. It should be noted that the "old series" figure for June 1971 includes about 24,000 trainee teachers.

(2) The percentage by which the total number of employees increased or decreased in each calendar year from 1970 to 1976 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Percentage increase (+) or decrease (−) over same month of previous year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1971</td>
<td>+ 1.2 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1972</td>
<td>+ 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1973</td>
<td>+ 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1974</td>
<td>− 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1975</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1976</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) estimated because of series break between benchmarks;
(b) rise of less than 0.1 per cent;
(c) fall of less than 0.1 per cent.

(3) Estimates of the number of school-leavers are available from ABS annual surveys of leavers from secondary schools, universities and other educational institutions. The data shown for 1970 to 1973 refer to persons who had attended school full-time at some time during the year shown and, at the time of the survey (February of the following year), had no intention of returning. Data for 1974 and 1975 refer to persons who had attended school full-time at some time during the year shown and, at the time of the survey (May of the following year), actually had not returned.

Figures from 1971 onwards classify trainee teachers as school-leavers proceeding to a different type of educational institution while those for 1970 classify them as not proceeding to a different type of educational institution. Since the estimates are based on a sample they may differ from the figures that would have been obtained from a complete census using the same questionnaire and procedures.

School Leavers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leavers not proceeding to a different type of educational institution</th>
<th>Leavers proceeding to a different type of educational institution</th>
<th>Total school leavers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( ’000)</td>
<td>( ’000)</td>
<td>( ’000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>168.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>210.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>198.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>164.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>219.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>176.8</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>229.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>249.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>182.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>244.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n.a. not yet available.

(4) Overseas movements are classified by the ABS into 3 groups: permanent movements, long-term movements and short-term movements. The measure best suited to answer the honourable member’s question regarding total net migration would appear to be permanent movement which, as indicated below, shows the net excess of settlers arriving over Australian residents (a) departing permanently:

...
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(5) The Government's view is that the form of leave loading which has now been endorsed by the Arbitral authorities, after hearing argument from the parties, reflects community standards and is appropriate for Commonwealth employees.

**Commonwealth Employment Service:**

**Non-English Speaking Applicants**

(Question No. 129)

Mr Stewart asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 8 March 1977:

(1) What special provisions are made by the Commonwealth Employment Service for servicing the requirements of non-English speaking applicants attending at CES offices.

(2) Which CES areas in each State have the largest number of members of ethnic groups registered for employment.

(3) Compared to areas with a very small migrant content of applicants, but dealing with approximately the same number of registrations, are offices with a large migrant content provided with extra staff to allow for the additional time that must be taken by officers to obtain information from and conduct interviews with non-English speaking applicants; if not, why not.

(4) Are any fully trained members of the staff employed at large migrant content offices capable of acting as interpreters; if so, in what language or languages.

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

(1) The Commonwealth Employment Service makes every effort to meet the needs of non-English speaking applicants, particularly in areas where heavy concentrations of migrants are found. This is achieved through appointing appropriate bilingual officers to offices in those localities. The CES also has at its disposal bilingual and multilingual officers who staff its offices at migrant hostels.

In addition to its own resources, the CES in each area liaises with such bodies as the Department of Social Security's Interpreter Service for migrants, bank migrant services, the Good Neighbour Council and civic minded members of ethnic communities.

(2) While the CES does not maintain statistical records of applicants on an ethnic basis, the Employment Office areas in which a substantial migrant population are well known to my Department. The following Offices of the CES, set out in State order, are regarded by my Department as being those whose areas include substantial numbers of migrants.

**New South Wales**—Bankstown, Campsie, Fairfield, Granville, Leichhardt, Liverpool, Marrickville, Surry Hills, Warilla, Wollongong.

**Victoria**—Brunswick, Coburg, Footscray, Newport, Oakleigh, Prahran, Richmond, St Albans, Sunshine.

**Queensland**—Annerley, Atherton, Ayr, Fortitude Valley, Inala, Ingham, Innisfail, West End, Woollongabba.

**South Australia**—Adelaide, Enfield, Norwood, Port Adelaide.

**Western Australia**—Cannington, Fremantle, Midland, Mt Hawthorn, Perth, Victoria Park.

(3) No extra staff are provided in CES offices which deal with large migrant groups. Surveys conducted by my Department suggest that, given the present arrangements in respect of migrant-oriented offices, the time involved in interviewing migrants is not significantly greater than for other applicants.

**Public Service: Annual Leave Loading**

(Question No. 107)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Public Service Matters, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) Is it a fact that the concept of annual leave loading was designed to ensure that employees would not suffer a reduction in income during periods of annual leave on account of lost overtime earnings.

(2) Is it also a fact that the salaries of public servants above Class 8 include a loading to compensate for the fact that they receive no extra pay for working overtime and that this loaded salary is the amount they receive while on annual leave.

(3) Did all public servants receive the same annual leave loading in (a) 1974 and (b) 1975 and was this an equivalent amount to the average weekly earnings, even though public servants above Class 8 were not suffering any loss of income during their periods of annual leave.

(4) Can he verify whether the last Determination of the Public Service Arbitrator relating to annual leave loading had the effect of increasing the value of the loading payable to those public servants who suffer no loss of income during periods of annual leave and of reducing the monetary value of the leave loading payable to those who, but for the loading, could have suffered loss of income.

(5) Did the Government support the change; if so, will he undertake to re-examine the effect of the change with a view to restoring the value of leave loading to those who lose by the change.

Mr Street—The Public Service Board has provided the following information for answer to the honourable member's question:

(1) No; annual leave loading was introduced for public servants on the basis that it reflected community standards. Arguments used in support of annual leave loading, such as the need to maintain an employee's income during periods of leave or the need to ensure that an employee has sufficient money to enjoy a holiday, have not necessarily been accepted by the employing authorities.

(2) No; in fact, some public servants above Class 8 do receive overtime payments.

(3) and (4) All public servants received the same annual leave loading in 1974 and 1975, which was equivalent to average weekly earnings. The Arbitrator's decision of 23 November 1976 (Determination No. 775), which is the Determination referred to in the Question, provided for a 17½ per cent of salary loading, subject to a maximum of average weekly earnings.

(a) Australian residents include former settlers who, prior to 1974, were so classified only provided they had spent at least 12 months in Australia. This distinction has since been removed.
(4) A significant proportion of fully trained staff in large migrant content offices of the CES are from migrant backgrounds or, in some instances, migrants themselves. As a result, a broad spectrum of languages is spoken by these officers and utilised in the interviewing process.

Tax Cuts and Devaluation
(Question No. 143)

Mr Jacobi asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

(1) As President Carter has proposed an increased public works program and greater social security benefits as well as tax cuts to revive the American economy, does he propose to hold discussions with the new President because of the obvious difference in approach to economic problems.

(2) Are any cuts in indirect and direct taxes likely in the next 6 months to induce greater public spending and greater investment by industry.

(3) Has devaluation prevented secondary industry re-equipping with new plant and equipment, such as machine tools and the like, as most plant and equipment is imported from Europe and America and is now more expensive.

(4) What is the value of the plant and equipment, such as machine tools and the like, for secondary industry which has been (a) manufactured locally, and (b) imported in the last 5 years.

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

(1) Economic policy in the United States is being framed in economic circumstances fundamentally different from those prevailing in Australia: notably, inflation in the United States is lower. While President Carter introduced in January a two year stimulatory package, the concern in the U.S. to avoid any re-emergence of inflationary pressures has been recently highlighted by the decision of President Carter to abandon the taxation rebate proposal, the major source of stimulus in his program in 1977.

That apart, measures adopted by other countries are not necessarily appropriate to Australian circumstances. That is not to say that other countries' programs are not continuously observed, to see whether they contain anything useful and relevant to our own position.

(2) In present budgetary conditions, immediate tax cuts would be difficult to justify.

(3) Devaluation will add to the cost of some capital assets (but to what extent—see answer to Part (4)—cannot be estimated). Disadvantages arising on that score must, of course, be judged against advantages flowing from devaluation, notably to the export and import-competing sectors of the economy. On balance, the Government judges that the favourable effects of devaluation on manufacturing, mining and other primary industries outweigh any adverse effects on costs that might flow from this decision.

(4) The Australian Statistician has advised that:

(a) The annual statistical bulletins 'Manufacturing Establishments—Details of Operations by Industry Class, Australia' (Reference No. 12.29) contain the following relevant information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Outlay on new fixed tangible assets—plant, machinery and equipment (including motor vehicles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$1.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$0.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>not yet available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information is not collected on how much of this expenditure is made on locally produced and how much on imported machinery, etc.

Statistics of the value of commodities of this type produced locally are for selected commodities and therefore not complete. Nor is there any way of distinguishing how much of such production of capital equipment goes into manufacturing industry.

(b) Statistics on imports compiled by the ABS do not record the industry of end use of any particular goods imported. Therefore it is not possible to obtain, from that source, information relating specifically to the value of imported plant and equipment to be used in manufacturing industries. However it is possible to state the value of total imports of those types of plant and machinery which would be expected to be used mainly in manufacturing industries. For the last 5 years these were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value of imports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$0.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$1.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures exclude such items as motor vehicles and office machines, for which some unknown proportion of imports would be destined for use as plant and equipment in manufacturing industries.

Investigation by Mr Justice Brennan of Affairs of Certain Companies
(Question No. 160)

Mr Jacobi asked the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, upon notice, on 17 March 1977:

(1) When will the report of the investigation by Mr F. G. Brennan, Q.C., into the following companies, incorporated or registered in the Australian Capital Territory, be tabled in the Parliament: (a) Inxex Ltd, (b) Intercontinental Credit Ltd, (c) Naninbe Corporation Ltd, (d) Jetair Australia Ltd, (e) Landmark Corporation Ltd and (f) Spinifex Explorations Pty Ltd.

(2) What figures do the profit and loss accounts and balance sheets show for each of these companies for each year since their incorporation.

(3) What reports have been filed by these companies with the Registrar of Companies in the Australian Capital Territory since their incorporation.

(4) Are these companies registered as foreign corporations in any other State or Territory of the Commonwealth or of
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A liquidator was appointed on 2 October 1973.

Jetair Australia Ltd
Incorporated in New South Wales
Registered as a foreign company in Queensland. Northern Territory, Australian Capital Territory and South Australia
Was registered as foreign company in Victoria but ceased business from 1 March 1974
Was registered in Tasmania as a foreign company but struck off as defunct on 15 October 1972
A liquidator was appointed on 2 October 1973.

Landmark Corporation Ltd
Incorporated in New South Wales
Registered as a foreign company in the Northern Territory
Was registered as a foreign company in Victoria and Tasmania.

Spinifex Explorations Pty Ltd
Incorporated in New South Wales
Registered as a foreign company in the Northern Territory, Tasmania. The Australian Capital Territory
It was also registered as a foreign company in New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia.
It is now a recognised company in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales.

I have not had investigated the question whether the companies are registered in other countries.

(5) I am not aware of any conviction of directors or officers of these companies.

(6) No proceedings have been brought in the Australian Capital Territory or the Northern Territory against the directors or officers of these companies. I understand that several proceedings have been instituted against some of the officers of some of these companies for alleged breaches of New South Wales legislation.

Agreements With the States
(Question No. 189)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister representing the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

Will the Minister bring up to date the information given on 20 May 1976 (Hansard, page 2363) on Federal-State agreements.

Mr Viner—The Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs has provided the following information for answer to the honourable member’s question:

The details listed below update, to 6 May 1977, the answer given on 20 May 1976 to parliamentary question No. 412:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Agreement</th>
<th>State or States concerned</th>
<th>Date Tabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flood Mitigation</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>17 March 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Development</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>19 May 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Development</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Agreement</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>15 February 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Development</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>15 February 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and Regional Development</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Not yet tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerage</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Not yet tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Estate</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>Not yet tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albury/Wodonga</td>
<td>New South Wales/Victoria</td>
<td>15 February 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Agreement</td>
<td>State or States concerned</td>
<td>Date Tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of Victoria in relation to Dairy Adjustment Programs (1976)</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>12 October 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of South Australia in relation to Dairy Adjustment Programs (1976)</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>30 November 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the State of Western Australia in relation to Dairy Adjustment Programs (1976)</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>12 October 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia and the States relating to Rural Adjustment (1977)</td>
<td>All States</td>
<td>Does not require tabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to Sugar Agreement 1975 (exchange of letters)</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>3 November 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of Hospital Services Agreement Amending the Financial Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States Rural Adjustment Scheme</td>
<td>All States</td>
<td>Not tabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement authorised by the Softwood Forestry Agreements Act 1976 concerning a Softwood forestry program for the year ending 30 June 1977</td>
<td>All States. (Agreement signed to date with: Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Tasmania.)</td>
<td>Does not require tabling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed by the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development States Grants (Nature Conservation) Act</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Wellington)</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Malacooa Inlet and Mount Richmond National Park)</td>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Pike River Guu-Guua Area and Deep Creek Area)</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Eubenaangee Swamp)</td>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Limeburners Creek)</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>25 August 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Dangalli Conservation Park)</td>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>10 March 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Resources Survey for Nature Conservation Purposes (South West Tasmania)</td>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>29 March 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition for Nature Conservation Purposes (Benger Swamp, Cape Le Grand, Yalgorup, Nambung, Lake Chandala)</td>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>10 March 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International Labour Organisation
Conventions: Compliance by Western Australia
(Question No. 214)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

On what dates and for what reasons did Western Australia decide that it no longer agreed to the ratification of International Labour Organisation Conventions No. 14—Weekly Rest (Industry), 1921, No. 17—Workmen’s Compensation (Accidents), 1925, No. 65—Penal Sanctions (Indigenous Workers), 1939, No. 92—Accommodation of Crews (Revised), 1949, No. 113—Medical Examination (Fishermen), 1959 and No. 195—Fishermen’s Competency Certificates, 1966 (Hansard, 31 May 1972, page 3379 and 23 February 1977, page 405).

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

The preparation of the table in Hansard, 23 February 1977, page 405 involved a comprehensive examination of my Department’s records and the information extracted was referred to the States for confirmation that it was accurate and current. The table, unlike the previous table which appeared in Hansard, 31 May 1972, page 3379, does not show Western Australia as having agreed to the ratification of ILO Conventions Nos 14, 17, 65, 92, 113 and 125. I am advised that the reasons for this are as follows:

Nos 65, 92 and 125—advice to hand in 1972 regarding Western Australia’s attitude to the ratification of these Conventions was taken as specific agreement to ratification when this was not the case.

Nos 14 and 17—further examination has raised doubts about the compliance of Western Australian law and practice with the requirements of these Conventions and those doubts have precluded continued agreement to ratification.

No 113—the entry in the 1972 table of 3 States including Western Australia as having agreed to ratification of this Convention was due to clerical error.

Unemployment: Western Sydney
(Question No. 219)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:

1. How many persons were registered as unemployed as at 31 December 1975 and 31 December 1976 in the electoral divisions of (a) Chifley, (b) Macarthur, (c) Macquarie, (d) Mitchell, (e) Parramatta, (f) Prospect and (g) Werriwa.

2. What percentage of the persons was (a) males and (b) females (i) under 21 years of age and (ii) 21 years of age and over.

(3) What were the principal work categories of the persons registered as unemployed.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

Statistics of unemployed persons registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service (CES) are normally compiled according to individual Employment Office areas. It is not usual for the boundaries of these to coincide with the boundaries of parliamentary electorates and in the majority of cases parts of several employment office areas would be contained in any one electorate.

It is possible to state roughly the proportion of each CES Office area contained in a particular electorate and to provide statistics relating to the total number of persons registered as unemployed in each of those Offices. Any attempt to apply the relative proportions to these total figures, however, in an effort to obtain an estimate of the number and characteristics of the unemployed registrants in that electorate, would be misleading as the incidence of population and unemployment within each CES Office area is unlikely to be uniform.

With this caveat in mind I am prepared to provide statistics of the numbers, age and sex of persons registered as unemployed in offices of the CES contained in the respective electorates as requested by the honourable member but, as statistics of occupational categories for which unemployed persons are registered are not normally published by CES Office areas I do not consider that the considerable clerical effort involved in their extraction, would be justified for part (3) of the honourable member’s question. In making this decision I am taking into account the fact that the honourable member has given notice of an identical question in relation to at least three other pairs of months and that the honourable member for Hughes has asked the same question, in relation to three electorates for at least 3 pairs of months.

The following are the answers, in terms of CES Office areas to the parts (1) and (2) of the honourable member’s question:

(1) (a) The federal electoral division of Chifley as presently constituted, comprises approximately 40 per cent of the Employment Office area of Mt Druitt, approximately 40 per cent of the Employment Office area of Blacktown and approximately 10 per cent of the Employment Office area of Penrith.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End-December</th>
<th>Employment Office</th>
<th>Persons registered as unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Mt Druitt</td>
<td>3 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>3 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>1 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Mt Druitt</td>
<td>3 382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>3 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>1 313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) The Federal Electoral Division of Macarthur, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 95 per cent of the Employment Office area of Campbelltown, approximately 75 per cent of the Employment Office area of Wollongong, approximately 25 per cent of the Employment Office area of Goulburn and approximately 20 per cent of the Employment Office area of Wollongong.

End-December | Employment Office | Persons registered as unemployed
---|---|---
1975 | Campbelltown | 1 100
 | Warilla | 1 978
 | Nowra | 981
 | Goulburn | 846
 | Wollongong | 5 823
1976 | Campbelltown | 1 473
 | Warilla | 1 884
 | Nowra | 1 422
 | Goulburn | 1 089
 | Wollongong | 5 185

† See electorate of Mitchell above.

(c) The Federal Electoral Division of Macquarie, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 75 per cent of the Employment Office area of Bathurst, approximately 65 per cent of the Employment Office area of Lithgow and approximately 5 per cent of the Employment Office area of Maitland.

End-December | Employment Office | Persons registered as unemployed
---|---|---
1975 | Bathurst | 770
 | Lithgow | 1 068
 | Maitland | 2 707
1976 | Bathurst | 859
 | Lithgow | 1 115
 | Maitland | 2 240

(d) The Federal Electoral Division of Mitchell, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 90 per cent of the Employment Office area of Parramatta, approximately 75 per cent of the Employment Office area of Windsor and approximately 40 per cent of the Employment Office area of Blacktown.

End-December | Employment Office | Persons registered as unemployed
---|---|---
1975 | Parramatta | 3 409
 | Windsor | 908
 | Blacktown | *
1976 | Parramatta | 3 510
 | Windsor | 890
 | Blacktown | *

† See electorate of Chifley above.

(e) The Federal Electoral Division of Parramatta, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 15 per cent of the Employment Office area of Ryde, approximately 10 per cent of the Employment Office area of Granville, approximately 5 per cent of the Employment Office area of Parramatta and approximately 2 per cent of the Employment Office area of Hornsby.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End-December</th>
<th>Employment Office</th>
<th>Persons registered as unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1975 | Ryde | 1 971
 | Granville | 2 221
 | Parramatta | *
 | Hornsby | 1 209
| 1976 | Ryde | 1 393
 | Granville | 2 811
 | Parramatta | *
 | Hornsby | 1 156

† See electorate of Mitchell above.

(f) The Federal Electoral Division of Prospect, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 75 per cent of the Employment Office area of Fairfield, approximately 50 per cent of the Employment Office area of Mt Druitt, approximately 50 per cent of the Employment Office area of Liverpool, approximately 15 per cent of the Employment Office area of Blacktown, approximately 15 per cent of the Employment Office area of Penrith and approximately 5 per cent of the Employment Office area of Parramatta.

End-December | Employment Office | Persons registered as unemployed |
|---|---|---|
| 1975 | Fairfield | 3 225
 | Mt Druitt | *
 | Liverpool | 4 467
 | Blacktown | *
 | Penrith | *
 | Parramatta | *
| 1976 | Fairfield | 3 477
 | Mt Druitt | *
 | Liverpool | 4 758
 | Blacktown | *
 | Penrith | *
 | Parramatta | *

† See electorate of Chifley above.

(g) The Federal Electoral Division of Werriwa, as presently constituted, comprises approximately 50 per cent of the Employment Office area of Liverpool, approximately 25 per cent of the Employment Office area of Fairfield and approximately 2 per cent of the Employment Office area of Campbelltown.

End-December | Employment Office | Persons registered as unemployed |
|---|---|---|
| 1975-1976 | Liverpool | $*
 | Fairfield | $*
 | Campbelltown | $*

‡ See electorate of Prospect above.

§ See electorate of Macarthur above.

(2) The percentage of persons who were (a) male and (b) female (i) under 21 years of age and (ii) 21 years of age and over for each of the Employment Office areas comprising the relevant Electoral Divisions at end-December 1975 and end-December 1976 were as follows:
### Employment Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End-Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Chifley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Druitt . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Macarthur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warilla . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowra . . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wollongong . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Macquarie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithgow . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown * Penrith * Parramatta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde . . . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville . . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta † Hornsby †</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Prospect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield . .</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Druitt * Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>331.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See electorate of Chifley above.
† See electorate of Mitchell above.
‡ See electorate of Prospect above.
§ See electorate of Macarthur above.

### School Grants: Western Sydney

**(Question No. 231)**

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister representing the Minister for Education, upon notice, on 8 March 1977.

What sums were paid by the Schools Commission in direct assistance to government schools and under each program for non-government schools in the electoral divisions of Chifley, Macarthur, Macquarie, Mitchell, Parramatta, Prospect and Werriwa in 1976.
Mr Viner—The Minister for Education has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question—

It is not possible to provide information in respect of payments to individual government schools except in relation to grants made under the Special Projects (Innovations) Program. The Commonwealth Government provides bulk funding to the New South Wales Government for government schools programs to disburse on a needs basis as it sees fit. Payments to non-government schools and payments to government schools under the Innovations Program are set out in the attached tables.

**GRANTS 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>General recurrent grants</th>
<th>Special education</th>
<th>Disadvantaged schools</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate: Chifley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACKTOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown Boys High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrician Brothers’ College</td>
<td>293,526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,828</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyndale Parent-Controlled Christian</td>
<td>42,816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACKTOWN SOUTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagle Girls’ High</td>
<td>168,353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>7,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s</td>
<td>115,727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOONSIDE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>4,935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GIRRAWEEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Anthony’s</td>
<td>97,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LALAR PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bernadette’s</td>
<td>72,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARAYONG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Family High</td>
<td>66,282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew’s Primary</td>
<td>70,678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROOTY HILL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Agnes High</td>
<td>127,653</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Aiden’s Primary</td>
<td>66,256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>176,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEVEN HILLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>80,614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate: Macarthur</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALBION PARK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s</td>
<td>40,606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BERRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOWRAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevalier College</td>
<td>158,670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31,289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College</td>
<td>25,276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Thomas Aquinas</td>
<td>41,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangara Special</td>
<td>8,286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMDEN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s</td>
<td>71,882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMPBELLTOWN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Gregory’s College</td>
<td>265,185</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>157,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s Girls’ College</td>
<td>187,085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAPTO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Anne’s College</td>
<td>82,360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>83,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KIAMA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ss Peter and Paul</td>
<td>42,476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MITTAGONG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frensham</td>
<td>27,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gib Gate</td>
<td>5,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s</td>
<td>33,913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Answers to Questions

24 May 1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>General recurrent grants</th>
<th>Special education</th>
<th>Disadvantaged schools</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOSS VALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Convent</td>
<td>52,374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Paul’s</td>
<td>34,896</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor House</td>
<td>9,348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT KEMBLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Kembla Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARELLAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Mater Del’ Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOWRA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael’s</td>
<td>91,693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Anthony’s</td>
<td>36,488</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELLHARBOUR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stella Maris</td>
<td>79,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate: Macquarie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATHURST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Saints College</td>
<td>40,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption Convent</td>
<td>53,560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Primary</td>
<td>48,833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocesan Catholic Girls High</td>
<td>225,604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsden Church of England</td>
<td>29,076</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Philomena’s</td>
<td>36,486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Scots</td>
<td>30,720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Stanislaus College</td>
<td>155,035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAULCONBRIDGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENBROOK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Finbar’s</td>
<td>100,081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZELBROOK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow Lodge Handicapped Children’s Centre</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hall School for Sub-normal Children</td>
<td>16,932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATOOMBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloura Special</td>
<td>17,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merriwa St Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Canice’s</td>
<td>47,496</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWSON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Nativity</td>
<td>19,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawson Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITHGOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salle Academy</td>
<td>70,540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnybank Special</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBERON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s</td>
<td>57,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENRITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Dominic’s College</td>
<td>251,133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Nicholas of Myra War Memorial</td>
<td>93,218</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith P &amp; C Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PORTLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph’s</td>
<td>12,428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGENTVILLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caroline Chisholm Girl’s</td>
<td>67,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>117,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRINGWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains Community</td>
<td>2,123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Thomas</td>
<td>50,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springwood High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Answers to Questions

#### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>General recurrent grants</th>
<th>Special education</th>
<th>Disadvantaged schools</th>
<th>Innovations</th>
<th>Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WARRIMOO Seventh Day Adventist Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wycliffe Christian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENTWORTH FALLS Blue Mountains Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate: Mitchell</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAULKHAM HILLS Our Lady of Lourdes</td>
<td>$96,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Michael's</td>
<td>$96,047</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macquarie Boys High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANCEL HILL Oakhill College</td>
<td>$174,578</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$35,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bernadette's School</td>
<td>$117,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>$28,321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Gabriel's School for Deaf Boys</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DURAL 'Warrah' Rudolf Steiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENHAVEN Lorien-Novalis School for Rudolf Steiner Education</td>
<td>$6,612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ROCKS Christ the King</td>
<td>$40,977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Blind Training Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Handicapped Blind Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHMOND St Monica's</td>
<td>$59,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVERSTONE St John's</td>
<td>$72,881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENTWORTHVILLE Our Lady of Mount Carmel</td>
<td>$135,657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTMEAD Catherine McAuley Girl's High</td>
<td>$97,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta Marist Brothers' High</td>
<td>$263,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart School</td>
<td>$47,908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINDSOR St Matthew's</td>
<td>$40,128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINSTON HILLS St Paul the Apostle</td>
<td>$21,583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Electorate: Parramatta</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARLINGFORD St Gerard Majella</td>
<td>$107,757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUNDAS St Patrick's Marist Bros</td>
<td>$183,648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Bernadette's</td>
<td>$90,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASTWOOD Marist Brothers' High</td>
<td>$270,013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kevin's</td>
<td>$86,542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPPING Karonga House Special</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39,077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Help of Christians</td>
<td>$114,368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Mercy College</td>
<td>$200,015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRIS PARK St Oliver Plunkett</td>
<td>$42,411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARSFIELD St Anthony's School</td>
<td>$70,032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRAMATTA Marist Brothers' Junior</td>
<td>$65,790</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>General recurrent grants</td>
<td>Special education</td>
<td>Disadvantaged schools</td>
<td>Innovations</td>
<td>Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Lebanon</td>
<td>36,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Mercy</td>
<td>264,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick's</td>
<td>119,718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kings School</td>
<td>113,506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARRAMATTA NORTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Monica's</td>
<td>94,561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Church of England Girls'</td>
<td>98,148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RYDALMERE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>95,285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate: Prospect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Rosary High</td>
<td>151,887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Rosary</td>
<td>85,260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrician Brothers' College</td>
<td>364,216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREYSTANES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady Queen of Peace</td>
<td>148,949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUILDFORD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick's</td>
<td>122,951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORSLEY PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anowah</td>
<td>17,698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOXTON PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped Children's</td>
<td>47,921.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoxton Park High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINGSWOOD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph's</td>
<td>69,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERRYLANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerdon College</td>
<td>244,673</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St MARY's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of the Rosary</td>
<td>114,986</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMITHFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Gertrude's</td>
<td>145,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENDLE HILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman High</td>
<td>184,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WERRINGTON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thondale</td>
<td>43,236.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electorate: Werriwa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABRAMATTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
<td>105,695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANLEY VALE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooinda Sub-normal Children's Centre</td>
<td>9,786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrician Brothers' High</td>
<td>228,859</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's High</td>
<td>190,484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's</td>
<td>161,702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACQUARIE FIELDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Day Adventist</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADLIER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Therese's</td>
<td>69,387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St JOHN'S PARK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Lady of Mount Carmel</td>
<td>78,706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB:—Payments to government schools are shown only in respect of the innovations program.
Australian Assistance Plan  
(Question No. 237)  
Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister, representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:  

(1) On what date did the Prime Minister write to the Premiers conveying the Government’s decision on the Australian Assistance Plan? (Hansard, 4 June 1976, page 3093).  

(2) On what date has each State government given a response concerning future legislative or administrative action on the Plan.  

Mr Hunt—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question.  

Advice from the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet is that the answer to the question is:  

(1) The Prime Minister wrote to the Premiers on 7 June 1976 and again on 1 October 1976.  

(2) Replies, as shown below, giving a response concerning future legislative or administrative action on the Plan have been received from State Governments:  

Victoria—21 July 1976; 10 December 1976;  
Queensland—15 July 1976;  
South Australia—13 July 1976;  
Tasmania—16 August 1976.  

Directory of Support Services for Women  
(Question No. 264)  
Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Women’s Affairs, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:  

What is the publication date of the booklet to replace the Directory of Support Services to Women in Australia which Women’s Day published without payment or authority on 23 and 30 August 1976? (Hansard, 8 September 1976, page 789 and 6 October 1976, page 1613).  

Mr Macphee—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:  

No date can be given for the possible publication of a directory of support services for women. Manuscript material which has been prepared has been reviewed by the various interested departments. A factor which has emerged from this review is that there would be continual need for updating the information in any such publication.  

For these and other reasons the proposed publication has been listed, amongst others of a developmental nature, for consideration as part of a long-term welfare services directory program.  

In the short-term a factor which inhibits any immediate production of such a directory is that the manner of provision of welfare and health services by the Commonwealth Government is currently the subject of a major review following the report by the Task Force on Co-ordination in Welfare and Health.  

It is understood however, that the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations is going ahead with a handbook dealing with aspects of employment for women.  

Assistance to Working Women’s Centres  
(Question No. 265)  
Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Women’s Affairs, upon notice, on 9 March 1977:  

(1) On what dates and to what extent has the Australian Government assisted the Women’s Trade Union Commission in Sydney, the Queensland Women’s Trade Union Committee and the Working Women’s Centres in Adelaide, Perth, Newcastle, Canberra and Footscray.  

(2) When will the Government decide on the extent of further assistance.  

Mr Macphee—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:  

(1) On 25 November 1975 the Women’s Trade Union Commission and the Queensland Women’s Trade Union Committee received grants of $40,000 and $500 respectively from the International Women’s Year allocation, to undertake activities which would assist women unionists and would work towards the elimination of discrimination against women in trade unions.  

The Women’s Trade Union Commission has since received $22,400 for the 1977 calendar year from the Office of Child Care for a child care needs investigator: this covers salary assistance, rent and administrative expenses. The assistance will be used for a study which considers the need for child care services specifically in relation to working areas rather than residential areas. Consideration is also being given to a submission for further funds to cover recurrent expenditure during 1977-78.  

The Queensland Women’s Trade Union Committee has not as yet made a further application for financial assistance.  

The Working Women’s Centre in Footscray received $39,000 in June 1976 through the Western Regional Council of the Australian Assistance Program. The grant enabled the purchase of a house, the salary of a co-ordinator and general administrative costs. As there are now no funds available under the Australian Assistance Plan which could be used for this purpose, no further assistance can be provided under this program.  

During International Women’s Year the Federal Government purchased a building in Newcastle which was leased to the Hunter Region Working Women’s Group as permanent premises for the Centre. Grants for purchase and renovations came from the Children’s Commission, the Hospital and Health Services Commission, and the International Women’s Year appropriation, totalling $136,177. Before the Centre’s child care program began, the Office of Child Care gave salary support for a child care worker. From June 1976 the Office of Child Care has provided $10,973.93 recurrent assistance to the organisation. Support is continuing under the provisions of the Child Care Act.  

In Canberra, a women’s union committee has been established, but as yet has not requested financial support for a working women’s centre.  

In Adelaide, a working women’s centre has not yet been established.  

In Perth, the W.A. Trades and Labour Council I.W.Y Women’s Committee received $1,500 during I.W.Y for a working women’s seminar. As yet, no working women’s centre has been established and no requests have been made for further financial support.  

(2) Any future applications for working women’s centres will be considered for financial assistance in the light of this
Government's continuing commitment to ensuring equal opportunity for all people in our society and within the limits of available financial resources at the time.

Connair Pty Ltd
(Question No. 276)

Mr Morris asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 10 March 1977:

(1) Further to his answer to question No. 1859 (Hansard, 15 February 1977, page 92) on what date was a submission first put to Cabinet for the payment of additional subsidies of (a) $50,000 and (b) $83,333 to Connair Pty Ltd.

(2) On what date did Cabinet approve each of the payments.

(3) On what date was each of the cheques for payment drawn.

(4) On what date was each of the cheques cleared through the Department's bank account.

(5) Was this question first asked as question No. 2045 on 22 February 1977.

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

(1) and (2) The honourable member is no doubt aware that the phrasing of these parts of his question is not appropriate for a parliamentary reply to be provided.

(3) Cheque for $50,000 was drawn on 22 April 1976. Cheque for $83,333 was drawn on 24 June 1976.

(4) The cheques were presented to the Bank of N.S.W. Collins Street on 22 April 1976 and 24 June 1976 respectively for telegraphic transfer to Connair in Alice Springs; they were thus cleared on the dates indicated.

(5) The honourable member's question was originally placed on notice 2 days before the House rose in the last session of this Parliament.

Overseas Residents: Medibank Levy
(Question No. 294)

Mr Hurford asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 10 March 1977:

(1) Is it a fact that—

(a) overseas residents who derive incomes in Australia on which they pay Australian income tax are also obliged to pay the Medibank levy if they are not contributors to a recognised Australian health insurance fund;

(b) if overseas residents are only temporarily overseas, then they are entitled to receive the same rebates relating to medical and hospitals claims as any Australian resident whether or not the medical and hospital charges are incurred in Australia or abroad;

(c) if overseas residents are more permanently overseas, then they are not entitled to medical or hospital rebates;

(d) if overseas residents pay income tax in the overseas country of their residence and that country has a double tax agreement with Australia, then they get a credit for the income tax paid in Australia but not for the Medibank levy which they are obliged to pay.

(2) If so, will the Government give consideration to including clauses obliging overseas countries to give credits for the Medibank levy in future double tax agreements for those more permanent overseas residents who are unable to obtain hospital and medical rebates in Australia.
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Mr Lynch—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:

(1) (a) The levy is payable only by persons who are residents of Australia for income tax purposes, but exemption from the levy is conferred on people who are covered by appropriate private insurance in Australia. Accordingly, Australians who continue to be regarded as residents of Australia for income tax purposes while they are overseas and who derive income on which they pay Australian tax would generally remain liable for the levy if they do not have appropriate private insurance.

(b) Medibank medical benefits at the New South Wales rates are payable to residents of Australia whilst temporarily overseas, whether the charges are incurred in Australia or abroad. A hospital payment of $16 per day is payable for periods spent in hospital overseas. If the person is hospitalised in Australia as a hospital service patient the accommodation and treatment is provided free of charge under Commonwealth/State cost sharing agreements.

(c) Where the Health Insurance Commission is satisfied that the person is not an Australian resident within the meaning of the Health Insurance Act 1973 (as amended), Medibank benefits are not payable.

(d) Where a country which is a party to a double taxation agreement with Australia taxes income that is derived by its residents from Australia and is taxed in this country, the question of whether it will allow a credit in respect of the levy against its own tax on that income is one for that country to determine, in its interpretation of the agreement. In Australia, the levy is not treated in reverse circumstances as a tax against which credit for foreign tax may be given.

(2) The people referred to would generally not be regarded as residents of Australia and therefore would not be liable for the levy, so that the question of other countries being obliged to give credit for the levy is unlikely to arise in practice.

Aid to Mozambique
(Question No. 295)

Mr Hurford asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 10 March 1977:

(1) Did Australia undertake at the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in May 1975, that it would give Mozambique economic aid to help it apply for United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia?

(2) If so, and as Mozambique has now announced that it will apply for United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, what steps is the Australian Government taking to implement its pledge?

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

(1) In Kingston in May 1975 Commonwealth Heads of Government (including Australia) decided unanimously in favour of providing immediate financial assistance to the new Government of Mozambique if it decided to comply with mandatory sanctions imposed by the United Nations Security Council in respect of Rhodesia, and endorsed a 'recommendation that an initiative should be taken by Commonwealth Governments at the United Nations to establish a program of assistance for Mozambique in terms of Articles 49 and 50 of the Charter'.

(2) The United Nations Security Council subsequently adopted a unanimous resolution calling on members to assist Mozambique to compensate it for its action in applying sanctions against Rhodesia. In response to this international appeal, Australia committed $51 million for food aid.
including freight, to Mozambique. This food aid comprises about 286 tonnes of corned meat and 3800 tonnes of wheat. Consistent with the Commonwealth Heads of Government resolution, a special fund was established under the auspices of the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation to provide technical assistance to Mozambique. The target set was £1 million. In response to the Commonwealth appeal, Australia contributed $US100,000 to the special technical assistance fund for Mozambique.

Medical Benefits Scheme: Differential Rebates
(Question No. 326)

Mr Lloyd asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 10 March 1977:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the NAGPA article in a recent AMA Gazette criticising the present differential rebate system for medical services.

(2) If so, is it a fact that the elimination of differential rebates for those items customarily and competently performed by general practitioners would strengthen the role of the general practitioner, save taxpayers' money and be more in line with overseas practice.

Mr Hunt—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Yes.

(2) Specialists in Australia have always as a general rule charged more for similar services than general practitioners. A higher benefit for a referred specialist consultation has been paid since the inception of the Medical Benefits Scheme on 1 July 1953. However, this differential related to consultations only and did not apply to other services carried out by both specialists and general practitioners.

The customary practice of specialists charging fees generally higher than those charged by general practitioners was recognised by a Commonwealth Committee of Enquiry under the chairmanship of Mr Justice Nimmo. In March 1969 the Nimmo Committee recommended that there be established what were, in fact, the most common fees being charged in each State for all the medical services and procedures provided by medical practitioners and that, wherever appropriate, fees charged by specialists in the practice of their specialty should be ascertained separately from the fees charged by general practitioners.

The Nimmo Committee recommended, in effect, that differential benefits should be provided where there were differences between the common fees charged by specialists and those charged by general practitioners for the same medical service.

The Government accepted these recommendations together with the list of Most Common Fees submitted by the A.M.A. in January 1970 as the basis for the reconstruction of the Medical Benefits Scheme as from 1 July 1970. As a result, the 1970 Medical Benefits Schedule contained about 340 items for which differential benefits applied for the same service when rendered by a general practitioner and when performed by a specialist on a referred patient.

Although a number of the differential items introduced in 1970 have since been removed from the Schedule, the concept of differential fees was endorsed by the Medical Fees Tribunal in 1973 in its determination of fair and reasonable fees for medical benefit purposes.

The Medibank Review Committee also considered the question of differential rebates during its examination of Medibank but did not suggest any changes.

The elimination of differential rebates is considered unlikely to contribute to a strengthening of the role of the general practitioner, unless it was done on the basis of raising general practitioner fees to the specialist level. This is the only practical way in which equality could be achieved.

The elimination of differential rebates by raising general practitioner fees, and benefits, would result in increased expenditure by the Government and the Health Insurance Funds. My Department estimates that the movement of general practitioner fees to the specialist level for procedural services would cost approximately $11 m in a full year.

The elimination of differential rebates may be in line with the practices of some overseas countries. However, it would appear undesirable to arbitrarily change the system of differential rebates in the Australian Medical Benefits Scheme when several formal inquiries have ruled out changing the system.

Pensioners: Fringe Benefits
(Question No. 377)

Mr Neil asked the Minister, representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 15 March 1977:

(1) What was the estimated cost to the Commonwealth Government of providing fringe benefits to pensioners during each of the last 5 financial years.

(2) How many persons were eligible for fringe benefits in each of these years.

(3) Of the persons referred to in part (2), how many were in each pension category.

(4) What would be the estimated additional annual cost to Commonwealth Government revenue of indexing the fringe benefit income test to the Consumer Price Index.

(5) How much of the cost referred to in part (1) is for exemption of pensioners from the Medibank levy.

Mr Hunt—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question.

(1) The following table shows expenditure on the major fringe benefits in each of the last 5 financial years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service/Benefit</th>
<th>1971-72</th>
<th>1972-73</th>
<th>1973-74</th>
<th>1974-75</th>
<th>1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner Medical Service</td>
<td>$27.8</td>
<td>$30.8</td>
<td>$35.4</td>
<td>$47.8</td>
<td>$53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner hospital benefits</td>
<td>$24.1</td>
<td>$23.7</td>
<td>$24.3</td>
<td>$25.2</td>
<td>$27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner pharmaceutical benefits</td>
<td>$52.0</td>
<td>$58.1</td>
<td>$66.8</td>
<td>$80.6</td>
<td>$107.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner nursing home benefits</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funeral benefits</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
<td>$1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone rental concessions and mail redirection</td>
<td>$3.8</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$7.1</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing aids for pensioners</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$109.5</td>
<td>$127.1</td>
<td>$159.7</td>
<td>$226.8</td>
<td>$200.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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* for medical services received prior to 1 July 1975.
† for hospital services received prior to the introduction of Medibank hospital arrangements.

Note—the cost of pensioner medical and hospital services for the year 1975-76 is not available.

(2) and (3) The number of pensioners and beneficiaries eligible for fringe benefits as at the end of each of the last five financial years by category of pension and benefit were as shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total eligible</td>
<td>1 036 800</td>
<td>1 113 900</td>
<td>1 167 300</td>
<td>1 208 800</td>
<td>1 256 800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipients of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age pensions</td>
<td>793 700</td>
<td>840 400</td>
<td>853 900</td>
<td>869 100</td>
<td>882 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid pensions</td>
<td>134 900</td>
<td>141 700</td>
<td>145 700</td>
<td>154 500</td>
<td>165 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife’s allowances/pensions</td>
<td>20 000*</td>
<td>34 600</td>
<td>40 400</td>
<td>45 500</td>
<td>53 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widows’ pensions</td>
<td>88 200</td>
<td>97 200</td>
<td>103 700</td>
<td>107 600</td>
<td>114 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting mothers’ benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 600*</td>
<td>32 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* estimated.

(4) Because future movements in the Consumer Price Index are unknown, it is not possible to estimate the cost of indexing the fringe benefit income test by the Consumer Price Index. However, if the income limits for fringe benefits were increased by the 14.4 per cent increase in the Consumer Price Index from December 1975 to December 1976, then the additional cost would be to the order of $5 million in a full year. In addition, there would be some loss to revenue from the exemption of additional pensioners from the Medibank levy.

(5) No part of the costs in part (1) is due to the exemption of pensioners from the Medibank levy as the levy became payable from 1 October 1976.

North Korea: Economic Position

(Question No. 392)

Dr Klugman asked the Minister for Overseas Trade, upon notice, on 16 March 1977:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the New Year address by Kim Il Sung of North Korea published as an advertisement in the National Times of 14-19 March 1977.

(2) If so, does Kim Il Sung claim that all is well with the North Korean economy.

(3) Does the North Korean Government owe any money to Australian companies for goods or services supplied.

(4) If so, what is the amount owing.

(5) What steps has the Australian Government taken to obtain payment of these debts.

Mr Howard—The Acting Minister for Overseas Trade has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) Yes.

(2) Yes. The address summarises progress achieved in the North Korean economy during 1976 and claims that 1976 witnessed the complete fulfilment of North Korea’s Six Year Plan. However, the address also draws attention to areas of the domestic economy needing particular attention during 1977.

(3) The Government is not aware of any debts owing by North Korea to Australian companies for goods and services supplied.

(4) Not applicable.

(5) Not applicable.

Construction Industry: Employment

(Question No. 397)

Mr Neil asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 16 March 1977:

What was the total estimated number of persons (a) employed and (b) unemployed in the construction industry in (i) Australia and (ii) each State and Territory during each month since January 1976.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

The following tables provide statistics on employed and unemployed persons in the construction industry during each month since January 1976 for which data are available.

The data presented to cover ‘unemployed in the construction industry’ are the number of unemployed persons registered with the Commonwealth Employment Service for employment in occupations related to the construction industry. The occupational categories covered in this instance are skilled building and construction workers, builders labourers and other building and construction workers.

Table 1. Civilian employees in the construction industry by State for each month since January 1976* (000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>371.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>372.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>373.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>124.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>372.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>371.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>123.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>370.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>122.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>368.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>121.4</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>365.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor-General's Visit to North Queensland

(Question No. 401)

Mr Charles Jones asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 16 March 1977:

(1) Were the Governor-General and his wife accompanied on their visit to Lizard Island by his naval aide, their butler, 2 Commonwealth police officers, the head of the Queensland's police special branch and a Queensland constable, or by any of them.

(2) What type of RAAF aircraft conveyed them to and from Lizard Island, and from and to which airports did it convey them.

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

(1) Yes, except that they were accompanied by only one Commonwealth police officer.

(2) An RAAF Caribou conveyed the party from Cairns to Lizard Island and returned them to Cairns.

Public Service: Appointments

(Question No. 423)

Mr Antony Whitlam asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 17 March 1977:

(1) Did the Chairman of the Public Service Board prepare a written report nominating persons considered suitable for appointment as Secretary to the Department of Productivity.

(2) If so, did the report contain the Chairman's name as a person considered suitable for that appointment.

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

I do not propose to adopt a practice of canvassing, in answer to parliamentary questions, details of persons considered for appointments as Permanent Heads or statutory officers, or details of persons who were on committees related to appointments, under the procedures outlined in my second reading speech of 18 November 1976 on the Public Service Amendment (First Division) Bill 1976.

I therefore wish merely to reassure the honourable member on the processes followed.

Regarding the appointment to the vacant office of Permanent Head of the Department of Productivity, I can confirm that, although there was at that time no statutory requirement to do so, a committee was appointed along the lines of the provisions since enacted by passage of that Bill. I should perhaps also remind the honourable member that the circumstances under which Sir Alan Cooley accepted the appointment were outlined in my press statement of 14 January 1977.

The office of Chairman of the Public Service Board, on the other hand, is a statutory office. There are no statutory selection procedures for filling such statutory offices, but the attention of the honourable member is invited to my statement in the second reading speech at page 2865 of Hansard of 18 November 1976 on the administrative guidelines to be followed in respect of statutory full-time civilian appointments. As I said in my Press statement of 14 January 1977, I
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asked Sir Alan Cooley to submit to me a list of names of persons who should be considered. He submitted names, following consultation along the lines I outlined in my statement of 18 November 1976, which did not envisage the appointment of a committee in such circumstances.

Public Service: Appointments
(Question No. 424)
Mr Antony Whitlam asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 17 March 1977:

(1) Did the Chairman of the Public Service Board appoint a committee to prepare a written report nominating persons considered suitable for appointment as Secretary to the Department of Productivity?

(2) If so, who were the members of the committee and did its report contain the Chairman’s name as a person considered suitable for that appointment.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
See my answer to Question No. 423.

Public Service: Appointments
(Question No. 425)
Mr Antony Whitlam asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 17 March 1977:

(1) Did the Chairman of the Public Service Board prepare a written report nominating persons considered suitable for appointment to the vacancy occurring in his office following his appointment as Secretary to the Department of Productivity?

(2) If so, did the report contain the name of Mr K. C. O. Shann as a person considered suitable for appointment to that vacancy.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
See my answer to Question No. 423.

Public Service: Appointments
(Question No. 426)
Mr Antony Whitlam asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 17 March 1977:

(1) Did the Chairman of the Public Service Board appoint a committee to prepare a written report nominating persons considered suitable for appointment to the vacancy occurring in his office following his appointment as Secretary to the Department of Productivity?

(2) If so, who were the members of the committee and did its report contain the name of Mr K. C. O. Shann as a person considered suitable for appointment to that vacancy.

Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
See my answer to Question No. 423.

Purpose and Responsibility of Department of Productivity
(Question No. 434)
Mr Brown asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 22 March 1977:

(1) What are the purposes for which the Department of Productivity was established.

(2) What are the present responsibilities of that Department.

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

(1) The Department of Productivity was established for the following purposes—

the achievement of continued improvement of the productivity of all sectors of Australian industry for the purpose of providing to Australian consumers goods and services of required quality at acceptable cost of improving the international competitive position of Australian industry, and of providing a more satisfying work experience for Australian workers

determined maintenance and operation of the Government’s munitions and aircraft factories to meet Australia’s defence needs

development and maintenance of an Australian defence aircraft industry to meet Australia’s defence needs

courage and assistance of invention, innovation and technological development in Australian industry.

(2) The present responsibilities of the Department are to—

provide advice to the Government on matters of policy and strategy formulation as they affect productivity

promote, including undertake where necessary, research into measures of productivity; interpret measures of productivity, both nationally and within industry

determine and undertake research into the continuing needs of industry for productivity improvement including—

employer/employee relationships

the physical and working environment

management practices

technology and its application

training

promote and participate in the development and implementation of national programs for productivity improvement

co-operate with and, as appropriate, co-ordinate and stimulate the activities of other departments, authorities and organisations which relate to the above functions

publicise, disseminate, and otherwise promote material and ideas relating to the above functions

manage assigned government factories for the production of defence material and the provisions of services as required for defence purposes

oversee the activities of the defence aircraft industry

manage an office for the examination and granting of patents and the examination and registration of trade marks and designs.

Kirribilli House
(Question No. 449)
Mr Les Johnson asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 22 March 1977:

(1) On which dates has he or have members of his family or staff stayed at Kirribilli House.

(2) On how many other nights did he stay in Sydney in 1976 or 1977.

(3) On which dates has the Governor-General or have members of his family or staff stayed at Kirribilli House.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question, as at 15 April 1977, is as follows:

(1) The nights of 1 April, 27 September, 21-22 November 1976; 25 January, 3-10 April, 12-13 April 1977. The honourable member may be interested to compare my use of Kirribilli House—on 15 nights in 15 months—with that of my predecessor. I am advised that during the 15 months from mid-July 1974 to October 1975, the then Prime Minister occupied Kirribilli House on 189 nights.

(2) 2.


Australian National Railways Commission: Time Lost by Employees

(Question No. 485)

Mr Wallis asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 22 March 1977:

(1) How many man-hours have been lost by employees of the Australian National Railways Commission as a result of compensable injuries in each of the last 3 years.

(2) How many man-hours have been lost by ANR employees as a result of (a) industrial disputes and; (b) personal sickness or injury not job related during the same period.

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


Compensation for Fraser Island

(Question No. 498)

Mr FitzPatrick asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 23 March 1977:

(1) Further to my question without notice on 11 November 1976 (Hansard, page 2595), what compensation has been paid to the Queensland Government for the cancellation of export licences for minerals from Fraser Island, to date.

(2) Has the Commonwealth Government placed conditions on its offer of $10m compensation, namely that the State Government forgo its rights to High Court action, and that the $10m is to apply to the labour content only of compensation projects.

(3) If so, has the Queensland Government expressed concern at the conditions and the amount of compensation.

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

(1) The proposal put forward by the Commonwealth Government and agreed to by the Queensland Government was for an unconditional grant totalling $10m—$1m in 1976-77 and $3m in each of the 3 succeeding years. A first payment of $500,000 was made on 7 March.

(2) The Commonwealth did not require the State Government to forgo its rights to High Court action, nor did it require that the $10m apply to the labour content only of compensation projects.

(3) Not applicable.

Joint Defence Space Communications Station, Woomera

(Question No. 510)

Mr Fry asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 23 March 1977:

(1) Who was the prime American contractor or contractors for the Joint Defence Space Communications Station, Woomera, South Australia, commonly known as Narrungar.

(2) What was the cost of establishing the facility and what are its annual operating costs.

(3) What proportion of these costs has been met by the Australian Government.

(4) What has been the Australian industrial participation in the construction and operation of the facility.

Mr Killen—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The prime contractor for the construction of the Joint Defence Space Communications Station was the Australian firm of A. V. Jennings.

(2) and (3) The Australian share of the cost of establishing the Station was $1.5m. Australia does not contribute to the annual operating cost of the Station but does maintain about 40 personnel there, mainly RAAF and Commonwealth Police at Commonwealth expense, as well as sharing the costs of the Woomera Support Area.

(4) The construction of the Station was almost entirely an Australian industrial effort. In the operation of the Station, there are at present 142 Australian civilian contractor employees at the Station (employed at United States expense) of whom 42 are employed in the operation of the Station while the remainder provide the entire industrial effort in the maintenance and support of the Station.

National Employment and Training System

(Question No. 522)

Mr Garrick asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 24 March 1977:

(1) Will he order an investigation into the alleged misuse of the Government subsidy made to employers who take on unemployed personnel for retraining.

(2) Has his attention been drawn to allegations that during this retraining some employers take the persons being retrained off the specified duties and put them on to other work.

(3) If so, do employers still receive the subsidy payable in respect of each employee under this scheme in those circumstances; if so, why.

(4) Is there any parallel between employers who exploit the Government subsidy for retraining unemployed people, and those people who draw unemployment benefits under false pretences.

(5) Are there many examples of employers drawing money from the public purse in such a way.

(6) If so, does he plan to take action commensurate with that taken on so-called ‘dole bludgers’.

(7) How many persons can a businessman employ under the Government subsidy available for retraining unemployed personnel.

(8) Could this subsidy be used to reduce or almost eliminate the need for fully qualified tradesmen in a business.
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(9) Is there a possibility of tradesmen whose wages are not subsidised to some extent by the Federal Government’s scheme being at a disadvantage in gaining or keeping their jobs in industries where retraining can be undertaken to the financial benefit of employers.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Any allegation of an employer abusing the system of subsidised training on-the-job under the National Employment and Training System is thoroughly investigated.

(2) No specific allegations have been drawn to my attention that some employers have not provided NEAT trainees with the training agreed upon.

(3) When subsidised training on-the-job is approved a training plan is drawn up to indicate what skills the employee is expected to have acquired at the end of the training period. The procedures lay down that when my Department finds a departure from the training plan has taken place appropriate action is to be taken. If the employee were no longer being trained, and there is no possibility of changing that situation, subsidy payments would be stopped immediately.

(4) This Government does not condone any person or organisation which exploits government assistance. If an employer were found to be abusing the NEAT System, subsidy would cease immediately.

(5) There are no known cases.

(6) If any instances of abuse are drawn to my attention they will be investigated and appropriate action taken.

(7) Instructions to CES specify that each vacancy must be looked at on its merits and applicants are only to be placed in training with an employer who is assessed as being capable of providing training. Instructions to the CES set limits on the number of trainees for which an employer may receive NEAT subsidy at any time. These limits are based on the total number of employees in the establishment at the time placement is being considered.

(8) No.

(9) No.

Mr L. J. Gruzman, Q.C.: Permission to Fly Aircraft out of Australia

(Question No. 533)

Mr James asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 24 March 1977:

On what dates and for what destinations has Mr L. J. Gruzman, Q.C., received permits to fly aircraft out of Australia.

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

Insofar as can be ascertained from departmental records Mr L. J. Gruzman, Q.C., has received permission to fly aircraft out of Australia on 3 occasions in recent years, viz.

1972—20 June, Sydney to United Kingdom
1973—1 May, Sydney to United Kingdom
1976—3 September, Sydney to Port Moresby.

Booklet: The Newcomer and the Law

(Question No. 537)

Mr Innes asked the Minister representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 29 March 1977:

(1) Did the Department of Social Security prepare, publish and distribute a pamphlet entitled The Newcomer and the Law.

(2) If so, when was the pamphlet published.

(3) How many pamphlets were published, and at what cost.

(4) How have the pamphlets been distributed, and how many have been distributed.

(5) Were the addresses and phone numbers of Australian Legal Aid Officers given in the publication correct at the date of publication.

(6) Did the pamphlet outline the basis for divorce under the Family Law Act; if not, why not.

(7) Was the other information in the pamphlet correct and factual at the time of publication.

(8) Was the pamphlet written by Mr W. E. Holder, a Senior Lecturer in Law at the Australian National University; if so, what fee was paid to Mr Holder.

Mr Hunt—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question:

(1) The Immigration Information Branch of the Australian Information Service prepared the booklet, The Newcomer and the Law. The Department of Social Security became responsible for post-arrival services for migrants following the abolition of the former Department of Immigration in 1974 after work on the booklet had begun, and has therefore become nominally responsible for it. The booklet was published by the Australian Government Publishing Service for distribution by the Department of Social Security.

(2) The booklet was published in May 1976, after some two years in preparation. Difficulties in translating and typesetting a substantial text, including legal terms into eight foreign languages in three alphabets caused delays in production of the booklet.

(3) 560,000 copies were printed in English and eight other languages at a cost of $49,596, including freight to outlets throughout Australia.

(4) Distribution began in January 1977 through offices of the Department of Social Security. Foreign language editions of the booklet were issued with a correction slip saying that the information on divorce and matrimonial matters no longer applies and announcing that a separate leaflet on the Family Law Act will be available soon. A slip for the English edition says a separate leaflet giving details of the Family Law Act and how it works is available from the Family Court of Australia in capital cities.

Distribution of the leaflet by each of the State offices was to a large and varied range of organisations. Distribution generally covered the following organisations: Employer organisations, Trade Unions, Social Security offices, Commonwealth Employment Service offices, police stations. Good Neighbour Councils, ethnic organisations, schools, legal aid, Consulates, State libraries, information and inquiry centres, bank and church migrant services, courts, national groups in the National Groups Directory, Councils of Social Service, voluntary welfare organisations, State and Federal Government Departments.

By 4 April 1977, 83,500 copies of The Newcomer and the Law had been distributed by the Department of Social Security.

(5) The booklet carries the notice that the information contained in it was the latest available at March 1975. The addresses and phone numbers were correct at that date, but some had changed by the time of distribution.
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Saccharin  
(Question No. 541)  
Mr Hodges asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 30 March 1977:

(1) Has his attention been drawn to the United States Food and Drug Administration ban on saccharin and a similar ban by the Canadian Government.

(2) Has his attention also been drawn to the research on the effects of saccharin which has been completed by the United States Food and Drug Administration.

(3) What studies have the Australian Drug Evaluation Committee and the National Health and Medical Research Council done on the effects of saccharin.

Mr Hunt—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Yes.

(2) I am not aware of any toxicological investigations recently completed by the United States Food and Drug Administration. The ban on saccharin in the United States and Canada is based on toxicological investigations carried out by the Health Protection Branch of the Canadian Ministry of Health and Welfare. Rats were used as experimental animals in these investigations.

(3) The Australian Drug Evaluation Committee has not carried out or commissioned any studies on saccharin but has been aware of the animal toxicity studies being conducted overseas. Progress reports on these studies have been considered by the Committee on a number of occasions but no action to restrict the availability of saccharin has been deemed necessary. The Committee is maintaining a watching brief.

The Food Science and Technology Sub-committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council (NH & MRC), which is responsible for the assessment of food additives in Australia, has examined the Canadian toxicological studies. The Council has subsequently not recommended any change to existing controls. The NH & MRC will, of course, be maintaining its review of saccharin along with other food additives. It should be noted that no cases of human cancer attributable to saccharin have been identified. Saccharin users have no cause for alarm and no further restrictions on saccharin usage in Australia are foreseen.

The intention to ban saccharin in the United States was based on legislation in that country which requires a food additive to be banned if the development of cancer in experimental animals can be attributed to that substance, irrespective of the level of ingestion. Some relaxation of the ban is now being undertaken by the United States.

In Australia saccharin is only permitted at specified levels in a limited number of foods. There is, however, no restriction on its availability for use as a sweetener for addition to beverages.

Farm Apprenticeship Schemes  
(Question No. 543)  
Mr Lloyd asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 30 March 1977:

(1) How many young people are enrolled in farm apprenticeship schemes, and in which States are they enrolled.

(2) How will farm apprentices benefit from the new craft and pre-apprenticeship schemes.
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Commonwealth Literary Fund Fellowship Awards
(Question No. 591)

Mr Hayden asked the Minister assisting the Prime Minister in the Arts, upon notice, on 19 April 1977:

How many Commonwealth Literary Fund Fellowship Awards have been made for each year since the Awards were initiated.

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

The first fellowships were awarded by the Commonwealth Literary Fund in 1939, with effect in 1940. The number of awards year by year from that time is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of fellowships offered by the Literature Board of the Australia Council, which replaced the Commonwealth Literary Fund in 1973, is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pensioners: Calare Electoral Division
(Question No. 610)

Mr MacKenzie asked the Minister representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 19 April 1977:

(1) How many pensioners reside within the electoral division of Calare.

(2) Of these, how many are (a) age pensioners, (b) invalid pensioners, (c) wives, (d) widows, showing a breakdown between classes A, B and C, and (e) supporting mothers.

Mr Hunt—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member's question:

(1) and (2) The latest information readily available on the distribution of pensioners, by type of pension, in electoral divisions of the Commonwealth is contained in the publication 'Social Security Pensioners in Postcode Districts and Electoral Divisions, 30 June 1976'. Copies of this publication

Australian Atomic Energy Commission: Incidental Expenditure
(Question No. 590)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for National Resources, upon notice, on 19 April 1977:

(1) Will he provide a full accounting of the item appearing on page 116 of the 1975-76 Annual Report of the Australian Atomic Energy Commission as incidental expenditure of $1.8 million.

(2) Will he also provide a similar breakdown of estimated expenditure under this item for 1976-77.

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

(1) and (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure</th>
<th>Estimated Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>1976-77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 632,823</td>
<td>$ 593,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 97,902</td>
<td>$ 112,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 442,835</td>
<td>$ 440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 630,105</td>
<td>$ 457,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,803,665</td>
<td>$ 1,602,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local and overseas fares and travelling allowances; Transport, freight and storage charges; Library supplies; Postage and telephone services; Laundry, advertising and sundry expenses.

Maintenance of grounds and buildings.

Hire of computer.

Servicing agreements; repairs to equipment and stores; period contracts for cleaning, manufacturing, drafting and tracing services, electrical wiring, microfiche masters; design and development contracts; consultants fees.
were sent to all members and senators at the beginning of this year.

In respect of the electoral division of Calare the position at 30 June 1976 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of pension</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Age pensioners</td>
<td>8,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Invalid pensioners</td>
<td>2,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Widows—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B and C</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Supporting mothers</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question No. 613)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Jacobi asked the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs, upon notice, on 19 April 1977:

1. Has his attention been drawn to a report appearing in the *Australian Financial Review* of 1 November 1976 to the effect that, as a result of the recommendations contained in paragraphs 9.132 of the Swanson Committee Report on section 73 of the Trade Practices Act, a draft clause was inserted in the earlier draft of the Trade Practices Amendment Bill to make financial corporations jointly and severally liable with suppliers in linked credit transactions; if so, is the position as stated.

2. Did he receive any representations from the Australian Finance Conference or any financial corporation for removal of this draft clause, as such a clause is not to be found in the Trade Practices Amendment Bill 1977, which was introduced into the House on 8 December 1976.

3. How will the conflict with the provisions of the proposed consumer credit legislation based on the Molomby Report be overcome if the recommendations of the Swanson Committee regarding section 73 are not implemented.

4. What recourse will consumers have if a supplier who is in breach of the obligations of Division 2 of Part V of the Trade Practices Act 1974, as amended, goes into liquidation or is made bankrupt, if the recommendations of the Swanson Committee in regard to section 73 are not implemented.

5. What statistical and other surveys on prices were carried out by the Swanson Committee which influenced it to recommend that section 49 of the Trade Practices Act be repealed.


7. Has his attention been drawn to the recommendations of the United States House of Representatives ad hoc Subcommittee on Antitrust on the Robinson-Patman Act and related matters, that the Robinson-Patman Act, upon which section 49 of the Trade Practices Act is modelled, should not be repealed or amended or tampered with in any way; if so, have these recommendations been considered by the Government.

8. Has the Government received any representations seeking the retention and strengthening of section 49 of the Trade Practices Act.

9. Has the inter-departmental committee finished its consideration of applications of the Trade Practices Act to governmental activities; if so, when will its Report be tabled in the Parliament.

10. Has his attention also been drawn to a report appearing in the *Australian Financial Review* of 21 January 1977 to the effect that the Government proposes to remove all provisions regulating mergers and takeovers from the Trade Practices Act; if so, is the report correct and when will the legislation to give effect to this proposal be introduced into the Parliament.

11. Will the removal of the anti-merger provisions of the Trade Practices Act affect competition and endanger small businesses competing with large conglomerate corporations.

12. Will removal of the anti-merger provisions of the Trade Practices Act bring about an increase in prices in consumer goods and are any surveys proposed to test the effect of such proposals.

13. Are any amendments to the Trade Practices Act proposed as a result of the decision of the High Court in the CLM Holdings Case, handed down on 10 February 1977.

Mr Howard—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

1. The contents of draft Bills are confidential.

2. Representations on the ‘Swanson’ Report were invited by the Government. Details of particular representations received are not made public by the Government.

3. The model legislation covering consumer credit, which is being developed by a Commonwealth/State Working Group, has not been finalised and the outstanding recommendations of the ‘Swanson’ Committee are being considered by the Government. Any question of conflict will be considered at the appropriate time.

4. Consumers in such circumstances would have the same recourse as they currently have under State and Commonwealth legislation in relation to such matters.

5. The methods adopted by the ‘Swanson’ Committee, unless described in its report which was tabled in the Parliament on 7 September 1976, are confidential to the Committee and are matters upon which I have no knowledge.

6. No.

7. Yes; yes.

8. Yes.

9. Yes; it is not proposed to table the report of the Committee in the Parliament.

10. Yes; the article is an accurate representation of the statements I made at that time; the article did not state that the Government proposed to remove all merger provisions from the Act and no legislation to give effect to such a proposal will be introduced into the Parliament.

11 and (12) See answer to question (10) above.

13. No.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commonwealth Employment Service: Staffing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Question No. 626)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 18 April 1977:

What was the staffing establishment of each office of the Commonwealth Employment Service in New South Wales at the time of the annual review in each of the last 5 years.

Mr Street—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
### Answers to Questions

The staffing establishment of each office of the Commonwealth Employment Service in New South Wales as a result of the annual reviews for the years 1972 to 1976 is set out in the accompanying attachment.

Additional staffing establishment is also made available to all regions as required to provide for work load increases and seasonal work load peaks occurring in individual offices between annual reviews, but records of these temporary allocations of staff are not available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albury</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armidale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankstown</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bega</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacktown</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bondi</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Hill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookvale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burwood</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbelltown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campsie</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canberra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caringbah</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlestown</td>
<td>Opened Aug. 1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffs Harbour</th>
<th></th>
<th>Opened Aug. 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cowra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granville</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurstville</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverell</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katoomba</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempsey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsford</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lismore</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithgow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marrickville (formerly Newtown)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascot</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt Druitt</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murwillumbah</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrabri</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sydney</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nowra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parramatta</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penrith</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryde</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills (formerly Paddington)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamworth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagga Wagga</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warilla</td>
<td>Opened Aug. 1973</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Windsor                      | 3                  | 4                |
| Woden                        |                   | Opened Jan. 1975 |
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Figures relate to the staffing levels at 1 October each year.

Community Health Services and Facilities
(Question No. 629)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 19 April 1977:

(1) How much was granted to each State for community health services and facilities in 1975-76, and how much will be granted in 1976-77.

(2) How much was transferred in 1975-76 and will be transferred in 1976-77 by each State government to (a) community health centres and (b) women's refuges.

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

(1) Under the Community Health Program the amounts expended by the States on community health services and facilities in 1975-76, and the amounts allocated to the States for this purpose in 1976-77, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Expenditure 1975-76</th>
<th>Allocation 1976-77</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>22 307 393</td>
<td>29 400 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>10 431 109</td>
<td>15 200 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>5 018 015</td>
<td>7 400 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>3 731 299</td>
<td>5 100 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>3 669 882</td>
<td>5 300 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>1 246 563</td>
<td>2 500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46 404 261</strong></td>
<td><strong>64 900 000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) (a) Under the Community Health Program, the amounts expended in 1975-76, and allocated in 1976-77, for community health centres (1) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Expenditure 1975-76</th>
<th>Allocation 1976-77*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>10 107 930</td>
<td>12 128 698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>5 802 436</td>
<td>8 978 810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>3 509 684</td>
<td>5 038 789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>1 559 180</td>
<td>1 317 597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>1 403 436</td>
<td>2 853 172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>991 182</td>
<td>1 466 630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23 373 848</strong></td>
<td><strong>31 783 696</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) (b) Under the Community Health Program, the amounts expended in 1975-76, and allocated in 1976-77, for women's refuges are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1975-76 1976-77*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>128 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>76 643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>114 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>104 013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>128 088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisional Tax
(Question No. 641)

Mr Neil asked the Treasurer, upon notice, on 20 April 1977:

(1) What is the maximum amount a taxpayer may earn per annum by way of income which ordinarily would attract provisional tax without being liable to provisional tax.

(2) In what year did this amount become applicable.

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

Under the PAYE system of the income tax law provisional tax is the practical equivalent, for income other than salary or wages, of the tax instalment deductions made from salaries and wages each pay day. Fundamentally, all income other than salary or wages (which, by definition, includes pensions and superannuation payments) is, therefore, subject to provisional tax. There is, however, a provision to the effect that, where a person derives other income as well as salary or wages, the provisional tax payable in respect of the other income is to be determined by the Commissioner of Taxation. Under administrative rules established in accordance with this provision, provisional tax is not at present notified where income other than salary or wages is less than $400. This amount was determined originally as $100, and with progressive increases reached its present level in respect of assessments for the year ended 30 June 1970.

Mildura-Darwin: Proposed Highway
(Question No. 642)

Mr Morris asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 20 April 1977:

(1) Has he received a proposal for a corridor study into the north-south link between Mildura and Darwin.

(2) If so, what are the names and employment agencies of the individuals who made representations to him seeking this study, and when were the representations made.

(3) Has he agreed to undertake this study.
(4) If so, (a) who will be undertaking the study, (b) when will he make available to the Parliament the terms of reference for the study and (c) when does he expect to receive the report of the study.

(5) Has his attention been drawn to reports of concern in Alice Springs that the proposal would mean circumventing the Stuart Highway and consequently take tourist trade and business away from the city.

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

(1) Yes.

(2) I commissioned the study following representations made to me and to other Ministers in late 1975 and early 1976 mainly by the North-South Highway Committee which is based in Mildura with a branch in Broken Hill.

(3) and (4) I agreed to the study being undertaken by the Commonwealth Bureau of Roads and its report was tabled in Parliament on 5 May 1976. In brief, the report showed that the construction of the road in question was not justified at this stage.

(5) Yes.

Oral Paediatric Tetracyclines
(Question No. 648)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 20 April 1977:

(1) How many prescriptions of oral paediatric formulations of tetracyclines were issued in each year from 1970 to 1976, and in 1977 to date.

(2) What was the cost of these prescription issues.

(3) What alternative antibiotics are available to replace oral paediatric formulations of tetracyclines.

(4) How many prescriptions of these antibiotics were issued in each year from 1970 to 1976, and in 1977 to date.

Mr Hunt—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) Prescriptions for oral paediatric tetracyclines dispensed as pharmaceutical benefits since 1970-71 were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77 (8 months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>322 490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>343 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>202 773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>110 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>89 374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>69 333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77 (8 months)</td>
<td>58 106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) The cost of these prescriptions (including patient contribution) was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>$616 030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>$643 982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>$403 983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>$225 790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>$190 962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>$165 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77 (8 months)</td>
<td>$141 648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) The choice of alternative antibiotics or anti-bacterial agents is a matter which must be left to the prescribing doctor who is aware of the needs of the particular patient.

Other oral paediatric formulations of antibiotics and anti-bacterial agents listed as pharmaceutical benefits are listed hereunder.

Hang Gliding
(Question No. 659)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 20 April 1977:

(1) How many persons have been killed or seriously injured in hang gliding accidents since he said (a) that he did not propose to do anything about regulating the sport (Hansard, 16 March 1976, page 632) and (b) that he had been forced to reconsider that position and that he would consult with his State colleagues to see what ought to be done about the matter (Hansard, 12 November 1976, page 2184).

(2) When were such consultations held, and what has been their outcome.

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

(1) (a) 10 killed and 29 reported seriously injured; (b) 4 killed and 10 reported seriously injured.

(2) Early in January 1977, I wrote to all State Transport Ministers, setting out the Commonwealth philosophy in relation to the control of hang gliding. In that correspondence, I pointed out that an Air Navigation Order had been issued
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Form and strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoxycillin</td>
<td>Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>Tablet 125 mg; Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalexin</td>
<td>Granules for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephadine</td>
<td>Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloramphenicol</td>
<td>Paediatric Suspension 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clindamycin</td>
<td>Capsule 75 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloxacillin</td>
<td>Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>Capsule 125 mg; Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epicapin</td>
<td>Capsule 125 mg; Powder for Syrup, 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincomycin</td>
<td>Capsule 125 mg; Tablet 125 mg; Paediatric Drops 100 mg per ml; Paediatric Suspension 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim with</td>
<td>Suspension 40 mg-200 mg per 5 ml, 100 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphathiazole</td>
<td>Tablet 125 mg; Capsule 125 mg; Powder for Syrup 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenethicillin</td>
<td>Tablet 125 mg; Capsule 125 mg; Powder for Syrup 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenoxy-methylpenicillin</td>
<td>Capsule 125 mg; Tablet 125 mg; Paediatric Suspension 125 mg per 5 ml</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
laying down conditions to ensure the safety of third parties and other airspace users. I also stated that the Commonwealth did not wish to restrict the freedom of persons wishing to undertake an essentially sporting activity, notwithstanding the hazard to participants. I advised the Ministers that, with this in mind, it was intended to encourage hang gliding organisations to form a single federated body with the aim of achieving self-regulation and thus increasing the safety standard of the sport. In this regard, my Department convened a meeting of all known hang gliding organisations on 21 March 1977 and it was agreed at that meeting that a federal body would be formed and that safety standards would be formulated by that body. The whole question of hang glider operations was discussed with State Transport Ministers at an Australian Transport Advisory Council Meeting on 23 February 1977 and the courses of action being pursued by my Department were endorsed at that meeting.

**Beef: Imports from New Zealand**

(Question No. 665)

Mr O'Keefe asked the Minister for Overseas Trade, upon notice, on 21 April 1977:

1. Is New Zealand at present selling beef to Australian buyers.

2. Have large quantities of this product been sold in Australia.

3. Will he provide the latest information concerning these beef imports from New Zealand.

4. Has his attention been drawn to reports that beef producers in the electoral division of Paterson are very concerned at these imports.

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

1. In 1975-76 some 214 tonnes of beef and veal were imported into Australia from New Zealand. In 1976-77 (7 months to January) preliminary figures indicate that 681 tonnes have been imported from New Zealand.

2. Imports of beef from New Zealand in recent years have been particularly small in relation to Australian production which totalled 1.84 million tonnes in 1975-76 and 1.03 million tonnes in 1976-77 (7 months to January).

3. New Zealand is the only source from which Australia permits imports of fresh, chilled or frozen meats. Imports from third countries are prohibited at present because of Australia's strict health requirements. In the context of world-wide trade in beef the Australian Government strongly advocates the liberalisation of access for Australian beef to world markets. It would be inconsistent with this policy for Australia to seek restraints on imports from New Zealand, particularly when such imports are small in relation to local production. At the same time it should be recognised there is free access for Australian beef to the New Zealand market and any steps taken to limit imports from New Zealand could give rise to retaliatory action.

4. I am aware of the concern expressed by certain beef producers as a result of imports of beef from New Zealand and in view of the sensitive nature of this trade, officers from my Department and the Department of Primary Industry maintain a watch on imports of beef from New Zealand.

**European Economic Community: Trading Policies**

(Question No. 666)

Mr O'Keefe asked the Minister for Overseas Trade, upon notice, on 21 April 1977:

Did the Government take the opportunity afforded by the recent visit to Australia of a delegation of senior officials from the Commission of the European Economic Community to impress upon these officials Australia's dissatisfaction with the Community's restrictive trading policies, particularly in relation to Australian exports of beef and veal and other primary products?

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

Senior officials of the Commission of the European Economic Community met with Government representatives in Canberra in March this year to discuss multilateral and bilateral issues relating to the trade between Australia and the EEC. On the Australian side we naturally wanted to discuss the impact of the Community's policies in the agricultural sector on Australia's exports of primary products, particularly beef and veal. The Government stressed the very unsatisfactory access and price conditions which have existed in the beef and veal trade for the last three years and pointed to the clear need for greater co-operation between exporters and importers in bringing greater stability and reliability into the international beef market. Although Australian welcomed the community's decision in December last year to permit 75,000 tonnes of manufacturing grade beef to be imported under two global quotas between April and December this year, the Government emphasised to the members of the Commission that it was still concerned at the likelihood that the revised variable levy scheme operating from 1 April would prevent regular and substantial imports of beef and veal into the Community and would restrict access to the EEC beef market to periods of short domestic supply which could be both relatively brief and infrequent.

Australia also expressed its concern at the very high level of EEC export subsidies which had encouraged considerable Community exports of beef and veal. In the very depressed conditions ruling in the world market during this period, these subsidised sales had further reduced those market outlets still remaining for traditional exporting countries as well as aggravating the already depressed world market prices.

The Commission representatives sought to ensure the Australian delegation that it was not the intention of the EEC to achieve self-sufficiency in beef production, particularly in the area of manufacturing grade beef, where the Community is likely to have a continuing need for imported beef. The Commission believed that the recent surplus situation which existed in the Community was due to very heavy slaughtering's attributed in particular to the rising prices of imported feedgrains on which the EEC was dependent. On the question of export subsidies, the Commission said that it was not the intention of the Community to actively seek the expansion of their beef exports in the longer term and that the recent increasing level of exports reflected the short term over-supply situation in the EEC.

**Public Works: Divisions of Hughes, Cook and Cunningham**

(Question No. 700)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for Construction, upon notice, on 26 April 1977:
Answers to Questions

What are the (a) location, (b) cost and (c) completion date of each public work which has been commenced or approved in the electoral divisions of Hughes, Cook and Cunningham.

Mr McLeay—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client and Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSIRO—Cronulla</td>
<td>Division of Fisheries and Oceanography— -landscaping of site —fire protection</td>
<td>29,520</td>
<td>May 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>Nov. 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Telecommunications Commission—Miranda</td>
<td>Repairs and Maintenance to Telephone Exchange</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>June 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Telecommunications Commission—Engadine</td>
<td>Erection of Telephone Exchange</td>
<td>387,000</td>
<td>Sept. 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Telecommunications Commission—Port Kembla</td>
<td>Erection of Telephone Exchange</td>
<td>580,000</td>
<td>July 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment, Housing and Community Development—Fairy Meadow</td>
<td>Fairy Meadow Hostel—Residence for Manager</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>Dec. 1977*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Construction not yet commenced.

Statutory Transport Authorities

(Question No. 723)

Mr Morris asked the Minister of Transport, upon notice, on 27 April 1977:

What are the names and classifications of Australian Government representatives on statutory transport authorities who are employed by the Australian Government.

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

(a) Australian National Airlines Commission—Trevor Ashmore Pyman, First Assistant Secretary, Department of Transport, Salary $28,623.

(b) Australian National Railways Commission—Colin William Martin Freeland, First Assistant Secretary, Department of Transport, Salary $28,623.

(c) Australian Shipping Commission—Raé Martin Taylor, Deputy Secretary, Department of Transport, Salary $30,907.

Cancer

(Question No. 728)

Mr O’Keefe asked the Minister for Health, upon notice, on 27 April 1977:

(1) Are 20 per cent of deaths in Australia caused by cancer.

(2) What funds are being made available by the Government for cancer research in Australia.

(3) Has any breakthrough been made by researchers in any particular aspect of cancer.

Mr Hunt—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) According to the latest figures available 18.67 per cent of all registered deaths in Australia in 1975 were caused by malignant neoplasms.

(2) The Commonwealth Government is supporting medical research through the National Health and Medical Research Council. The Council funds cancer research through its project grant scheme and through a grant to the Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research, Melbourne. Total cost of these grants in 1977 is $1,507,200 of which $412,200 is for project grants and $1,095,000 for the Hall Institute. In addition the Council supports a substantial number of projects which are indirectly relevant to cancer research.

(3) It is highly unlikely that cancer research will lead to a sudden breakthrough. While new forms of treatment are constantly being developed they require clinical evaluation before being released for general use. The time lapse between the discovery of a new drug or technique and in general application will thus have to be measured, at least, by a number of years. However, the cumulative body of knowledge being assembled from research means that the patient benefits in improved diagnosis and treatment.

Australian Assistance Plan: Division of Calare

(Question No. 729)

Mr MacKenzie asked the Minister, representing the Minister for Social Security, upon notice, on 27 April 1977:

(1) What has been the cost to the Commonwealth Government of financing the development and operations of the regional councils set up under the 3-year pilot phase of the Australian Assistance Plan, in the electoral division of Calare.

(2) What part of those costs was (a) grants, (b) salaries, (c) rental, (d) telephone, (e) travel and (f) incidental.

(3) To whom, and in what amount, have these organisations allocated grants.
Mr Hunt—The Minister for Social Security has provided the following answer to the honourable member’s question.

(1), (2) and (3) No funds have been provided under the Australian Assistance Plan to organisations centred in the Electorate of Calare. However, the Orana Regional Rehabilitation and Social Welfare Council which is located at Dubbo, in the Electorate of Darling, was provided with the $2,000 Initiating Grant in 1974-75 under the Plan. The once only grant was provided to assist the organisation in meeting some of the costs incurred in the establishment of a Regional Council for Social Development in the Orana Region (Australian Government Region, New South Wales No. 14). Region 14 falls partly within the Calare electorate. Some of the costs incurred in the establishment of a regional council are printing, postage, telephone, travelling expenses, hall hire and seminars.

Launching of Australian Progress: Receipt of Gift
(Question No. 753)

Mr Morris asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 28 April 1977:

(1) Did the person launching the Australian National Line vessel Australian Progress in Hamburg on 6 April 1977 receive a gift from the Blohm and Voss shipbuilders.

(2) If so, what was the nature and value of the gift.

(3) If the value of the gift is in excess of $100, will it be paid for by the recipient in accordance with the guidelines announced by the Prime Minister in March 1976.

(4) What is the present location of the gift.

(5) Was the person launching the ship asked to nominate the nature of the gift.

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

(1) Yes.

(2) The gift was a gold bracelet.

(3) The recipient will be given an opportunity to purchase if the valuation of the gift is greater than $100.

(4) The gift is presently in the Prime Minister’s Department for valuation.

(5) No.

VIP Aircraft
(Question No. 755)

Mr Morris asked the Minister for Defence, upon notice, on 28 April 1977:

What flights for any purpose were undertaken by each aircraft of No. 34 Squadron during the period 1 to 9 March 1977.

Mr Killen—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

AIRCRAFT No. 1: BAC-111

2.3.77 Canberra/Cooeanglinga/Melbourne/Canberra

2.3.77 Canberra (Local Training)

3.3.77 Canberra/Melbourne/Canberra

7.3.77 Canberra/Launceston/Canberra

9.3.77 Canberra/Brisbane/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 2: BAC-111

3.3.77 Canberra/Melbourne/Canberra

3.3.77 Canberra/Williamtown/Canberra

7.3.77 Canberra/Bourke/Canberra

9.3.77 Canberra/Brisbane/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 3: Mystere

4.3.77 Canberra/Sydney/Melbourne/Canberra

8.3.77 Canberra (Local Training)

8.3.77 Canberra/Richmond/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 4: Mystere

1.3.77 Canberra/Rockhampton/Moranbah/Cairns

1.3.77 Cairns/Alice Springs/Darwin/Alice Springs

3.3.77 /Melbourne/Canberra

4.3.77 Canberra/Adelaide/Wagga/Sydney

/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 5: Mystere

2.3.77 Canberra/Armidale/Canberra/Sydney

/Canberra

5.3.77 Canberra/Sydney/East Sale/Canberra

5.3.77 Canberra/Sydney/Canberra

6.3.77 Canberra/Melbourne/Canberra

6.3.77 Canberra/Sydney/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 6: HS748

2.3.77 to Canberra/Cairns/Cooktown/Thursday

4.3.77 Island/Weipa/Normanton/Bourketown/Mt Isa/Longreach/Brisbane/Canberra

5.3.77 Canberra/Corryong/Melbourne/Bendigo

/Albury/Canberra

6.3.77 Canberra/Latrobe Valley/Canberra

Sydney/Canberra

9.3.77 Canberra/Williamtown/Canberra

AIRCRAFT No. 7: HS748

1.3.77 Canberra/Horsham/Melbourne/Canberra

4.3.77 Canberra (Test Flight)

9.3.77 Canberra (Test Flight)

Commonwealth Works: Division of Bowman
(Question No. 757)

Mr Jull asked the Minister for Construction, upon notice, on 28 April 1977:

(1) What Commonwealth works are (a) under construction and (b) proposed in the electoral division of Bowman.

(2) What is (a) the total cost of these projects and (b) the cost of each individual project.

(3) What Commonwealth projects have been completed in the electoral division of Bowman since December 1975.

(4) What was (a) the total cost of these projects and (b) the individual cost of each project.

Mr McLear—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) to (4) The following is a list of Commonwealth projects arranged by the Department of Construction in the electoral division of Bowman which are currently under construction and those which have been completed since December 1975. No further projects are proposed for the Division in the financial year 1976-77. Minor works valued at less than $15,000 have not been included.
Answers to Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under Construction</td>
<td>Fisheries Research Laboratory</td>
<td>$1,885,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>Telephone Engineering Centre</td>
<td>267,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington Point</td>
<td>Telephone Exchange</td>
<td>223,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Has a new arbitrator been appointed to replace Sir John Spicer in the dispute between MacRobertson Miller Airlines Pty Ltd and Trans-Australia Airlines; if not, is he able to say when an arbitrator will be appointed.

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

The Attorney-General recently appointed Sir Nigel Bowen as Arbitrator under the Airlines Agreements Act.

Interdepartmental Working Party on Interpreters and Translators
(Question No. 809)

Mr E. G. Whitlam asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 4 May 1977:

(1) Which departments were members of the interdepartmental working party set up to examine future requirements for interpreters and translators.

(2) What were its terms of reference.

(3) When was it established.

(4) When did it report.

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

(1) to (4) The information the honourable member seeks is contained in the report of the interdepartmental working party on interpreters and translators which I tabled in the Parliament on 22 February 1977.

Prices and Income Pause—Breaches
(Question No. 843)

Mr Scholes asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 5 May 1977:

(1) Will he consult with the Premier of Victoria regarding breaches of the prices freeze advocated by the Premier and announced as a fact by the Prime Minister.

(2) Will he take up with the Victorian Premier a 67 per cent increase in charges in Parliament House, Melbourne, introduced after the commencement of the freeze on prices is said to have commenced.

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

(1) The Prices Justification Tribunal is carrying out a monitoring role in relation to prices. At a State level the Victorian Consumer Affairs Bureau is also monitoring prices. I see no reason to consult with the Premier on breaches.

(2) Charges in Parliament House, Melbourne are a matter for the Victorian Parliament, and it would be quite inappropriate for me to take up the matter with the Premier.

Beef
(Reservation No. 770)

Mr Scholes asked the Minister for Overseas Trade, upon notice, on 28 April 1977:

Did he recently call for a strike by beef producers.

Mr Anthony—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

No.

Cannabis
(Reservation No. 781)

Dr Klugman asked the Minister for the Capital Territory, upon notice, on 3 May 1977:

(1) What is the maximum penalty for use of, or possession of, less than 25 grams of cannabis under the Public Health (Prohibited Drugs) Ordinance 1957.

(2) How many persons in the Australian Capital Territory were (a) charged with and (b) convicted of the use of, or possession of, less than 25 grams of cannabis in each year since 1965.

Mr Staley—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

(1) The maximum penalty available to the Court of Petty Sessions on conviction for either using or having in possession an amount of cannabis less than 25 grams is a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars.

(2) Response to the second question is qualified by making mention of the fact that prior to October 1975, when certain amendments were made to the Public Health (Prohibited Drugs) Ordinance 1957, details of weight played no specific role, and in consequence no reliable statistics are available. Relevant details between 1975 and 1977 are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Charged</th>
<th>Convicted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975 (Oct-Dec)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977 (to 31.3.77)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MacRobertson Miller Airlines and TAA: Appointment of Arbitrator
(Reservation No. 799)

Mr Morris asked the Minister for Transport, upon notice, on 3 May 1977: