THIRTY-FIRST PARLIAMENT
FIRST SESSION—SECOND PERIOD

Governor-General

His Excellency Sir Zelman Cowen, Knight of the Order of Australia, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George, Knight of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, one of Her Majesty's Counsel learned in the law, Governor-General of the Commonwealth of Australia and Commander-in-Chief of the Defence Force.

Third Fraser Ministry (Liberal Party—National Country Party Government)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Right Honourable John Malcolm Fraser, C.H. (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade and Resources</td>
<td>The Right Honourable John Douglas Anthony (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Industry and Commerce</td>
<td>The Right Honourable Phillip Reginald Lynch (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Primary Industry and Leader of the House</td>
<td>The Right Honourable Ian McCahon Sinclair (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>The Honourable Anthony Austin Street (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Transport</td>
<td>The Honourable Peter James Nixon (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>The Honourable John Winston Howard (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Education, Vice-President of the Executive Council, Leader of the Government in the Senate and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable John Leslie Carrick (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>The Honourable Andrew Sharp Peacock (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence</td>
<td>The Honourable Denis James Killen (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Social Security</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable Margaret Georgina Constance Guilfoyle (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Finance</td>
<td>The Honourable Eric Laidlaw Robinson (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Honourable Robert Ian Viner (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Health</td>
<td>The Honourable Ralph James Dunnet Hunt (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs</td>
<td>The Honourable Michael John Randal MacKellar (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Northern Territory and Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister for Primary Industry</td>
<td>The Honourable Albert Evan Adermann (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Construction and Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence</td>
<td>The Honourable John Elden McLeay (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for National Development</td>
<td>The Honourable Kevin Eugene Newman (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Science</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable James Joseph Webster (NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Post and Telecommunications</td>
<td>The Honourable Anthony Allan Staley (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General and Minister for Administrative Services</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable Peter Drew Durack, Q.C. (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Productivity</td>
<td>The Honourable Ian Malcolm Macphee (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs</td>
<td>The Honourable Wallace Clyde Fife (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Special Trade Representations and Minister Assisting the Minister for Trade and Resources</td>
<td>The Honourable Ransley Victor Garland (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for the Capital Territory</td>
<td>The Honourable Robert James Ellicott, Q.C. (LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development and Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>The Honourable Raymond John Groom (LP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minister in the Cabinet.

PARTY ABBREVIATIONS

**Third Fraser Ministry (Liberal Party—National Country Party Government)**

(From 25 August 1978)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister Role</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Right Honourable John Malcolm Fraser, C.H.</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade and Resources</td>
<td>The Right Honourable John Douglas Anthony</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Industry and Commerce</td>
<td>The Right Honourable Phillip Reginald Lynch</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Primary Industry and Leader of the House</td>
<td>The Right Honourable Ian McCaion Sinclair</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Education, Vice-President of the Executive Council, Leader of the Government in the Senate</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable John Leslie Carrick</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>The Honourable Anthony Austin Street</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Transport</td>
<td>The Honourable Peter James Nixon</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>The Honourable John Winston Howard</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>The Honourable Andrew Sharp Peacock</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Defence</td>
<td>The Honourable Denis James Killen</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Social Security</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable Margaret Georgina Constance Guilfoyle</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Finance</td>
<td>The Honourable Eric Laidlaw Robinson</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister</td>
<td>The Honourable Robert Ian Viner</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney-General</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable Peter Drew Durack, Q.C.</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Health</td>
<td>The Honourable Ralph James Dunnet Hunt</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and Minister Assisting the Treasurer</td>
<td>The Honourable Michael John Randal MacKellar</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for the Northern Territory and Minister for Veterans’ Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister for Primary Industry</td>
<td>The Honourable Albert Evan Adermann</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Construction and Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence</td>
<td>The Honourable John Elden McLeay</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for National Development</td>
<td>The Honourable Kevin Eugene Newman</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Science</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable James Joseph Webster</td>
<td>(NCP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Post and Telecommunications</td>
<td>The Honourable Anthony Allan Staley</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Productivity</td>
<td>The Honourable Ian Malcolm Macphee</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs</td>
<td>The Honourable Wallace Clyde Fife</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Special Trade Representations and Minister Assisting the Minister for Trade and Resources</td>
<td>The Honourable Ransley Victor Garland</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for the Capital Territory</td>
<td>The Honourable Robert James Ellicott, Q.C.</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development and Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations</td>
<td>The Honourable Raymond John Groom</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister for Administrative Services and Minister Assisting the Minister for Education</td>
<td>Senator the Honourable Frederick Michael Chaney</td>
<td>(LP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Minister in the Cabinet.

**PARTY ABBREVIATIONS**

Third Fraser Ministry (Liberal Party—National Country Party Government)  
(From 28 September 1978)  
*Prime Minister  
The Right Honourable John Malcolm Fraser, C.H. (LP)  
*Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Trade and Resources  
The Right Honourable John Douglas Anthony (NCP)  
*Minister for Industry and Commerce  
The Right Honourable Phillip Reginald Lynch (LP)  
*Minister for Primary Industry and Leader of the House  
The Right Honourable Ian McAlloon Sinclair (NCP)  
*Minister for Education, Vice-President of the Executive Council and Leader of the Government in the Senate  
Senator the Honourable John Leslie Carrick (LP)  
*Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations  
The Honourable Anthony Austin Street (LP)  
*Treasurer  
The Honourable Peter James Nixon (NCP)  
*Minister for Foreign Affairs  
The Honourable Andrew Sharp Peacock (LP)  
*Minister for Defence  
The Honourable Denis James Killen (LP)  
*Minister for Social Security  
Senator the Honourable Margaret Georgina Constance Guilfoyle (LP)  
*Minister for Finance  
The Honourable Eric Laidlaw Robinson (LP)  
*Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister  
The Honourable Robert Ian Viner (LP)  
*Attorney-General  
Senator the Honourable Peter Drew Durack, Q.C. (LP)  
Minister for Health  
The Honourable Ralph James Dunnet Hunt (NCP)  
Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and Minister Assisting the Treasurer  
The Honourable Michael John Randal MacKellar (LP)  
Minister for Veterans' Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister for Primary Industry  
The Honourable Albert Evan Adermann (NCP)  
Minister for Construction and Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence  
The Honourable John Eiden McLeay (LP)  
Minister for National Development  
The Honourable Kevin Eugene Newman (LP)  
Minister for Science  
The Honourable James Joseph Webster (NCP)  
Minister for Post and Telecommunications  
The Honourable Anthony Allen Staley (LP)  
Minister for Productivity  
The Honourable Ian Malcolm Macphee (LP)  
Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs  
The Honourable Wallace Clyde Fife (LP)  
Minister for Special Trade Representations and Minister Assisting the Minister for Trade and Resources  
The Honourable Ransley Victor Garland (LP)  
Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for the Capital Territory  
The Honourable Robert James Elicott, Q.C. (LP)  
Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development and Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations  
The Honourable Raymond John Groom (LP)  
Minister for Administrative Services and Minister Assisting the Minister for Education  
Senator the Honourable Frederick Michael Chaney (LP)  

* Minister in the Cabinet.  

PARTY ABBREVIATIONS  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adermann, Hon. Albert Evan</td>
<td>Fisher, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aldred, Kennethses</td>
<td>Henty, Vic.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony, Rt Hon. John Douglas</td>
<td>Richmond, N.S.W.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armitage, John Lindsay</td>
<td>Chifley, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailie, Marshall</td>
<td>La Trobe, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baume, Michael Ehrenfried</td>
<td>Macarthur, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bink, Reginald John</td>
<td>Phillip, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blevett, Dr Neal</td>
<td>Bonython, S.A.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourchier, John William</td>
<td>Bendigo, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen, Hon. Lionel Frost</td>
<td>Kyneton, Smith, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradfield, James Mark</td>
<td>Barton, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brathwaite, Raymond Allen</td>
<td>Dawson, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, John Joseph</td>
<td>Parramatta, N.S.W.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Neil Anthony</td>
<td>Diamond Valley, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant, Hon. Gordon Monro, E.D.</td>
<td>Wills, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungey, Malville Harold</td>
<td>Canning, W.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns, William George</td>
<td>Isaacs, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr, Maxwell Arthur</td>
<td>Widney, Tas.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadman, Alan Glyndwr</td>
<td>Mitchell, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns, Hon. Kevin Michael</td>
<td>Lilley, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder, Stephen Edward, D.F.C.</td>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, Hon. Clyde Robert</td>
<td>Hindsmarsh, S.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, Donald Milton</td>
<td>Fadden, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron, Ewen Colin</td>
<td>Indi, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, James Joseph</td>
<td>Mackellar, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case, Hon. Moses Henry</td>
<td>Maribyrnong, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapman, Hedley Grant Pearson</td>
<td>Kingston, S.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen, Barry</td>
<td>Robertson, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conolly, David Miles</td>
<td>Bradfield, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, James</td>
<td>Maranoa, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter, John Francis</td>
<td>Kaikoura, W.A.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson, John Sydney</td>
<td>Fremantle, W.A.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean, Arthur Gordon</td>
<td>Herbert, Qld</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobie, Hon. James Donald Mathies</td>
<td>Cook, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drummond, Peter Hertford</td>
<td>Forrest, W.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, Dr Harold Raymond</td>
<td>Berowra, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott, Hon. Robert James, Q.C.</td>
<td>Wee Wau, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eveningham, Hon. Douglas Nixon</td>
<td>Capricornia, Qld</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falconer, Peter David</td>
<td>Casey, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife, Hon. Wensley Clyde</td>
<td>Farrer, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher, Peter Stanley</td>
<td>Mallee, Vic.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser, Rt Hon. John Malcolm, C.H.</td>
<td>Riverina, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fry, Kenneth Lionel</td>
<td>Cooks, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gairdner, Hon. Ramsay Victor</td>
<td>Wannon, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilles, Geoffrey O'Halloran</td>
<td>Riverina, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillard, Reginald</td>
<td>Carnarvon, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gough, Bruce John</td>
<td>North Sydney, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham, Bruce William</td>
<td>Braddon, Tas.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groome, Hon. Robert John</td>
<td>Canberra, A.C.T.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haslam, John Whitton</td>
<td>Oxley, Qld</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden, Hon. William George</td>
<td>Perie, Qld</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges, John Charles</td>
<td>Denison, Tas.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgman, Michael</td>
<td>Denison, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holding, Alan Clyde</td>
<td>Melbourne Ports, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard, Hon. John Winston</td>
<td>Bemmals, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howse, Brian Leslie</td>
<td>Batham, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphreys, Benjamin Charles</td>
<td>Griffiths, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Hon. Ralph James Duntun</td>
<td>Gwydir, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurford, Christopher John</td>
<td>Bedford, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innes, Urquhart Edward</td>
<td>South Grafton, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James, Albert William</td>
<td>Hackett, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jarman, Alvin William</td>
<td>Deakin, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins, Dr Alfred</td>
<td>South, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Leonard Keith</td>
<td>Burke, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Hon. Leslie Royston</td>
<td>Hughes, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Peter Francis</td>
<td>Brisbane, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston, James Roger</td>
<td>Hotham, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Barry Owen</td>
<td>Lalar, Vic.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Hon. Charles Keith</td>
<td>Newcastle, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul, David Francis</td>
<td>Bowman, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keen, Sir Robert Commin</td>
<td>Kennedy, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesting, Hon. Paul John</td>
<td>Blaxland, N.S.W.</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerin, John Charles</td>
<td>Werriwa, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenny, Hon. Denis James</td>
<td>Moreton, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klugman, Dr Richard Emanuel</td>
<td>Prospect, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd, Bruce</td>
<td>Murray, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luce, Philip Errett, C.B.E.</td>
<td>Lyne, N.S.W.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusher, Stephen Augustus</td>
<td>Home, N.S.W.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch, Rt Hon. Philip Reginald</td>
<td>Flinders, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacKellar, Hon. Michael John Ral Ling</td>
<td>Warringah, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackenzie, Alexander John</td>
<td>Calare, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, Ross Malcolm</td>
<td>Berri, W.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean, Hon. John Elder</td>
<td>Boothby, S.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, James Leslie</td>
<td>Sydney, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMahon, Rt Hon. Sir William,</td>
<td>Lowe, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClelland, Hon. John Daniel, C.H.</td>
<td>Darling Downs, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacPhee, Hon. Ian Malcolm</td>
<td>Balclay, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Vincent Joseph</td>
<td>Banks, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martyn, John Raymond</td>
<td>Swan, W.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Percival Clarence</td>
<td>Wide Bay, Qld</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore, John Colinton</td>
<td>Ryan, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, Peter Frederick</td>
<td>Shepparton, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal, Maurice James</td>
<td>St George, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman, Hon. Kevin Eugene</td>
<td>Bass, Tas.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon, Hon. Peter James</td>
<td>Gipsland, Vic.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Keefe, Frank Lionel</td>
<td>Paterson, N.S.W.</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacock, Hon. Andrew Sharp</td>
<td>Konyong, Vic.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter, James Robert</td>
<td>Barker, S.A.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Hon. Eric Laidlaw</td>
<td>McPherson, Qld</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Rt Hon. Ian Louis</td>
<td>Cowper, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruddock, Phillip Maxwell</td>
<td>Dundas, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short,雪梅, Madeleine</td>
<td>Eden-Monaro, N.S.W.</td>
<td>LP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinclair, Gordon Denton</td>
<td>Corio, Vic.</td>
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An Act to amend the Air Navigation (Charges) Act 1952.

Airline Equipment (Loan Guarantee) Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 161 of 1978)—
An Act relating to the provision of certain equipment for a domestic airline.

Apple and Pear Stabilization Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 120 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Apple and Pear Stabilization Act 1971.

Apple and Pear Stabilization Export Duty Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 121 of 1978)—

Apple and Pear Stabilization Export Duty Collection Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 122 of 1978)—

Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1978–79 (Act No. 141 of 1978)—
An Act to appropriate certain sums out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the service of the year ending on 30 June 1979.

Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1978–79 (Act No. 142 of 1978)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for certain expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 1979.

An Act to authorize a further contribution by Australia to the Asian Development Bank for the purposes of the Asian Development Fund.

Atomic Energy Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 182 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Atomic Energy Act 1953.

Australian Capital Territory Electricity Supply Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 115 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Australian Capital Territory Electricity Supply Act 1962.

An Act to establish an Australian Dried Fruits Corporation, and for related purposes.

Australian Overseas Projects Corporation Act 1978 (Act No. 105 of 1978)—
An Act to establish an Australian Overseas Projects Corporation.

Bounty (Agricultural Tractors) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 108 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Agricultural Tractors Bounty Act 1966.

Bounty (Books) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 109 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Book Bounty Act 1969.

Bounty (Commercial Motor Vehicles) Act 1978 (Act No. 208 of 1978)—
An Act to provide for the payment of bounty on the production of certain motor vehicles.

Bounty (Drilling Machines) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 155 of 1978)—
An Act to amend section 6 of the Bounty (Drilling Machines) Act 1978.

An Act to provide for the payment of bounties on the production of certain metal-working machine tools.

Broadcasting and Television Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 210 of 1978)—
An Act relating to applications for the grant or renewal of licences under the Broadcasting and Television Act 1942.

Commonwealth Employment Service Act 1978 (Act No. 102 of 1978)—
An Act to establish a Commonwealth Employment Service, and for other purposes.

Continental Shelf (Living Natural Resources) Act 1978 (Act No. 100 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Continental Shelf (Living Natural Resources) Act 1968.

Customs Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 183 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Customs Act 1901 in respect of certain matters relating to the value of goods for duty.

Customs Tariff Amendment Act (No. 3) 1978 (Act No. 101 of 1978)—
An Act relating to duties of Customs.

Customs Tariff Amendment Act (No. 4) 1978 (Act No. 185 of 1978)—
An Act relating to duties of customs.

Dairying Industry Research and Promotion Levy Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 138 of 1978)—

Dairying Industry Research and Promotion Levy Collection Act 1978 (Act No. 139 of 1978)—
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Defence Service Homes Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 137 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Defence Service Homes Act 1918.

Departure Tax Act 1978 (Act No. 118 of 1978)—
An Act to impose a tax in respect of the departure of persons from Australia.

Departure Tax Collection Act 1978 (Act No. 119 of 1978)—
An Act relating to taxation imposed in respect of the departure of persons from Australia.

Diplomatic and Consular Missions Act 1978 (Act No. 98 of 1978)—
An Act to prevent the improper use of diplomatic and consular signs and titles.

Dried Fruits Export Charges Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 196 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Dried Fruits Export Charges Act 1924.

An Act to provide for an equalization scheme in respect of the proceeds of sales of dried vine fruits, and for related purposes.

An Act to impose a levy upon certain dried vine fruits for the purposes of an equalization scheme in respect of the proceeds of sales of dried vine fruits.


Dried Vine Fruits Stabilization Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 135 of 1978)—

Excise Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 110 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Excise Act 1901 to provide for rebates of Excise Duty imposed on stabilized crude petroleum oil.

Excise Tariff Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 184 of 1978)—
An Act relating to duties of excise.

An Act relating to grants for the purpose of providing incentives for the expansion of exports.

Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 163 of 1978)—


Fisheries Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 99 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Fisheries Act 1952.

Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 140 of 1978)—

Health Insurance Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 133 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Health Insurance Act 1973, and for other purposes.

Health Insurance Commission Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 134 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Health Insurance Commission Act 1973, and for related purposes.

Health Insurance Levy Act 1978 (Act No. 127 of 1978)—
An Act to impose a health insurance levy upon certain incomes.

Homeless Persons Assistance Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 114 of 1978)—

Income Tax Assessment Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 123 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936, and for related purposes.

Income Tax Assessment Amendment Act (No. 3) 1978 (Act No. 171 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936, and for related purposes.

Income Tax Assessment Amendment Act (No. 4) 1978 (Act No. 172 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Income Tax Assessment Act 1936, and for related purposes.

Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Act 1978 (Act No. 126 of 1978)—
An Act to impose a tax upon incomes of companies and superannuation funds.

Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 174 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Act 1978.

An Act to impose a tax upon incomes, other than incomes of companies and of superannuation funds.

An Act to impose income tax upon the reduced taxable income of non-resident companies.

Income Tax (Rates) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 124 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the law declaring certain rates of income tax.
ACTS OF THE SESSION—continued

Income Tax (Rates) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 175 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the law declaring certain rates of income tax.

Industrial Research and Development Incentives Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 211 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act 1976.

International Monetary Agreements Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 97 of 1978)—
An Act relating to the International Monetary Fund and to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory (Remuneration and Allowances) Act 1978 (Act No. 104 of 1978)—
An Act relating to remuneration and allowances of Members of the Legislative Assembly of the Northern Territory.

Life Insurance Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 177 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Life Insurance Act 1945.

Livestock Diseases Act 1978 (Act No. 181 of 1978)—
An Act to make provision for and in relation to the control and eradication of exotic diseases affecting livestock.

Live-stock Export Charge Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 180 of 1978)—

Live-stock Slaughter Levy Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 179 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Live-stock Slaughter Levy Act 1964.

Loan Act 1978 (Act No. 106 of 1978)—
An Act to authorise the borrowing and expending of moneys for defence purposes.

Loans (Taxation Exemption) Act 1978 (Act No. 160 of 1978)—
An Act to provide for the exemption from taxation of certain documents and payments relating to certain overseas borrowings by or on behalf of the Commonwealth.

Maternity Leave (Australian Government Employees) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 168 of 1978)—


National Health Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 132 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the National Health Act 1953, and for other purposes.

National Health Amendment Act (No. 3) 1978 (Act No. 189 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the National Health Act 1953.

New South Wales Grant (Chrysotile Corporation) Act 1978 (Act No. 190 of 1978)—
An Act to grant financial assistance to New South Wales in relation to Chrysotile Corporation.

Nitrogenous Fertilizers Subsidy Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 112 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Nitrogenous Fertilizers Subsidy Act 1966.

Patents Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 131 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Patents Act 1952.

Pig Slaughter Levy Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 111 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Pig Slaughter Levy Act 1971.

Primary Industry Bank Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 167 of 1978)—

Public Service Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 170 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Public Service Act 1922, and for related purposes.

Qantas Airways Limited (Loan Guarantee) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 186 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Qantas Airways Limited (Loan Guaranteed) Act 1978.

Queensland Grant (Special Assistance) Act 1978 (Act No. 191 of 1978)—
An Act to grant financial assistance to Queensland.

Re-establishment and Employment Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 103 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Re-establishment and Employment Act 1945.

Remuneration and Allowances Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 166 of 1978)—
An Act relating to the remuneration and allowances payable to the holders of certain judicial and other offices, and for other purposes.

Remuneration Tribunals Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 178 of 1978)—

An Act relating to Repatriation and related matters.
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Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 1) 1978 (Act No. 144 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 1) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 145 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 2) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 3) 1978 (Act No. 146 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 3) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 4) 1978 (Act No. 147 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 4) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 5) 1978 (Act No. 148 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 5) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 6) 1978 (Act No. 149 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 6) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 7) 1978 (Act No. 150 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 7) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 8) 1978 (Act No. 151 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 8) 1930.

Sales Tax Amendment Act (No. 9) 1978 (Act No. 152 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Act (No. 9) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 1) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 197 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 1) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 2) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 198 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 2) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 3) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 199 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 3) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 4) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 200 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 4) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 5) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 201 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 5) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 6) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 202 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 6) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 7) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 203 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 7) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 8) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 204 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 8) 1930.

Sales Tax Assessment (No. 9) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 205 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax Assessment Act (No. 9) 1930.

Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 107 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Act 1935, and for related purposes.

Science and Industry Research Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 143 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Science and Industry Research Act 1949.

Social Services Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 128 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Social Services Act 1947.

An Act to grant financial assistance to the States in connection with expenditure of a capital nature
and to authorize the borrowing of certain moneys by the Commonwealth.

States Grants (Home Care) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 113 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Home Care) Act 1969.

States Grants (Roads) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 159 of 1978)—

States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act 1978 (Act No. 187 of 1978)—
An Act relating to the grant of financial assistance to the States for and in relation to schools.

States Grants (Tertiary Education Assistance) Act 1978 (Act No. 188 of 1978)—
An Act relating to the grant of financial assistance to the States in connection with universities, colleges
of advanced education and technical and further education institutions.

Superannuation Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 169 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Superannuation Act 1976.

Tasmania Grant (The Mount Lyell Mining and Railway Company Limited) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978
(Act No. 157 of 1978)—
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Trade Marks Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 130 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Trade Marks Act 1955.

An Act relating to Trade Practices.

Trade Practices Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 207 of 1978)—
An Act relating to Trade Practices.

Trade Union Training Authority Amendment Act (No. 2) 1978 (Act No. 209 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Trade Union Training Authority Act 1975.

Weights and Measures (National Standards) Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 158 of 1978)—

Wheat Industry Stabilization Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 165 of 1978)—

Wheat Research Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 117 of 1978)—
An Act to amend the Wheat Research Act 1957.

Wheat Tax Amendment Act 1978 (Act No. 116 of 1978)—
An Act to amend section 5 of the Wheat Tax Act 1957.
THE BILLS OF THE SESSION

(FIRST SESSION: SECOND PERIOD)

Audit Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Second Reading.

Casey University—Australian Defence Force Academy Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Cocos (Keeling) Islands Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Commonwealth Authorities (Northern Territory Pay-roll Tax) Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.

Criminology Research Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Income Tax Assessment Amendment Bill (No. 5) 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Norfolk Island Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Postal Services Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Poultry Industry Assistance Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.

Quarantine Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.

Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Amendment Bill (No. 2) 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.

States Grants (Urban Public Transport) Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. First Reading.

Whaling Amendment Bill 1978—
Initiated in the House of Representatives. Third Reading.
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remuneration And Allowances Amendment Bill 1978</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY IN PARLIAMENT HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traders' Rights Amendment Bill 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Marks Amendment Bill 1978</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bills Returned From The Senate</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Law Act 1975: Proposed Joint Select Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Senate Message</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 1</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause 2</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Finance</td>
<td>1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Situation</td>
<td>1304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministerial Statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preamble</td>
<td>1305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationing of Forces</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assent To Bills</td>
<td>1307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A National Museums Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why Museums?</td>
<td>1326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>1328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Rosander, M.A. July 1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjournment</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood Mitigation - Nomad Aircraft - The Parliament- Pecuniary Interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
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</table>

**QUESTIONS IN WRITING**

Answers To Questions Upon Notice

- Hydrogen Gas (Question No. 21)                                          | 1336 |
- Coal Research (Question No. 740)                                        |      |
- Public Servants: Payment of Telephone Charges (Question No. 1100)       |      |
- Advisory and Consultative Committees: Inclusion of Members of Parliament (Question No. 1140) | 1337 |
- National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council: Priorities (Question No. 1420) | 1337 |
- Recycling of Waste Materials (Question No. 1451)                         |      |
- Energy Research and Development (Question No. 1539)                      |      |
- Surveys of Household Expenditure (Question No. 1659)                    |      |
- Distribution of Cables to Parliamentary Advisers at Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly (Question No. 1662) | 1338 |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1564 (Question No. 1972)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1565 (Question No. 1973)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1566 (Question No. 1974)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1567 (Question No. 1975)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1568 (Question No. 1976)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1569 (Question No. 1977)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1570 (Question No. 1978)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1571 (Question No. 1979)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1572 (Question No. 1980)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1574 (Question No. 1981)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1579 (Question No. 1982)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1580 (Question No. 1983)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1581 (Question No. 1984)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1582 (Question No. 1985)               |      |
- Answer to Parliamentary Question 1583 (Question No. 1986)               |      |
Mr SPEAKER (Rt Hon. Sir Billy Snedden) took the chair at 10.30 a.m., and read prayers.

PETITIONS

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

Royal Commission on Human Relationships

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

That because the Report of the Royal Commission on Human Relationships and especially its recommendations—

(a) Have been widely condemned for its support of un-Australian, anti-family, anti-child behaviour and morals such as incest, promiscuity, abortion, pornography, homosexuality, prostitution and brothels, etc.

(b) Have been strongly criticised by the medical profession for the absence of any medical practitioner on the Commission or on its staff of 31 persons, and for the Commissioners action in rejecting or ignoring relevant medical evidence.

(c) Have been discredited as irresponsible in adopting a new definition of the family, i.e., "a varying range of people living together in relationships of commitment", which has effectively confused the real meaning and intentions of the Report where it refers to the 'family'.

Therefore the Parliament has a responsibility to the families of Australia not to adopt this controversial Report and its recommendations.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray:

That the Australian Parliament will—

(a) Simply receive the Report and not adopt its recommendations,

(b) Set up a Select Parliamentary Committee along the lines of the New Zealand Select Committee to conduct a public inquiry into the ways and means of supporting and strengthening family life and providing adequate protection for children from physical and sexual abuse before as well as after birth in accordance with the UNO Declaration of the Rights of the Child as part of Australia's support for the Year of the Child.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will take no measures concerning the Royal Commission on Human Relationships Report that will further undermine and weaken marriage, child-care or the family which is the basic unit of our society.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Cadman, Mr Gillard and Mr Keating.

Petitions received.

Post Graduate Research Awards

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned, members of the Sydney University Post Graduate Representative Association, and like people, respectfully shoveth that the Government decision to tax Commonwealth Post Graduate Research Awards will result in:

(a) a further serious decline in living standards for post-graduate scholars performing valuable low cost research for the Australian community and

(b) a reduction in the standard of research at the universities as top scholars will be forced to reject offers of inadequately financed Research Awards.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the House will reverse the decision to tax Commonwealth Postgraduate Research Awards and revert to the former policy of annual adjustments in line with the Consumer Price Index.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Bryant and Mr Lusher.

Petitions received.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

To the Honourable the Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of Commonwealth employees of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics (BAE) respectfully shoveth:

that BAE staff are scheduled to be relocated in Macarthur House, Canberra; and

that they are gravely concerned at the adverse effects of space allocations in Macarthur House on working environment, professionalism and productivity; and

that they desire to remind Honourable Members that the BAE, being heavily engaged in research projects, must be allocated suitable accommodation space to establish an environment suitable for those functions; and

that Government decisions governing space allocations for Commonwealth officers have scant regard for differing functions of Commonwealth clerical/administrative classifications and in particular those in research classifications; and

that the guidelines for Commonwealth office accommodation are not generally practicable for establishments, and for the BAE in particular, being mindful of the number of officers employed and the service areas operated within them—

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that Honourable Members of the House of Representatives will seek to ensure that Government decisions affecting the accommodation of BAE officers are so framed and administered as not to impair the work and professional reputation of the BAE and its officers.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Fry and Mr Haslem.

Petitions received.

Medical Benefits: Abortions

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

1. As Section 6469 on Health Refunds is the number for a curette and abortion, to remove Medical Rebate for No. 6469 would be penalising thousands of women, (particularly those aged 50 years and over) who must have a curette for medical reasons having nothing to do with pregnancy.

2. Furthermore your petitioners desire to draw to the Government's attention that removal of No. 6469 would
transgress a woman's right to the rebate available via medical health insurance.

3. Furthermore, the removal of No. 6469 would be a discrimination against women, as rebates are paid for vasectomy and prostate operations for males.

Your petitioners strongly oppose the removal of No. 6469 from the Medical Rebate list.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Bryant.

Petition received.

Unemployment

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

1. We petition that the Australian Government should take urgent action to reduce the level of unemployment.

2. We request that the Government makes firm and public commitments regarding its policies for the reduction of unemployment.

3. We request that these commitments include target dates for the progressive reduction of unemployment.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Falconer.

Petition received.

Mr Luigi Pochi

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:

Mr Luigi Pochi of 96 Macfarland Crescent, Pearce, was sentenced to 2 years imprisonment in the Griffith District Court in 1977 on charges arising from the cultivation of marijuana. He was released after one year on a good behaviour bond, and is now in permanent employment.

A Deportation Order was served on Mr Pochi on 7 August 1978.

Mr Pochi has been a resident of Australia for nearly 19 years. He married in 1962. His wife, Rosa, and their three children (aged 13, 14 and 6), are Australian citizens.

Mr Pochi applied for citizenship in 1972, but allowed his application to lapse. The immediate relatives of both Mr and Mrs Pochi are living in Australia.

Mr Pochi has served his sentence and repaid his debt to society.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Minister of State for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, Mr MacKellar, reverse the Deportation Order, which is a brutal penalty, not only on Mr Pochi, but on his wife and family, and as such represents a gross miscarriage of justice and a denial of basic human rights.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Fry.

Petition received.

Economic Policies

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

1. That the latest Fraser Budget will severely contract the Australian Economy, reducing employment and the standard of living of Australian workers.

2. That increases in taxation and the abolition of taxation concessions will boost the cost of living for the average Australian worker by some $12 a week. The average Australian earning $200 a week will be forced to meet the following additional costs from the weekly pay packet:

   - $1.80 for petrol
   - $2.00 for cigarettes and drink
   - $1.50 for clothing and footwear
   - $3.50 for mortgage repayments
   - $3.20 for the income tax surcharge

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the House will request the Fraser Government to abandon its present restrictive economic policies in favour of the expansionary alternative Budget outlined to the House of Representatives by Opposition leader Bill Hayden on 22 August, as this alternative Budget would reduce the cost of living, boost employment and generate strong economic growth.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Hayden.

Petition received.

Aged Persons Accommodation

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

(a) That surveys reveal a substantial percentage of adults over the age of 55 years in the Loftus-Engadine-Heathcote and Waterfall areas of the Hughes electorate, are in urgent need of special housing and nursing home accommodation.

(b) That many families in the area are experiencing difficulty in the placing of their aged parents in suitable nursing care; many cases having to be placed in care many kilometres from their families and consequently causing great strain on the relatives concerned.

(c) That this problem is aggravated by this area's geographical and public transport isolation from the rest of the Sutherland Shire.

(d) That Government subsidises nursing homes in other parts of the Hughes and Cook electorates have long waiting lists and in fact, have closed their lists to further inquirers.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the House of Representatives in Parliament assembled will—

1. Acknowledge that there is a need for the construction of an aged persons complex in this area as already acknowledged by the Federal/State Co-ordinating Committee for Nursing-Home accommodation in N.S.W.

2. Take immediate action to provide sufficient funds in the current financial year to finance the construction and maintenance of an aged-persons complex, providing hostel and nursing bed accommodation in this area.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Les Johnson.

Petition received.

Pornographic Publications

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

That we the undersigned, having great concern at the way in which children are now being used in the production of
pornography call upon the Government to introduce immediate legislation:

1. To prevent the sexual exploitation of children by way of photography for commercial purposes;

2. To penalise parents/guardians who knowingly allow their children to be used in the production of such pornographic or obscene material depicting children;

3. To make specifically illegal the importation, publication, distribution and sale of such pornographic child-abuse material in any form whatsoever such as magazines, towels, papers or films;

4. To take immediate police action to confiscate and destroy all child pornography in Australia and urgent appropriate legal action against all those involved or profiting from this sordid exploitation of children.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable House will protect all children and immediately prohibit pornographic child-abuse materials, publications or films.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Neil.

Petition received.

South Australian Country Rail Services

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

1. That any downgrading or closures of Country Rail Services in South Australia would have grave consequences for the Railway Industry, Primary Industry, Individual Country Communities and the State as a whole and calls on the Parliament to ensure that the Federal Minister for Transport takes the necessary action to maintain all existing services.

2. That continued and increased Public Subsidy is fully justified in the long term National Interest.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Wallis.

Petition received.

National Family Policy

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

That 'the family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the state'.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the government initiate a national family policy and use the concept of family impact statements as a means of highlighting family needs.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Mr Wilson.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS

Mr HOWE—Is the Prime Minister aware of statements made in Darwin by the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs concerning the future of Aboriginal land rights legislation? Is the Prime Minister aware that these statements have been interpreted as a threat by several members of the Northern Land Council? Will the Prime Minister give the Northern Land Council and this House an assurance that the Government will not in any way, through legislation or otherwise, weaken the Northern Land Council or the land rights legislation should the present situation in the Northern Territory not produce a favourable result for the Government?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The Government has already demonstrated its commitment to the Northern Land Council under the land rights legislation in the Northern Territory and it has demonstrated that in very firm and cogent ways. Titles have already been issued to a number of communities. This stands as a proud record of this Government in bringing to fruition policies which I had thought had the support of all members of this Parliament, and I have no doubt that the Government's policies in relation to land rights will be maintained and continued. If any implications of threat were read from my colleague's remarks, I am quite sure that the person who drew those implications would be drawing them wrongly and falsely. Quite plainly the Government has, I think, a cause to be concerned when a properly constituted decision of the Northern Land Council immediately comes under challenge and under threat in quite unconstructive ways by members of the Australian Labor Party. I would be very grateful for a similar commitment from all members of the Australian Labor Party not to play politics with the wellbeing of the Aboriginal people.

BRISBANE AIRPORT

Mr KEVIN CAIRNS—I direct to the Minister for Transport a question relating to Brisbane Airport. When will the co-ordinated discussions begin with the Queensland Government and the Brisbane City Council on drawing up a detailed time-table for the Brisbane Airport project? Is the Government still committed to completion of the project by early 1986? What matters have to be finalised with the Queensland Government and the Brisbane City Council before actual work can commence? Can the Minister indicate whether any environmental study has been
made on Brisbane Airport and, if so, whether this will be made public?

Mr NIXON—The joint Commonwealth, State and Brisbane City Council committee is in fact meeting in Brisbane today. It is the first meeting to try to draw up a time-table for the redevelopment and construction of the new Brisbane Airport. A number of important works have to be considered, such as the floodway works, the movement area drainage, the main outfall for building area drainage, the pavements for runway and field taxiways and the clearing of approachways. In addition, there have to be discussions between the Queensland Government and the Brisbane City Council about access roads and the like. All in all it is a very big construction task. The time-table will be laid down. It is the Government’s intention to stick to the time-table that we had earlier worked out as being a possibility, that is, the completion of stage 1 by 1986. The honourable member asked a question about the environmental impact study. I will have to check to see at what stage that is. I will let the honourable member know.

QUEENSLAND ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Mr HAYDEN—I ask the Prime Minister a question. Did any other Minister besides the former Minister for Administrative Services speak to the Chief Electoral Officer in relation to the last redistribution of federal boundaries? Explicitly, did the Prime Minister speak to the Chief Electoral Officer at any time? If so, what was the basis of that discussion?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I do not believe that I spoke to the Chief Electoral Officer at any time. I certainly—

Mr Cohen—Did you or didn’t you?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I do not recollect every occasion on which I speak with all public servants. If I did speak to the Chief Electoral Officer, I believe it would have been in the presence of Senator Withers. This matter has been thrashed through inordinately and, on the particular matter in relation to the change of name, I can guarantee that I did not speak to the Chief Electoral Officer.

AIRPORT CAR RENTALS

Mr BURNS—Has the Minister for Transport received a letter from Budget Rent-a-Car claiming the proposed terms of tender for airport car rentals are constructed in such a way that only Avis can win the national position? If this is so, will he consider changing the terms of contract so that all national operators can have an opportunity to compete?

Mr NIXON—I should point out in the first instance that the draft tender form that has been issued for discussion with interested groups is designed, in my view, to seek competition from those who want to compete. Having said that, I should point out that I have had a visit from Mr Bob Ansett of Budget Rent-a-Car and, since then, I have received a letter from him in which he states that in his view it is not possible for anybody to compete on a proper basis with Avis. I have told Mr Bob Ansett that I will look at what he has put to me and of course consider that before final decisions are made about tendering. I make the point that in Mr Bob Ansett’s letter to me I do not think he has come up hard to the questions that I put to him in a way that satisfies me at this point. I have asked my Department to go back to him and hold further discussions about the point that is made. Certainly consideration will be given to the points that he has made. What I am seeking to do, of course, is to get the best service for the people of Australia. I am really not terribly interested whether it is Budget, Hertz Rent-A-Car or Avis that wins the final tenders.

BROADCASTING AND TELEVISING OF ELECTION MATERIAL

Mr LIONEL BOWEN—I direct a question to the Minister for Post and Telecommunications. I refer to the Werriwa by-election to be held next Saturday which would bring into operation section 116 of the Broadcasting and Television Act, which prevents the use for broadcasting or television purposes of any election matter. Has the Minister seen advertisements in today’s newspapers indicating that there will be television programs and radio programs this evening advertising the Liberal Party’s State election policy speech by Mr Coleman? In view of the Werriwa by-election, has the Minister or the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal notified all radio and television stations that to broadcast comment or material from that policy speech before next Saturday night would be in contravention of sub-section 4 of section 116 of the Broadcasting and Television Act? Has the Minister informed all television and radio stations that this applies also to political advertising?

Mr Sainsbury—Frightened of what he is going to say?

Mr LIONEL BOWEN—No, it is just a question of law.
Mr STALEY—The question is complex and the particular matters are matters for the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal. I might say that I believe that the law needs examination to see whether changes ought to be made in order that situations like the one raised by the honourable member can be looked at. When I bring to the Government next year the question of amendments of a significant nature to the Broadcasting and Television Act, I will particularly ask the Government to consider this type of matter. In the meantime, any question of contravention is one for the Australian Broadcasting Tribunal.

AUSTRALIAN AIRLINES

Mr BRAITHWAITE—Is the Minister for Transport aware of the comparison of operating costs per tonne per kilometre travelled between major world airlines and the two Australian airlines as presented in the 19 September issue of the Bulletin in an article headed 'Two Airline Policy is strangling efficiency'? The comparison shows operating costs for the Australian airlines at $US0.78 as compared with the lowest operating costs of $US0.42.2 for an American airline. Does the Minister believe that these additional costs can all be attributed to the Australian airlines' excellent safety record, or that immediate rationalisation is necessary in the airline industry in rescheduling, administration and staffing and in in-flight service to reduce operating costs so as to make air travel available to more people and to assist Australia's own domestic tourist industry? Also, in view of these unfavourable comparative costs, does the Minister believe that a further increase of 7½ per cent in domestic air fares is warranted?

Mr NIXON—Taking the last part of the honourable member's question first, I of course have my Department investigating the claim that has come in from the airlines for an increase in air fares. I will be in a position to give an answer on that at a later point. Insofar as the article in the Bulletin is concerned, what the writer purports to do is to come to conclusions which the Domestic Aviation Policy Review Committee was not able to reach. The writer also tended to make judgments which the Review Committee was not prepared to make. For my part, I would back the work of the Review Committee against the skill of the person who wrote the article in order to help sell the magazine.

The fact is that the Committee concluded that insufficient evidence and information were available to come to that conclusion. In terms of costs, I should point out to the House that there has been a wide-ranging argument about the level of air fares on the domestic scene in Australia. This is one example of the sort of debate that is going on in the community.

Let me give some information to the House. This is information which is hard to equate as between one country and another because of other factors which we are not able to ascertain. Nevertheless, in the broad, on an economy fare the rate on a cents per kilometre basis from Melbourne to Sydney is 7.93c and from Melbourne to Canberra 8.21c. From Montreal to Toronto the rate is 9.7c, from Frankfurt to Munich 11.68c, from Wellington to Auckland 8.55c, from London to Edinburgh 7.42c, from Vienna to Graz 8.17c, and from Washington to New York 5.34c return. That shows that a range of domestic air fares in other countries is in fact either around the same price as or dearer than in Australia. People therefore should not rush to quick conclusions that the Australian air fare structure is much dearer, or in fact dearer at all, than international domestic air fare structures.

AUSTRALIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE ORGANISATION

Mr CLYDE CAMERON—I preface my question to the Prime Minister by referring to an article in today's Melbourne Sun which reports the Prime Minister as having denied that he was briefed by Mr Whitlam on the reason for the dismissal of the then Director-General of the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation, and that Mr Whitlam briefed him on an alleged infiltration of ASIO by the KGB. Since only the Prime Minister and Mr Whitlam would be privy to the briefing if it did take place, firstly, will the Prime Minister say whether the report is correct and, secondly, will he state whether he told anybody else about it?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I think that report might have come out of a comment I made last night. I indicated that I had heard of this current round of reports only when I was in Niue. It is correct that Mr Whitlam said something to me about Mr Barbour when that matter became public and also about some part of the reason for it. If there was a misunderstanding from what I indicated last night, I regret that; but it was in relation to the report which has come out over the last day or two and which I heard about when I was in Niue. The other matter Mr Whitlam had referred to me. I think it might have been behind the chair in this House that he first did it, which in a sense indicates the nature of the conversation.

So far as ASIO is concerned, the only thing I will do in relation to the rest of the question is to
follow the course taken by other Prime Ministers, including Mr Whitlam, and that is not to say in answer to a question anything that would confirm or deny allegations in relation to that Organisation. I draw the attention of the House to the fact that a royal commission report in relation to ASIO has been received from a most learned and respected judge and the Government has acted upon that. I also draw attention to the fact that the present Director-General of ASIO was appointed by the previous Government and certainly has the confidence of this Government. I hope very much that he still has the confidence of the Australian Labor Party.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr DEAN—My question, which is addressed to the Minister for Special Trade Representations, relates to the disruptive effect of European Economic Community policies on international trade. As a result of pressure from Australia and other countries, especially in the current multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, is the EEC yet showing any sign of moderating the effect of its policies? In his answer will the Minister make particular reference to the sugar industry?

Mr GARLAND—As the house will recall, my predecessor, the present Treasurer, left with the EEC a note of some 25 representations which were the result of Australia’s having lost exports to the Community of over 80 per cent of its agricultural products. That loss was brought about by the method of the common agricultural policy and the use of a variable price levy, which effectively denies most access to the Community and, in addition, results in highly subsidised exports which are dumped on third markets around the world that otherwise would be ours, if only commercial considerations applied. The EEC has responded that it wants those matters discussed in the context of the Multilateral Trade Negotiations that are going on, principally in Geneva. Of course, while this is happening our balance of payments position with the Community is worsening. Australia already is in deficit by some $2.5 billion largely as a result of the unequal trading opportunities. The Community is subsidising exports to the tune of $4 billion in this current year. We have been seeing the effect of this recently, particularly in respect of sugar.

There are some small indications—they are only small—of some movement. For instance, the Community has held out the prospect of some marginal benefits by an agreement on prefixation of levies for frozen beef and the amelioration of some of the difficulties in respect of veterinary matters. There is also a steel arrangement, although the delay in finalising this arrangement has certainly weakened its value to Australia in 1978. There is also some indication of a restoration of previous tariff treatment for buffalo meat. But agreement on the main issues—in respect of export subsidies, in which of course the United States of America is also particularly interested, binding access commitments for beef, dairy products and fruit and the Community’s participation in the International Sugar Agreement—is outstanding and the Community’s response to our industrial tariff offer has been so far insignificant. Some 4 million tonnes of sugar are being dumped by the Community on world markets and most of this is being subsidised at the rate of two to three times the world price. This was rightly described yesterday by the Deputy Prime Minister as outrageous behaviour. Indeed, it is far worse than anything indicated to Australia by the EEC Commission. This matter is one of the 25 representations I mentioned. The Government will seek a special Council meeting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to deal with these trading practices. We would expect that from that meeting a panel would be set up which would have the effect of testing the effectiveness, and indeed the genuineness, of Article 16 of GATT. We will see from those proceedings whether the Agreement really works. Another example of an area——

Mr SPEAKER—I ask the Minister to draw his answer to a conclusion.

Mr GARLAND—Yes, Mr Speaker. I just want to indicate a second example of a worsening position which relates to Australian exports of canned fruit to the Community. From the beginning of July this year the EEC introduced a system of production subsidies on some canned fruits including canned peaches. It is expected that the effect of this subsidy will be to permit canned peaches produced by the community to be sold at prices substantially below the duty paid price of imports. This will introduce a new element of preference for Community producers which parallels the preference provided by the import levy system. In the light of these facts, the Government will continue to carry on vigorous negotiations with the Community in order to expand the access for our agricultural products to the Community and around the world.
BAUXITE MINING IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Mr COHEN—Has the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development received representations from groups in Western Australia who are concerned at the proposal by Alcoa of Australia Ltd to mine bauxite at Wagerup and who are seeking a public inquiry? What is his response and does the Government propose to initiate a public inquiry?

Mr Nixon—Are you opposed to that, too?

Mr COHEN—We are not opposed to it. We just want to know a great deal more about it at this stage because it is a matter of great concern to the people of Western Australia and, particularly, the people of Perth.

Mr GROOM—Yes, I have received representations from a number of groups in Western Australia—when I was in Perth, here in Canberra and also recently in Melbourne when a lady made an approach to me. There are two proposals on the bauxite issue in the West. One is the Wagerup proposal by Alcoa of Australia Ltd to mine and refine bauxite. The other is the Worsley proposal by a group of companies—Alwest Pty Ltd, Dampier Mining Co. Ltd and Reynolds Australia Alumina Ltd. Both of these proposals come within the Commonwealth legislation and the Commonwealth officers of my Department are working very closely in association with the Western Australian officers to determine what impact these proposals might have on the environment. I must say that the officers of the Commonwealth and the Western Australian department are working very closely together and it is pleasing to see this sort of co-operation.

As far as the Wagerup proposal is concerned, the public review period is over and Alcoa is preparing its final impact statement taking into account the public comment that has been already received. As far as the other project is concerned, there is a 56-day period for public comment which has run from 22 August and which I think concludes on 16 October of this year. When that public review period is over, of course the company will be required to take into account public comment that has been received from various people who are interested in the proposal. Ultimately a final impact statement will be prepared both under the Federal legislation and under the Western Australian administrative provisions. It certainly is too early to determine the Government’s attitude to the environmental impact statement which is being prepared. However, I want to say that if the Government should at any stage be considering an inquiry under the arrangements that have been agreed upon between the Western Australian Government and the Commonwealth Government it would be necessary for me to consult with the Western Australian Minister on that issue. At this stage I want to make it clear to the honourable member that I have not seen fit for obvious reasons to consult with the Western Australian Minister on that issue.

INTERNATIONAL AIR TRAVEL

Mr BAILLIEU—My question which I direct to the Minister for Transport relates to the general question of air fares and particularly to the Government’s objective of introducing lower air fares for international travel. Is the Minister aware that the Australian Council of Trade Unions in a joint arrangement with Jetset Tours (Australia) Pty Ltd is proposing to launch a major program whereby members of the ACTU and affiliated unions will be offered what are alleged to be travel subsidies for international travel? Is the Minister aware that the travel industry believes that such a scheme could seriously undermine the stability of the international travel industry in Australia and jeopardise the Government’s efforts to introduce a range of lower international air fares that are available to all Australians?

Mr NIXON—I must compliment the honourable member for La Trobe for the intelligent interest that he has taken in the negotiations that we are undertaking to secure a regime of lower air fares in and out of Australia. It is a pity that some spokesmen of the Opposition did not take a like intelligent interest. If they did so they might learn something.

Mr Morris—Certainly not from you. You still need lessons.

Mr NIXON—the honourable member’s intelligence is equalled only by his stupidity. I am extremely concerned—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The Minister will resume his seat. The honourable member for Robertson has interjected continually this morning. I ask him to remain silent. The honourable member for Shortland should listen to the answer. I ask all honourable members to behave in an appropriate fashion at Question Time.

Mr NIXON—I am concerned about the proposals put forward by ACTU Jetset because, as I understand them, they are discriminatory in their form. We are concerned in this country to try to overcome some of the problems that have emerged in international travel schemes and arrangements put forward by travel agents over a
period. As I understand it, this particular scheme is a device designed to by-pass the regulatory arrangements which are the foundation of Australia’s bilateral air services with other countries. I think it is very important that all travel agents be able to compete on an equal basis with a clear understanding as to the ground rules. If I am able to change the ground rules as a result of negotiations with other countries, that will be time enough, but until those ground rules are changed I would expect all travel agents to obey the ground rules as they are presently laid down.

I am having the proposals put down by ACTU Jetset investigated by the Attorney General’s Department because, if they are discriminatory, it means that its travellers are being cross-subsidised in a fashion that is not proper or correct by other travellers leaving this country. Therefore, I just lay it on the table that those people who are considering travelling with ACTU Jetset ought to get an undertaking from ACTU Jetset that their travel arrangements can be honoured. As I said I am taking this matter up with the Attorney-General’s Department.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr HAYDEN—I ask the Treasurer a question. I refer to the fact that Government spending in the first two months of this financial year increased by 13.4 per cent compared with a projected increase for the full year of 7.7 per cent. Does this mean a marked contraction in Government spending for the rest of the year with consequential contractionary effects on the economy or a substantial blowing out of the project deficit of $2.8m?

Mr HOWARD—The answer to the question is no. The honourable gentleman ought to wait before he gets excited about the Niemeyer statements for the first two months. One of the principal reasons why Government spending in the first two months is higher than projected is that there was an extra pension pay period in August.

FUEL LEVY

Mr FISHER—My question is directed to the Minister for Transport. The Minister will be aware of proposals suggesting the application of an additional fuel levy to replace various road taxes. Has the Federal Government received submissions from any State governments on this matter which indicate their preparedness to forgo road maintenance taxes, motor registration or licensing fees in favour of a one-up tax?

Mr NIXON—So far as I am aware, the Government has not received any proposition to replace registration charges with a fuel tax. We have received suggestions from the States from time to time that the States’ own tax, the road maintenance tax, ought to be abolished and replaced by a fuel tax. As I have explained to the House before, it is a State tax. The States are responsible for the tax and it is quite within their own competence to change the form of the tax if they do not like it. The total amount raised by road maintenance taxes throughout Australia is only about $44m and in the State of Victoria, for example, the Victorian Government recoups about $10m from the road maintenance tax.

If this tax is is discriminatory and difficult as the States make out, why do they not face up to the situation and abolish it? After all, Victoria, for example, has received an extra $100m or thereabouts this year under the general revenue assistance plan. It ought therefore to be within the competence of Victorians to face up to their own responsibilities and abolish the tax. Under the federalist approach that this Government takes we believe that the State governments ought to be responsible and take a responsible attitude about any taxes that they control. In my view there is no chance that the Commonwealth will replace the road maintenance tax with a fuel levy. The question has been considered and discarded because we do not believe in the principle of hypothecation of taxes in the first instance. Again I make the point that we believe that the States ought to be responsible for the taxes that they themselves raise.

DEFENCE PROCUREMENT

Mr SCHOLES—I ask the Prime Minister whether he is correctly reported in a letter in the Pacific Defence Reporter which appears above his name. Does he confirm the statement in that report which indicates that the long term future of defence procurement items for Australia rests with overseas suppliers rather than Australian suppliers? Does that statement reflect government policy and is that objective the reason why the Nomad aircraft has been excluded from the specifications for the supply of equipment for surveillance ordered by the Department of Transport?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—The Government has a very firm policy, which is not restricted to any one area of activity, of buying Australian made goods where that is possible. The decision in relation to that policy has also quite specifically referred departments and people to the fact that where possible we want them to make quite sure that specifications are not drawn in such a way that they might exclude Australian
tenders from any particular government contract. That applies in the surveillance area, the transport area and the defence area.

The plain fact is that for some types but not all types of defence equipment it is likely that the principal sources of supply for the foreseeable future are overseas countries. I know quite well that my colleague the Minister for Defence, within the broad thrust of government policy, within specific Defence Force needs and to the best of his capacity within the funds available, has sought to make sure that as much as possible of the Department of Defence vote is spent on the purchase of Australian equipment. I will check my recollection of that letter that appeared in the Pacific Defence Reporter and I will see if there is any need to add—

Mr Scholes—What about the Nomad being excluded?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—That still falls within the general policy guidelines that I have indicated. It would be excluded only on the basis that it did not meet the particular requirements that were necessary for the task in train.

SOUTH AFRICA

Mr SIMON—My question is directed to the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs. It relates to the resignation of Mr Vorster as Prime Minister of South Africa. Does the Minister believe that the change of leadership in South Africa will assist black South Africans in obtaining basic human rights? Does he believe that the inhumane practice of apartheid will in any way be relaxed?

Mr SINCLAIR—Of course it is quite impossible for anybody in Australia to determine future attitudes or views of the political heads of other states or countries. It is true, however, that I think we can understand something of the apparent ill health of the retiring Prime Minister of South Africa, given the tremendous stress under which I think the Government of that country must work. From our point of view, we certainly are concerned about the attitudes and views that have been expressed by him and by his colleague Ministers about apartheid and relations between the coloured people and the white settlers of South Africa.

It is a country which, for so long, was very close to Australia. It is most unfortunate that in its political views and attitudes in the racial sphere it now seems to have pursued a course which is in complete conflict with the attitudes and views of so many Australians. I would hope that under the change of leadership perhaps there might be a recognition of the very strongly held views of people of this country and indeed through most of the Western world that there might be some reconciliation between the white and the coloured peoples in South Africa. Certainly if that took place it would be a move very much welcomed in this country.

QBE INSURANCE LTD

Mr HOLDING—I ask a question of the Minister for Industry and Commerce. I draw his attention to recent public allegations made by the honourable member for Lalor wherein it has been admitted that the Minister, while occupying the position of Treasurer, exercised his official ministerial powers in favour of QBE Insurance Ltd in respect of a recommendation from the Foreign Investment Review Board to enable QBE to sell a property in Brisbane to an overseas company known as American Housing Insurance Corporation Ltd. That decision, which was a ministerial decision for which the Minister alone was responsible, was announced on 22 December 1976. In June 1977 the Minister obtained a personal loan of $79,000 from QBE on extremely favourable terms.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable gentleman should cease giving information and ask his question.

Mr HOLDING—My question is this: At the time of making that application for a loan, was the Minister’s attention directed to the fact that a possible allegation of conflict of interest could arise? Can he inform the House whether he made any applications, and, if so, what type of applications, to acquire loans from any, and, if so, what, other organisation or companies?

Mr LYNCH—I have said before, and I repeat, to the House that I think the inferences behind the question are in fact contemptible. The honourable gentleman should be aware, as other honourable members on both sides of the house are aware, that these matters have been subject to very exhaustive examination. So far as the investment proposal by QBE Insurance Ltd is concerned, that matter has been dealt with on at least several occasions in this House by my colleague, the Federal Treasurer. As I recall, my colleague said that the proposal first came before the former Treasurer who is now the Leader of the Opposition. The file in question then came to me for decision. As the present Federal Treasurer has indicated, the advisory committee, which consists of representatives of all of the appropriate Commonwealth departments, made the recommendation for that proposal in unanimity. I recall that representatives of some seven
Commonwealth departments and the Reserve Bank of Australia were involved.

If the honourable gentleman is trying to put forward in this House some conspiracy theory about it, I invite him just to dwell on the facts. Representatives of seven Commonwealth departments and the Reserve Bank recommended that proposal to me as Treasurer. The papers earlier had been before the present Leader of the Opposition. As the Treasurer has indicated, there is no substance to the assertions that are sought to be made in this House at Question Time. I remember what the honourable member for Lalor was first asserting—that is, that there was some mysterious 007 missing Treasury file. Assertions also were made about conversations which were purported by the honourable gentleman to have taken place between a member of my staff and a member of the Treasury. The Treasury is one department in this country—as I hope other departments are—which methodically records everything on its own files. The honourable gentleman has been charged by me to put up or shut up about this matter. I say to the honourable gentleman that he continues in this House to be utterly irresponsible in relation to the charges that he has made. He has yet to substantiate in this House in any possible way whatsoever the assertions that he has sought to make, or to apologise to the House, which I believe would be a proper form of behaviour.

So far as the second matter in the question is concerned, again it is typical of the Labor Party that it should be raised. The assertions have been made before and they have been very firmly repudiated. Those repudiations have been without qualification. I remind the honourable gentleman of a statement made in November last year by Irish Young and Outhwaite. I read it into the record:

Each of the transactions concerning units located at Surfers Paradise was negotiated on the Treasurer's behalf by Irish Young and Outhwaite—

Not by me personally—

and the partners are satisfied that they were proper in every way and, in particular, state that the terms of the financial arrangements were, on the Treasurer's instructions, arranged on terms normal for such transactions.

Beyond that, the propriety of those transaction and their commercial normality have been further attested to by Mallesons, the solicitors, as well as by Stephen Charles, Q.C. after independent examination. I will not take up the time of the House by reading it into the record, but I remind the House that a letter from QBE Insurance Ltd, which was tabled with the original document, confirmed that such terms as were made available at the time were in fact normal commercial terms.

Mr Barry Jones—Not in that block of flats.

Mr LYNCH—They were normal commercial terms. The honourable member for Lalor was a nitwit in the Victorian Parliament before, and his irresponsibility seems to continue in this House.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The Minister will continue his answer.

Mr LYNCH—I summarise, Mr Speaker, by saying that this is a rerun of an old reel. These assertions have been made previously.

Mr Scholes—A rerun of Khemlani.

Mr LYNCH—Khemlani, of course, continues very much to motivate the honourable member's behaviour in this House. The assertions have been repudiated previously by Irish Young and Outhwaite, accountants, by Mallesons, solicitors, and by an independent Queen's Counsel; and the matter ought to rest there.

**INDUCEMENTS TO MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS**

Mr HODGES—Is the Minister for Health aware of reports that inducements are still being paid to medical practitioners to encourage them to seek unnecessary pathology tests for patients? Is the Minister taking any action to review the operation of the relevant section of the Health Insurance Act to make such inducements illegal?

Mr HUNT—I am aware of Press reports in the last two or three days concerning inducements which are apparently still being made to medical practitioners to encourage them to make unnecessary applications for pathology tests, in spite of the amendments which were made to the Health Insurance Act last year to close off the opportunities for abuse and overuse. I have spoken this morning with Dr Sax, who is the chairman of the pathology working party, to find out what progress his committee has made in reviewing the changes which were made last year to the laws relating to pathology and the payment of benefits for pathology purposes. He assures me that the review is almost complete and that the Government will have the report available to it for consideration in the very near future. That report will make recommendations to the Government to enable it to close off some of the loopholes which apparently still exist. I will make that report public.

One of the difficulties has been the legal interpretation of section 129AA of the Health Insurance Act. I have sought, and my Department for some time has been seeking, legal advice
about the interpretation of this provision of the Act. I hope to get an interpretation on this. If the Act proves to be inadequate we will take whatever steps are necessary to close the loophole. We are determined to stamp out this abuse and overuse of pathology services by irresponsible and unscrupulous doctors and also by pathology operators and laboratory operators in this country. I condemn them because I believe that there is nothing more loathsome than a group of people in a privileged position who are using the health of people to make their millions at the expense of the community. We will continue to take whatever action is necessary and to seek whatever legal advice is necessary to stop the malpractice of a very small percentage of irresponsible and unscrupulous medical practitioners who should not have any place in our society.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON HUMAN RELATIONSHIPS

Mr JOHN BROWN—I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Is it a fact that he said that he had no option but to act on the information revealed by the McGregor Royal Commission. Given this reference to the findings of royal commissions, will the Prime Minister tell the House why he has shown such marked reluctance to acknowledge the validity of the Royal Commission on Human Relationships? Why has he ignored this valuable report except for picking out a few lines and trivialising them for election purposes?

Mr SPEAKER—The honourable gentleman should ask his question.

Mr JOHN BROWN—When can the House expect a recognition of the more important recommendations of the Royal Commission on Human Relationships?

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—It was an interesting link into the real substance of the honourable gentleman's question. Let me just say that I would believe that any government has to take any particular royal commission report, examine that on its merits and make its judgments accordingly. Decisions in relation to one cannot be regarded as decisions in relation to others. So far as the Royal Commission on Human Relationships is concerned, the honourable gentleman would know quite well that there are some aspects of that report about which I have expressed one or two views. Going beyond that, I have written to State Premiers to seek their views in relation to the report because quite clearly if the report is to be implemented the activities of State governments are going to be quite critical in relation to it. Many parts of the report would be dependent on State powers and State actions and would not be the direct responsibility of the Commonwealth.

From the Commonwealth's own point of view my colleague the Minister for Home Affairs has been quite actively pursuing the report and after Question Time I shall have a discussion with him to see how far matters have progressed and when it might be possible to say something to the Parliament about it. The matter has not been shelved. Obviously there are matters of substance within the report that ought to be pursued, and I know that my colleague is pursuing them with his traditional vigour and energy.

DEFENCE PROCUREMENT

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—Mr Speaker, I seek your indulgence to add to an earlier question about the foreword that I did write for the Pacific Defence Reporter in relation to the Farnborough Air Show edition. I seek leave to incorporate in Hansard a full copy of the telex that was sent because the implications inherent in the question are certainly not inherent in the foreword to the report.

Leave granted.

The document read as follows—

From Dept Prime Minister and Cabinet
To: Pacific Defence Reporter
Telex No. 21552
From Malcolm Fraser

Australia with its large area, small population and long lines of supply from overseas has chosen to provide its armed forces with high technology equipment to make the most effective use of its resources for defence purposes.

We could not hope to direct sufficient resources from other national priorities to completely manufacture this specialised high technology equipment. Consequently we must ensure that the overseas sources chosen are reliable and consistent with our overall long term national interests.

Traditional sources for our military equipment have been the European Community (EC) and the USA. In 1977-78 about $100m of the $296m spent on equipment overseas was spent in the EC. The EC, which is Australia's largest trading partner has a large current account surplus with us and we are working hard to develop a more balanced relationship.

The Government recognises the importance of reducing Australian Dependence on overseas sources for provision of equipment and its long term support. Our industry already manufactures much of our defence material with more than half our expenditure on equipment and stores in 1977/78 being in Australia despite the major overseas expenditure high cost items such as Frigates, Hercules and Orion aircraft and Leopard tanks.

Regional co-operation with New Zealand in supply matters, while not showing dramatic results, is developing and we would like to see wider regional involvement in the future.
QUEENSLAND ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I again seek the indulgence of the House to add to another answer to a question. I was asked earlier by the Leader of the Opposition whether I had had discussions with the Chief Electoral Officer. I asked my office to check with Mr Pearson himself. From his records, on Thursday, 7 July 1977, he did attend for a while in a meeting in my office with other Ministers to discuss possible options for the holding of the next general election in 1977 or 1978. Of course honourable members will know that options in relation to this year were put aside because the election has already been held. To the best of Mr Pearson’s memory and to the best of his records that he has been able to check during Question Time, that was the only occasion on which he met with me during last year to discuss options for an election during 1977 or 1978.

BRISBANE AIRPORT

Mr NIXON—Mr Speaker, I wonder whether I could seek the indulgence of the House to complete an answer given to a question asked earlier by the honourable member for Lilley.

Mr SPEAKER—I think you ought to ask for my indulgence because if you ask for the indulgence of the House it can be refused by only one person. If you ask for my indulgence one person can grant it.

Mr NIXON—I ask for your indulgence, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER—I call the Minister for Transport.

Mr NIXON—Thank you, Sir. The honourable member for Lilley raised the question of the environmental impact study in relation to the development of the new Brisbane Airport. I am now able to inform him that the study is completed and it is proposed to release that study today.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr BARRY JONES (Lalor) (11.22)—I seek to move a procedural motion. I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the honourable member for Lalor—

(a) moving a motion questioning the relationship of the Minister for Industry and Commerce with QBE Insurance, and

(b) tabling a copy of the Bill of mortgage dated 5 July 1977.

Mr SPEAKER—The motion needs to be in writing.

Mr BARRY JONES—I present the motion in writing.

Mr Armitage—I second the motion and reserve my right to speak.

Mr BARRY JONES—Last night an attempt was made to raise a serious matter of public importance and I believe that there was a perversion of the forms of the House which prevented the matter being discussed.

Mr Sinclair—On a point of order, perhaps I could indicate to the honourable member that the Government will accept the motion to suspend the Standing Orders. I suggest that the honourable member might proceed to the substantive motion.

Mr SPEAKER—Under those circumstances, the honourable member for Lalor might ask for leave to move a motion to suspend the Standing Orders.

Mr BARRY JONES—I seek leave to move the motion.

Mr SPEAKER—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted. The honourable member for Lalor may now move his motion.

Mr BARRY JONES—I move:

That the Minister for Industry and Commerce has a responsibility to inform the House of his relationship with the QBE Insurance company—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member has asked for leave to suspend Standing Orders. That leave has been granted. He should now move the motion to suspend the Standing Orders.

Motion (by Mr Barry Jones)—by leave—agreed to:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the honourable member for Lalor—

(a) moving a motion questioning the relationship of the Minister for Industry and Commerce with QBE Insurance Limited, and,

(b) tabling a copy of a Bill of mortgage dated 5 July 1977.

MINISTER FOR INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

Mr BARRY JONES—(Lalor) (11.24)—Mr Speaker, yesterday I wrote to the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch) in these terms—

Mr Bungey—There is no motion.

Mr SPEAKER—The honourable member is entitled to speak and to move the motion at the end of his speech. I am grateful to the honourable member for Canning for his help.

Mr BARRY JONES—I move:
That the Minister for Industry and Commerce has a responsibility to inform this House of his relationship with QBE Insurance Limited.

Yesterday I wrote to the Minister for Industry and Commerce in these terms:

My dear Minister,

This is to advise you that I will be attempting to speak on the Adjournment debate tonight and that I intend to pursue the subject matter raised in my question last week and this week.

As a matter of fairness, I think that you should be forewarned so that you would have the opportunity to answer the matter raised if you wish to take it.

Yours sincerely,

BARRY O. JONES
Federal Member for Lalor

Yesterday when I spoke on a related matter I was invited by the Minister to ‘put up or shut up’. I believe it is important that this matter should be canvassed in the House. The matter concerns the Minister’s dealing in home units on the Gold Coast, and more specifically, the extraordinarily generous terms he received from QBE Insurance Ltd on a $79,000 loan to finance the purchase last year of his home unit in the Golden Gate development at Surfers Paradise. I say at once that there may be a perfectly innocent and obvious explanation for the matters that concern us. If there is, I would be very glad to hear it from the Minister. I have known the Minister for nearly 30 years. I bear him absolutely no personal ill-will, as he knows very well. I believe that the Minister has consistently and persistently failed to make a full disclosure to the Parliament on this matter, preferring, I think, to hide behind some evasions and a personal attack on the integrity of people who raise matters. I believe that the terms of the QBE loan raise questions concerning the propriety of a senior Minister of the Crown gaining what was extremely favourable treatment from a particular company.

The facts are these: In November 1977, during the election campaign, the Minister was forced to resign as Treasurer by the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser). Following the Government’s re-election, he released an abridged statement on 15 December concerning his family’s land dealings in Victoria and his purchase of two home units in Surfers Paradise. The statement said in part that in June 1977 the Minister and his wife had purchased a home unit in the Surfers Paradise Golden Gate development for $95,000. The purchase was financed by a bank loan of $16,000 and a $79,000 loan from QBE Insurance Ltd at an interest rate of 11½ per cent per year, payable yearly and not variable during the term of the loan. The Minister’s statement gave no other details of the QBE loan agreement other than to include a letter from the insurance company claiming that the loan was ‘on normal commercial terms’. One might ask, normal for whom? Normal for a Minister, normal for a Treasurer or normal for other would-be borrowers?

I note that last night—I am sorry that I did not have an opportunity to hear it in full—the honourable member for Moore (Mr Hyde) began to reply during the adjournment debate. He said:

I have a letter from QBE Insurance Ltd which granted this loan. The letter states quite clearly that the loan was made on normal terms. The letter has been made public and the honourable member for Lalor (Mr Barry Jones)—

The honourable member for Moore was then interrupted by a point of order and we heard no more from him.

Let us just examine for a moment what those ‘normal terms’ were. Certainly many thousands of home borrowers in this country would not regard them as such for so large a loan. In fact the loan was on very favourable terms to the Minister. Firstly, there was a high loan to security ratio of 83 per cent whereas more usual sources of loan funds for this purpose such as finance companies and trustee company funds are restricted by law to a ratio of 66 per cent. Secondly, the terms of the 15-year loan allow the Minister to pay only the interest during the first three years and then 47 quarterly installments of $750 each over the following 12 years. The first of these installments is not payable until September 1980, by which time the Minister might well have sold the property and presumably the capital gain that would have occurred would be non-taxable and would be to his benefit entirely. This arrangement is rather unusual, to say the least, especially when at the end of the 15 years less than half the principal of the loan will have been repaid. Furthermore, under the terms of the mortgage on the unit that secures the loan, the Minister can pay off the loan at any time without penalty. Mr T. P. Keene, Assistant General Manager of the QBE Insurance Group, was asked about the company’s mortgage policies, and his comments are quoted on page 129 of the April 1978 issue of Ryde’s. The article states:

T. P. Keene, assistant general manager—investments, says the company has an absolute minimum of $100,000 but prefers mortgages in the $300,000-$500,000 range. Maximum is about $2m.

Interest rates are 13-13½ per cent, with the lower rate applying in the case of particularly good proposals. Term is normally 3 years, but can be extended to 5 years, with interest only payable quarterly.
Keene said he was currently seeing few good properties being put forward: 'I think we are seeing people trying to renegotiate loans obtained earlier at finance company rates.'

I will leave out two paragraphs which are not germane to this matter, but of course I will table the document. The article continues:

QBE excludes hotels, motels and residential properties, and requires that the property be producing sufficient income to cover interest payments at least one and a quarter times. Loans are made up to a maximum of 65 per cent of the company's valuation.

Are we to believe what the spokesman for the company puts on the public record as to what it regards as a normal transaction, or are we to say that the transaction which so benefited the then Treasurer is to be regarded as normal? The second proposition is absolutely absurd. It is impossible to reconcile the two propositions. But let me go further. There is one other point that is particularly relevant to this property investment of the then Treasurer. At the time the Minister made his statement last December, 55 of the 182 units in the Golden Gate development had been sold. Only two of them had been financed by QBE Insurance Ltd. One loan was to the new Minister for Industry and Commerce, the then Treasurer. The other was to a couple, who borrowed $40,000 at 12½ per cent interest for five years, with a penalty rate of 14½ per cent for late payment and no moratorium period on principal repayments, which was the normal transaction. The two transactions are impossible to reconcile. Clearly, that family did not do anywhere near as well as the Minister in its dealings with QBE.

Ever since the Opposition first sought to clarify aspects of the Minister's business dealings while he was Treasurer, the right honourable gentleman has chosen to paint it as a personal slur. It is not a personal matter at all, in the submission of the Opposition. It is a matter involving the possibility, however remote, of a conflict of interest. The Minister has chosen conveniently to ignore the fact that as Treasurer he had to accept an obligation to ensure that nothing he ever did could suggest a conflict of interest, however remote, between his public office and his personal advantage. He did not accept that obligation in this case, just as I did not believe that he accepted the obligation in the case of his family's land dealings in Victoria. On 22 December 1976 the Minister approved a recommendation from the Foreign Investment Review Board allowing QBE Insurance Ltd to sell a property in Brisbane to an overseas company known as American Housing Insurance Corporation Ltd. Six months later QBE Insurance Ltd approved a loan of $79,000 to the Minister on what were extremely favourable terms. I should have thought that elementary considerations of prudence on the part of the Minister when he was trying to arrange for finance would have led him to say to his accountants: 'I want you to see the entire range of options that are open, with all the lending institutions in Queensland; but, because I have had some dealings which have conferred a benefit on QBE, I think you ought to be very careful. I would not want to have an advantage from QBE. If QBE offers me a mortgage on absolutely normal terms so that I am not advantaged in any way at all, perhaps that is all right'. I should have thought that there would have been a red light flashing somewhere in the Minister's mind that would have caused him to say: 'Because I have had dealings with QBE I must avoid any possibility of conflict of interest'.

At this stage I am not suggesting that there was an impropriety; I am simply saying that every Minister—perhaps every member of this House, quite apart from Ministers—has an obligation to avoid the possibility of conflict of interest. The power of a Minister is so enormous and the power of a Treasurer in particular is so great that it is essential that any kind of conflict be avoided. I make no judgment; but I say that there ought not to be, to use a word that is familiar to the Minister, even a scintilla of evidence to suggest a conflict of interest. I ask the Minister to make a frank statement, to arrange for the tabling of the Treasury file, and to resolve any doubt about the propriety of his actions.

Again I pose a question which needs to be asked and needs to be resolved. In some ways there has been an essentially semantic response on the part of the Government to some of the questions I have asked before. It should be remembered that every government is in a very strong position. A private member has access to very few pieces of information. A Minister, who if he chooses can sit on the files and do what he wishes with them, is in a very strong position. There is a great inequity in terms of information. I ask a question in broader terms than the question I asked last week: Did any member of the then Treasurer's staff make any representations to any member of the Foreign Investment Review Board in 1975 or 1976 with respect to the sale by QBE Insurance Ltd of a Brisbane property to the American Housing Insurance Corporation Ltd, a foreign corporation? I add 1976 because it is possible that the transaction which I thought occurred at the end of 1975 in fact occurred early in 1976. Therefore it might have been possible for the Minister to give an answer which was technically correct but in fact did not
cover the circumstances of the question. I have in my hands a photocopy of a bill of mortgage in the names of the Minister and Mrs Lynch in respect of the property at Surfers Paradise. I think it is important that honourable members have the opportunity to look at this.

Mr Clyde Cameron—I think you are only bluffing. You produce it.

Mr BARRY JONES—I produce the document, and if it is appropriate for me to table it I will do so. It is a rather lengthy document to have incorporated into Hansard.

Mr SPEAKER—What is the document?

Mr BARRY JONES—The document is entitled ‘Bill of Mortgage’. It is a photocopy only of a bill of mortgage dated 5 July 1977.

Mr SPEAKER—The honourable gentleman already has succeeded in having the Standing Orders suspended inasmuch as they prevent him from tabling the documents; so he already has authority to do so.

Mr BARRY JONES—In that case, let me just read briefly from the document and then actually table it. It is to all intents and purposes a normal mortgage on the face of it, except that it has several terms that are of very great advantage to the Minister. Let me just summarise: The combination of having 3½ years with no principal repayment, followed by 11¾ years of low quarterly instalments, is rather unusual, especially when at the end of 15 years only $35,250 principal will have been repaid, out of $79,000. The general market rate of interest for 3-year investment loans for trust funds would have been in the order of 13 per cent to 14 per cent. The mortgage gave the Lynches the option at any time to repay the loan, without penalty, merely by giving one month’s notice. Hence the arrangements could be said to be flexible from the point of view of the Minister. It would be more usual to provide for some penalty in the event of early repayment.

Mr Clyde Cameron—Is that specifically stated?

Mr BARRY JONES—Yes, it is certainly specifically stated. This is a very long document. I think that it would be more satisfactory in the circumstances to table it. I have explained that this is by no means an ordinary, conventional, run-of-the-mill mortgage transaction. It is quite exceptional in nature. All of us who have been through the business of raising money on mortgage would count ourselves as supremely fortunate if we could have a mortgage granted to us on such favourable terms. As I say, the fact that there is a holiday on principal repayment for three years means that it is possible to have your cake and eat it too. It is possible to enjoy the capital appreciation, sell the property and then get out of the transaction without ever having paid a dollar off the principal. Financially, that is the equivalent of a free gift from a company. There may be a perfectly reasonable explanation for all this, although I must say that it escapes me for the moment. I would like to know what it is. As a prudent man, it would have been in personal and political interest of the former Treasurer, the present Minister for Industry and Commerce, to have said: ‘I want the property. Of course, I want to get it on favourable terms. But, in the circumstances, I do not believe that we should deal with QBE Insurance Ltd. I believe that QBE is the last firm we ought to deal with if it gives us a preferential deal because there is an unfortunate inference that could be drawn from this’.

I believe that politicians, particularly when they hold positions of influence, must exercise a care and a prudence in their ordinary personal dealings which is not required of citizens outside the Parliament. If such tests were applied to ordinary citizens, they would be regarded as oppressive. I believe that the Minister has an obligation in this matter. I find the investigation by Irish, Young and Outhwaite quite extraordinary. I do not believe that they could have considered the case of the other people in the same block of flats who also had a mortgage from QBE Insurance Ltd. I ask the Minister to resolve this matter. I ask him to make an absolutely frank disclosure about the matter so that it can be cleared up once and for all. It is no pleasure or satisfaction to me to raise the matter. I find it distasteful. I would rather have this ghost laid at rest.

Mr SPEAKER—Could I have the precise terms of the motion which has been moved by the honourable member for Lalor? I see now that the honourable member for Lalor has moved:

That the Minister for Industry and Commerce has a responsibility to inform this House of his relationship with the QBE Insurance company.

Mr Sinclair—Mr Speaker, I wish to take a point of order. The honourable member for Lalor sought leave to suspend Standing Orders to move a motion—that which he has just moved—and to table a copy of a bill of mortgage. For the Government’s part, we agreed that the motion be moved embracing both items. I am prepared to give the honourable member leave to table a copy of the bill of mortgage. It had been my firm understanding that the honourable member would move a motion embracing the two parts. I therefore suggest that he seek leave
to table a copy of the bill of mortgage. I had been under the impression that the motion he was going to move embraced the tabling of the document. If the honourable member seeks to table it, he should request leave to do so and it could be tabled in the normal course.

Mr SPEAKER—The motion before the House is to suspend Standing Orders. It reads as follows:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the honourable member for Lalor (a) moving a motion questioning the relationship of the Minister for Industry and Commerce with QBE Insurance Ltd; and (b) tabling a copy of the bill of mortgage dated 5 July 1977.

My interpretation is that there were two quite disparate things. One was leave to move a motion and the other was leave to table a copy of a bill of mortgage. The Leader of the House (Mr Sinclair) has placed a different interpretation upon it. However, as he has indicated that leave to table the document would be given in any event, I think that we should allow that motion to go forward on my construction of the position because the same result would be achieved if the honourable member asked for leave to table the bill of mortgage. The honourable member for Lalor has now moved this motion:

That the Minister for Industry and Commerce has a responsibility to inform this House of his relationship with the QBE Insurance company.

Is the motion seconded?

Mr Holding—I second the motion.

Mr SPEAKER—I call the honourable member for Melbourne Ports.

Mr SINCLAIR (New England—Leader of the House) (11.49)—Mr Speaker, I understood that there would be only one speaker a side speaking on this motion. I therefore move:

That the honourable member be not further heard.

Question put—
The House divided.

(Mr Speaker—Rt Hon. Sir Billy Snedden)

<table>
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<tr>
<th>AYES</th>
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</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
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Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER—The question now is: ‘That the motion be agreed to’. I call the Treasurer.

Mr HOWARD (Bennelong—Treasurer) (11.54)—Mr Speaker—

Mr Hayden—Mr Speaker, we protest. It is the Minister for Industry and Commerce whose credibility and integrity are in question before the House. We do not want to hear from the accountant; we want to hear from the used car dealer.

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

Mr Hayden—Mr Speaker, this is—

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The honourable gentleman will resume his seat.
Mr Hayden—This is a perversion of the forms of the House. What would the—

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

Mr Hayden—accountant know about it?

Mr SPEAKER—I have called the Treasurer.

Mr Hayden—Mr Speaker, I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the Minister for Industry and Commerce responding immediately to the grave charges levelled against him by the honourable member for Lalor.

Mr SPEAKER—Order! The House will come to order. I had already called the Treasurer. The Leader of the Opposition stood without getting the call. Until he gets the call he cannot move suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr HOWARD—This side of the House—

Mr Hayden—Mr Speaker, I am seeking a call. I take a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER—I will hear the point of order.

Mr Hayden—Mr Speaker, we require the Minister for Industry and Commerce to answer these serious charges. Accordingly, I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent the Minister for Industry and Commerce responding immediately in his own defence to the grave charges levelled against him by the honourable member for Lalor.

Mr Sinclair—Mr Speaker, the honourable gentleman fails to realise that we are in the process of debating a motion to suspend Standing Orders. I would suggest that you cannot entertain the motion that the Leader of the Opposition now seeks to advance until the one that we are now debating has been concluded.

Mr SPEAKER—The Leader of the House is correct.

Mr HOWARD—This side of the House listened in comparative silence to the honourable member for Lalor (Mr Barry Jones) not because it was impressed with the arguments he presented, not because he presented anything new but because I believe all members on this side of the House share a very justifiable and deep sense of outrage at the constant manner in which members of the Opposition, pleading distaste for mud slinging, pleading a reluctance to raise matters that cast doubt on the integrity of people on this side of the House, have persisted over the past nine or 10 months at periodic intervals to continue to impugn the behaviour, the reputation and the integrity of my colleague the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch).

The honourable member for Lalor presented nothing new in what he said. It was known months ago—indeed, at the end of last year—that my right honourable friend and his wife obtained a loan from QBE Insurance Limited. As long ago as April in this House in answer to a question from the honourable member for Grayndler (Mr Stewart) I provided details surrounding the approval by the former Treasurer of a foreign investment application involving that company. The mortgage that he tabled has been a matter of public record and access because it is a document filed with a registry in Queensland, I imagine, since the document was executed. I remind the honourable member for Lalor and the honourable member for Melbourne Ports (Mr Holding) that the foreign investment approval was given on 22 December 1975 and not 1976 as both them incorrectly alleged and therefore preceded by 18 months the date of signing of the mortgage by Mr and Mrs Lynch over the particular unit. What the honourable member for Lalor has tried to establish is one or other of two charges. He has either tried to establish that the right honourable gentleman obtained this mortgage in some kind of kick-back for a favourable foreign investment decision—

Mr Barry Jones—They are your words, not mine.

Mr HOWARD—The honourable member has had his say. I ask him just keep quiet. Either that is the charge or another is the charge. I will come to the other charge in a moment.

Mr Barry Jones—Mr Speaker, on a point of order. I raised the question of lack of prudence—lack of prudence essentially. I did not talk about kick-backs.

Mr SPEAKER—The honourable member for Lalor will remain silent. There is no substance in his point of order. The debate should proceed and the person with the call should be permitted to speak without interruption.

Mr HOWARD—He may describe his words as being words to establish lack of prudence. He hopes and he knows that the possible consequence is to cast doubt on the integrity of my friend and that I think is what many on this side of the House find so distasteful. So the charge—

Dr Everingham—I rise to order. Mr Speaker, is it in order for the honourable member to impute hopes to a member of this House? The Treasurer referred to what the honourable member for Lalor hopes will happen. He is not justified in making that assumption.

Mr SPEAKER—There is no substance in the point of order.
Mr Howard—It is very hard to find any hope from the honourable gentleman. Nonetheless, I think that anybody listening to the speech of the honourable member for Lalor would imagine that he is making two charges. The first of those charges is that the mortgage was obtained as some kind of favourable response, whatever one likes to call it, for the foreign investment decision given by my colleague. In order to sustain that charge, surely the honourable gentleman has to satisfy this House, first, that when the right honourable member for Flinders (Mr Lynch) gave the foreign investment decision he in fact acted in a way that was not sustainable, taking into account the facts and the merits of that particular case. Secondly, in my view the honourable member for Lalor would also have to establish that in some weird way there was a conspiracy among a number of Government departments to bring about a favourable recommendation. The truth is simply this: On 22 December 1975, 18 months before the mortgage was signed, my colleague approved a recommendation from the Foreign Investment Review Board. As the honourable gentleman should know, under the Foreign Investment Act numerous recommendations come from the Foreign Investment Review Board in relation to a large number of transactions. That particular proposal had been the subject of examination by the Department of Urban and Regional Development, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, the Department of Overseas Trade, the Department of Minerals and Energy, the Department of Manufacturing Industry, the Attorney-General's Department, the Department of the Treasury and the Reserve Bank of Australia.

I am informed—and I understand it to be a fact—that every single one of those departments recommended that the proposal should be approved. They made those recommendations to the Foreign Investment Review Board in the course of the normal process of departmental consultation. In the teeth of that advice, the Foreign Investment Review Board recommended to the former Treasurer that the proposals should be accepted. I put it to the House that in those circumstances it would have been extraordinary if the right honourable gentleman had not approved the proposal. To suggest that there is something peculiar about that particular approval, to suggest that there is any nexus at all between that approval and the signing of that mortgage is an absolute nonsense.

It has palpably not been sustained or established by anything that the honourable member for Lalor has produced in this debate and has not been sustained by anything that any of his colleagues have sought over the last 10 or 11 months to bring out in this whole situation. That, in my judgment, disposes of the first of the possible charges that are raised. If the honourable member for Lalor is not satisfied with that explanation, I believe that it is impossible to satisfy him with any explanation. Here we have the clearest possible situation where all of the participating departments said that it ought to proceed. The Foreign Investment Review Board said that it ought to proceed. It was approved by the right honourable gentleman in December 1975.

The second of the charges is that in some way the mortgage obtained by Mr and Mrs Lynch was obtained on extremely favourable terms. Of course the honourable member for Lalor would be a world expert on normal commercial terms. His word on whether something is commercially normal is something to which we would all listen in awe so that we would all know everything about it. The first thing that he ought to know about commercial normality is that it depends entirely on the circumstances of individual or group transactions.

Mr Barry Jones—I have no doubt about that.

Mr Howard—That is good. That is one step forward. If we just remain calm, we might go a few more steps forward. Every member of this House knows that taken out of context the comparison of an interest rate on one mortgage of X thousands of dollars and terms of repayment compared with the interest rate on another mortgage and terms of repayment can, on the face of it, look as though one is extraordinarily generous and the other is not. The fact of the matter is that there has already been tabled—

Opposition members interjecting—

Mr Speaker—Order! The honourable gentleman will resume his seat. I ask honourable members on my left to cease the interjections that are constantly occurring. I call the Treasurer.

Mr Howard—There has already been tabled in this House a letter written to my right honourable friend on 12 December 1977 by QBE Insurance Ltd. I think it is worth while that this letter, which is comparatively short and to the point, be read. I think it is very relevant to the charges that have been made. It states:

I confirm that, as agreed at the outset with Irish, Young and Outhwaite, the mortgage loan made by QBE Insurance Ltd to you and Mrs Lynch was on normal commercial terms.
The interest rate was determined as being equal to the then current lending rate of the Queensland State Government Insurance Office Building Society. Since there is no provision in the mortgage for a reduction in interest rates... I emphasise that...

... should the general level of rates fall in the future (as is the case with building society loans) it was reasonable to allow the option of repayment without penalty. The detailed terms of QBE mortgage loans take into account the wishes of the borrowers, consistent with commercial considerations including their credit worthiness. This company has made other loans having an initial period without principal repayment and indeed some loans do not require any principal repayment during the term.

There is nothing remarkable about that last sentence. There are many loans that do not require any repayment of principal during the term. Surely the honourable member for Lalor is aware of the fact that many mortgages are arranged that are commonly described as 'fixed mortgages' and do not require any repayment during that period. That, Mr Deputy Speaker, is the first limb of my response to the charge that in some way there was something wicked and sinister about the loan that was obtained by Mr and Mrs Lynch.

As the honourable member for Lalor well knows and as members of this House well know, the affairs of my right honourable colleague and his family were subject to very exhaustive investigation and affirmation by a reputable firm of accountants, Irish, Young and Outhwaite, by a reputable firm of solicitors, Mallisons, and by Mr Stephen Charles, Q.C. Affirmative advice was conveyed by those two firms and by that gentleman to my right honourable friend, to the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and to a number of their joint colleagues. All advice indicated that there was no impropriety and that there was commercial normality in the arrangements. The advice from Mallisons stated:

The documents and correspondence do not disclose that the Treasurer or his family interests have been involved in any transaction which in our opinion is improper, reprehensible or illegal, nor that they obtained any advantage from the transactions, pecuniary or otherwise, which might not have been obtained by any private citizen in the management of his own interests.

That is an unequivocal response by a reputable firm to the charge that in some way the right honourable gentleman used his position to gain a privilege and advantage. I think that this House and the community are fed up to the back teeth with the running smear in which the honourable member for Lalor has participated today under the guise of having disdain and disgust for raising matters of this nature. If he wants to sling a bit of mud, why does he not be honest enough to get up and say that he is doing it. That is what he has done. He has continued to persecute the right honourable gentleman and I think that this House ought to reject the motion.

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

Mr Scholes—Mr Deputy Speaker, I request that all documents quoted from by the Treasurer (Mr Howard) be tabled.

Mr Howard—I am quite happy to table the Hansard record.

Mr Hayden—And the report you were quoting from. All the papers.

Mr Howard—Just let me have a look.

Mr Hayden—Do not be selective.

Mr Howard—I am just trying to find the documents from which I quoted.

Mr Scholes—Mr Deputy Speaker, under the Standing Orders, if a Minister quotes from documents in the House he is required to table them on request, unless he declares them to be confidential documents. I would ask that the Minister be requested to do so.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The honourable member for Corio is correct.

Mr Howard—if the honourable gentleman contains his rage, I will see what I can table. I have three documents which are the only documents from which I quoted. I have another document, but I did not quote from it.

Mr Hayden—Mr Deputy Speaker, I wish to advise you that we will provide sufficient time for the Minister for Industry and Commerce to address the House in his defence.

Motion (by Mr Sinclair) agreed to:

That the Leader of the Opposition be not further heard.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The question is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say aye; of the contrary no. I think the noes have it. Is a division required?

Mr Hayden—Is this the motion that I be not further heard?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—That question has been resolved.

Mr Hayden—Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask that question because people on the other side are rattling their heads. It is a bit hard to hear you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The question that was put to the House and was resolved was that the motion, as moved by the honourable member for Lalor, be agreed to. It was resolved in the negative.
Mr Hurford—Mr Deputy Speaker, I called: ‘The ayes have it’. I demand a vote.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The Standing Orders require two voices to call for a division.

Mr Hayden—Mr Deputy Speaker, can I clarify a point please?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The Leader of the Opposition has the indulgence of the House. The House will come to order.

Mr Hayden—A little bit of silence will help you, Mr Deputy Speaker, rather than me. As I understood it, the motion that was put by the Leader of the House was that I be not further heard. I do not recall your putting that motion to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Yes, the question was put.

Mr Hayden—It was not put to the House. Mr Deputy Speaker, we do not wish to divide on that. I do not recall your putting it to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Yes, it was.

Mr Hayden—It was presumed on this side that the motion that you were putting was a continuation of that matter. In that situation we do not want to divide, but we want to divide on the motion of the honourable member for Lalor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—that motion has been put. I was seeking an indication from the Opposition as to whether a division was required. The period has become somewhat protracted, but I accept the fact that a division is required if that is the intention.

Mr Bourchier—I raise a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Unfortunately members on the other side are either stupid, deaf or do not know the Standing Orders. That is no reason why you should retract from a decision that you have made. We on this side of the House will oppose it if you do.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The Chair does not retract from its position. A time is not specified for the indication of a division being required. I was in the process of establishing that fact when the Leader of the Opposition rose. A division is required.

Question put:

That the motion (Mr Barry Jones's) be agreed to.

The House divided.

(Mr Deputy Speaker—Mr P. C. Millar)
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Question so resolved in the negative.

Mr Barry Jones—Mr Deputy Speaker, I raise a point of order. I direct your attention to Standing Order 321, which states:

A document relating to public affairs quoted from by a Minister or an Assistant Minister, unless stated to be of a
Mr Sinclair—I wish to speak to the point of order. Surely the honourable member for Lalor can read. Standing Order 321 states:

A document relating to public affairs quoted from . . .

My colleague the Treasurer quoted from the paper that was tabled in this House. He did not quote from any other document. The motion related specifically to the document from which he quoted. There is no requirement under the Standing Orders, I contend, for any other document that has not even been produced in the House to be tabled, in those circumstances.

Mr Keating—I wish to speak to the same point of order. The essential point is that the paper has no authority. It is just a piece of typewritten paper. The authority is the source of the documents. The documents themselves are the source documents. The source documents are the Mallesons document and the Charles document, not the piece of typed paper. That has no authority. The authority is the source document. That is what my colleague is calling upon the Treasurer to table.

Mr Sinclair—No provision in Standing Orders gives any authority to any document tabled in this place. The Standing Orders relate only to specific documents. The specific document is the one from which the honourable gentleman read. The Standing Order extends no further. On that basis, I contend that documents that are not even produced here cannot be required to be tabled.

Mr Keating—Mr Deputy Speaker, the authorities which the Minister quoted were the documents from Irish Young and Outhwaite and the report of Mr Charles, Q.C. The authority for the quotations comes from those documents which, under the Standing Orders, become public documents once they are quoted by the Minister. The typewritten extract has no authority and no basis. It is the source documents which my colleague has called for and which, under the Standing Orders, the Treasurer is now obliged to table.

Mr Scholes—On the point of order: Standing Order 321 clearly says that documents called for must be tabled. If the Treasurer does not want to table the documents, he has the option of declaring them confidential. If the Government is afraid of their contents being made public, it is up to the Treasurer to declare them confidential. If the Government is not prepared to table the documents, then the Treasurer should declare that the documents are confidential and show that the Government is afraid of their being published.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—The Chair rules that the Standing Order referred to requires that the documents in physical form quoted from in the House are the documents which have to be tabled, upon request. It is my understanding from the Treasurer that he has tabled all the documents from which he quoted in the course of the debate. Therefore, I rule there is no substance to the point of order.

Dr Everingham—I raise a further point of order and I seek your advice, Mr Deputy Speaker. Does that mean that a document that has no authority can be completely discredited when it is tabled in this House?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—I have ruled on the point of order.

Suspension of Standing Orders

Mr HAYDEN (Oxley—Leader of the Opposition) (12.25)—I move:

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent—

1. The Minister for Industry and Commerce responding in his own defence to the matters affecting him raised by the honourable member for Lalor today and which have not been satisfactorily answered by the Treasurer.

2. The Minister for Industry and Commerce tabling all documentation which he supplied to the Prime Minister late last year concerning certain of his business dealings and which so far have been concealed from the Parliament and the public.

Mr Deputy Speaker, it is necessary to move this motion——

Motion (by Mr Sinclair) proposed:

That the Leader of the Opposition be not further heard.

Mr HAYDEN—. . . . in an effort to bring some light on to this issue. The Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch) obviously is seeking to avoid his responsibilities and accountabilities——
Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The Leader of the Opposition will resume his seat.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Mr Lionel Bowen—I second the motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! I have not the motion in writing from the Leader of the Opposition.

The Leader of the Opposition having submitted his motion in writing—

Mr LIONEL BOWEN (Kingsford-Smith) (12.28)—I second the motion. The position is very clear. The Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch) is very foolish not to defend himself in this matter——

Motion (by Mr Sinclair) agreed to:

That the honourable member for Kingsford-Smith be not further heard.

Question put:

That the motion (Mr Hayden’s) be agreed to.

The House divided.

(The Chairman—Mr P. C. Millar)

Ayes ............................. 27

Noes .............................. 67

Majority .......................... 40

AYES

Armitage, J. L. ........................... Jenkins, H. A.
Blewett, N. .............................. Jones, Barry
Bowen, Lionel ........................... Keating, P. J.
Brown, John .............................. Martin, V. J.
Cameron, Clyde .......................... Morris, P. F.
Cass, M. H. .............................. Scholes, G. D.
Cohen, B. .............................. Stewart, F. E.
Dawkins, J. S. ........................... Uren, T.
Everingham, D. N. ........................ Wallis, L. G.
Flax Patrick, J. .......................... West, S. J.
Holding, A. C. ........................... Willis, R.
Howe, B. L. ............................. Tellers:
Humphreys, B. C. ........................ Johnson, Les
Hurford, C. J. ........................... McManus, Les

NOES

Adermann, A. E. ........................... Hunt, R. J. D.
Aldred, K. J. ............................. Hyde, J. M.
Anthony, J. D. ........................... Jarman, A. W.
Baillieu, M. .............................. Johnson, Peter
Baume, M. E. ............................. Johnstone, Roger
Bourchier, J. W. .......................... Jull, D. F.
Bradfield, J. M. ........................... Katter, R. C.
Brathwaxter, R. A. ........................ Killen, D. J.
Brown, N. A. .............................. Lloyd, R.
Burney, M. H. ............................ Lusher, S. A.
Burns, W. G. ............................. Lynch, P. R.
Burr, M. A. .............................. MacKellar, M. J. R.
Cadman, A. G. ............................ MacKenzie, A. I.
Cairns, Kevin ........................... McLean, R. M.
Calder, S. E. .............................. McLeay, J. E.
Cameron, Donald .......................... McMahoon, Sir William
Cameron, Ewen ........................... Macpherson, I. M.
Carlton, J. J. ............................. Marry, A. R.
Chapman, H. G. P. ........................ Neil, M. J.
Connolly, D. M. ........................... Nixon, P. J.
Coster, J. F. ............................. O’Keeffe, F. L.
Dohie, J. D. M. ........................... Porter, J. R.

Minister for Industry and Commerce

NOES

Drummond, P. H. ........................... Robinson, Ian
Elliot, R. J. .............................. Sainsbury, M. E.
Falconer, P. D. ........................... Shack, P. D.
Fife, W. C. .............................. Short, J. R.
Fisher, P. S. .............................. Simon, B. D.
Garland, R. V. ........................... Sinclair, I. Mcc.
Giles, G. O’H. ............................. Staley, A. A.
Gillard, R. .............................. Wilson, J. B. C.
Goodluck, B. J. ........................... Yates, W.
Graham, B. W. ............................. Tellers:
Groom, R. J. .............................. Corbett, J.
Hodgman, M. .............................. Hodges, J. C.

PAIRS

Klugman, R. E. ........................... Edwards, H. R.
James, A. W. .............................. Lucocq, P. E.
Jones, Charles ........................... Moore, J. C.
Jacobi, R. .............................. Binney, R. J.
Bryan, G. M. .............................. Robinson, Eric
Innes, U. E. .............................. Pescock, P. S.

Question so resolved in the negative.

AUSTRALIAN MOTORISTS AND GENERAL INSURANCE COMPANY PROPRIETARY LIMITED

Mr HOWARD (Bennelong—Treasurer)—For the information of honourable members I present the report of an inspector appointed pursuant to the Insurance Act 1973 to investigate and report on certain matters concerning the Australian Motorists and General Insurance Company Proprietary Limited.

REPATRIATION COMMISSION

Mr ADERMANN (Fisher—Minister for Veterans’ Affairs)—Pursuant to section 122 of the Repatriation Act 1920 I present the annual report of the Repatriation Commission for the year ended 30 June 1978.

COMMONWEALTH SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH ORGANISATION

Mr ADERMANN (Fisher—Minister for the Northern Territory)—Pursuant to section 30 of the Science and Industry Research Act 1949 I present the annual report of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation for the year ended 30 June 1978 together with the text of a statement by the Minister for Science relating to the report.

TERTIARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

Mr STALEY (Chisholm—Minister for Post and Telecommunications)—For the information of honourable members I present the report of the Tertiary Education Commission for the 1979-81 triennium, volume 2, containing recommendations for 1979, together with the text of a statement by the Minister for Education.
NEW AND PERMANENT PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—On behalf of Mr Speaker I present the following reports from the Joint Standing Committee on the New and Permanent Parliament House:

Report relating to the proposed construction of a cooling tower enclosure at the rear of the provisional Parliament House.

Report relating to the installation of guard boxes at the rear of the provisional Parliament House.

Ordered that the reports be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Sir WILLIAM McMahon (Lowe)—I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

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

Sir William McMahon—Yes, I do. On page 1239 of the Hansard of 20 September there appears an interjection by the honourable member for Parramatta (Mr John Brown). In reply the honourable member for Chifley (Mr Armitage) said:

As the honourable member for Parramatta says, they are rip-offs, I am very surprised indeed that a person such as the right honourable member for Lowe, who has been in this chamber for so long, would lend himself to these lobbyists who are operating in the corridors of this Parliament.

Might I say that at the time I made my first approaches to the Government and it was not the Treasurer, I had spoken to no person at all about these problems. I had read a pamphlet by Laurie Oakes, a journalist well known to the House, and I had gained a good deal of information from the Australian Financial Review. At that time I did not know one corporation that was involved. I believe a mistake has been made by the member for Parramatta. I do not believe there is a rip-off. Grave damage can be done to Australian industry unless this matter is looked at and a review takes place.

Mr Armitage (Chifley)—I claim to have been misrepresented.

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

Mr Armitage—I claim to have been misrepresented. In reply to the right honourable member for Lowe (Sir William McMahon), I accept his explanation completely and unreservedly. But I would like to make this point as to the reason why I made that statement. I was present in the House when he asked a question of the Treasurer (Mr Howard). I formed the distinct impression—and I am absolutely confident on that impression—that the Treasurer himself is going very quiet on the foreign tax credits Bill—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Will the honourable member quickly proceed to the point on which he claims to have been misrepresented?

Mr Armitage—Yes. I wanted to make that point. At the time I had the impression that it was a Dorothy Dix question to the Treasurer. Evidently it was not a Dorothy Dix question. I accept completely the explanation of the right honourable member for Lowe. But I am still completely satisfied that the Treasurer himself is going soft on this legislation which can have a big impact on employment in Australia.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member will conclude his remarks.

AUSTRALIA'S TRADING POLICY IN MINERALS

Discussion of Matter of Public Importance

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Mr Speaker has received a letter from the honourable member for Blaxland (Mr Keating) proposing that a definite matter of public importance be submitted to the House for discussion, namely:

The insensitivity of the Minister for Trade and Resources to the national interest with respect to Australia's trading policy in minerals.

I 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 Keating (Blaxland) (12.42)—Mr Deputy Speaker—

Motion (by Mr Sinclair) agreed to:

That the business of the day be called on.

REMUNERATION AND ALLOWANCES AMENDMENT BILL 1978

Bill presented by Mr Ellicott, and read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr Ellicott (Wentworth—Minister for Home Affairs and Minister for the Capital Territory) (12.44)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The primary purpose of this Bill is to implement the recommendations of the Remuneration Tribunal as to the salaries and allowances payable to judges and persons of judicial status. This is effected by clause 5 of the Bill which revises Schedule 3 to the Remuneration and Allowances Act 1973 by including the rates of salary, annual
allowance and travelling allowance recommended by the Remuneration Tribunal as part of its 1978 Review. Clause 3 adjusts the rate of additional salary payable in certain cases where a judge holds more than one judicial office and fixes the maximum rate of travelling allowance payable in such instances in accordance with the Tribunal’s recommendations. In accordance with the recommendations of the Tribunal, the new rates of remuneration are backdated to 1 July 1978.

Opportunity has also been taken to make an amendment of a technical nature to section 17 of the Remuneration and Allowances Act 1973. Section 17 enables regulations to be made to prescribe the remuneration payable to certain statutory office holders who had previously been officers of the Australian Public Service or statutory officers. Where a regulation has been made in respect of an officer, the officer is unable to receive a higher rate of remuneration determined by the Remuneration Tribunal with respect to his office, even where a rate of remuneration prescribed by the regulation has not been reviewed in some cases for more than two years. Clause 4 will amend section 17 to allow a Remuneration Tribunal determination to operate in those cases where the rate of remuneration it contains exceeds the rate of remuneration prescribed in the regulation. I commend the Bill to the House.

Debate (on motion by Mr Lionel Bowen) adjourned.

GREAT BARRIER REEF MARINE PARK AMENDMENT BILL 1978

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 6 April, on motion by Mr Groom:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr COHEN (Robertson) (12.46)—This Bill proposes to change the requirement that the Chairman of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority must hold ‘special academic qualifications and have experience in the field of biological conservation’. This is the major area of concern to the Labor Party because the proposed amendment will mean that the Chairman is required to have only the same qualifications as the other two members of the Authority. At present they are required to ‘possess qualifications or extensive experience in a field related to the functions of the Authority’. The Labor Party agrees that the present Act may be too rigid and that there would be only a handful of people who would be qualified for the position.

However, we of the Labor Party also believe that the proposed changes will go to the other extreme. Not one of the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee members will now be required to have qualifications in a marine science or for that matter in any of the environmental sciences. This, in our view, is not good enough. Having experience in a field ‘related to the functions of the Authority’ could mean virtually anything. For example, Sir Charles Barton, the former Co-ordinator General of Queensland, which is a similar position to the head of the Public Works departments in other States, is an engineer. We have no objection to engineers but, if it is considered that an engineer is qualified to be a member of the Authority, almost anyone could be appointed. It may be said that an accountant or someone qualified in some other field would be sufficient. We believe it is important that the Chairman should be required at least to be qualified in the environmental sciences, and we intend to move an amendment to that effect in the Committee stage. This will get rid of the problem of rigidity that now applies but at the same time it will ensure that the Chairman of the Authority is a man who has shown an interest in the environment and has studied and qualified in that area.

The Australian Conservation Foundation has expressed the view that the Act should remain unchanged in regard to this matter and we can understand its concern. But I do not believe that it has considered the difficulties which would remain with the present rigid position. However, I think the attitude of the Foundation has changed in recent months and possibly it has come around to our way of thinking. I was talking to Mr Heggle of the Australian Littoral Society, which is a part of the Foundation, and he was of the view that the Society wants an amendment similar to the one we propose to move although originally it was totally opposed to the amendment.

We propose to move in the Committee stage of the Bill that section 10 of the principal Act be amended by omitting in sub-section (5) the words ‘the field of biological conservation’ and inserting the words ‘the environmental sciences’. The other proposed changes in the Bill do not cause us any concern. The Authority will be able to be more flexible in respect of who will represent it on the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee. The changes will mean that the Authority’s representative on the Consultative Committee can now remain a member of the Committee after he has ceased to be a member of the Authority.
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There appears to be no problem with the closing off of the region at the tip of Cape York to ensure that the region has been legally declared. We fully understand the cartographic accident that created the situation whereby the region inadvertently included portion of the Saumarez Reef which clearly is in the Coral Sea Island Territory. There are, however, a number of other areas for concern with regard to the Great Barrier Reef.

I refer to the proposal of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) which came out of the Premiers Conference in October 1977 to hand back control of the three-mile off-shore zone to the States. I understand that at present the legal framework is still being considered by the Standing Committee of Federal and State Attorneys-General. This will imply, amongst other things, that the Queensland Government will regain effective control over a substantial part of the Great Barrier Reef from the Federal Government. Unfortunately the Queensland Government's cavalier attitude towards the Great Barrier Reef includes its very pro-oil stance and the possibility of its enthusiasm for drilling for oil on the Barrier Reef, with the introduction of legislation to exempt specifically 70 major metal refining industries at Townsville and Gladstone, which are adjacent to the Reef, from having to comply with the Queensland Government's Clean Waters Act. The Queensland Government's track record on environmental matters generally has been an absolute disaster. I instance Moreton Island, Fraser Island, the destruction of rain forests and so on. It is essential that the Commonwealth retain control of the Reef.

There has been a lot of discussion in newspapers over recent months and rumours to the effect that the Government is going to allow oil drilling on the Reef. Let me say that I can hope only that the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Groom) can put paid to those rumours. I think I asked him a question on this matter earlier this year. I hope we will finally get a declaration from the Government that there will never be any oil drilling on the Reef because if oil drilling is permitted or even if it is suggested that drilling will be permitted, I think the Minister will be in for the greatest battle of his political career, certainly on the conservation front, as I do not believe that the Australian people will tolerate oil drilling on the Reef, anywhere or at any time.

Mr COHEN—I am not saying that the Government has said that it will allow drilling there. The honourable member must concede that there have been a number of reports in various newspapers and magazines saying that drilling will occur. Nothing would delight me more than to have an unequivocal statement from the Government or the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Anthony) or the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development saying that the Government will never permit drilling on the Barrier Reef. We would give the Government 100 per cent unqualified support. We could then stop any speculation and any dreams of any companies. People could then rest easy on this matter.

I should like to quote from Judith Wright's excellent book, The Coral Battleground, which I think most Australians would support. At page 20 of that excellent book it states:

To begin with it is the largest marine coral ecosystem in the world, a 'stable mature marine community' of a very special kind. It is what is known as a 'climax ecosystem', in which hundreds of thousands of species interact in ways that are not only not yet understood, but probably beyond present scientific capacity to understand. Ecology, as against the older taxonomic and classificatory biology, is a very new appearance on the scientific scene, and there were and are, few authoritative ecological studies even of one single subsystem such as the fish on the corals of the Reef, let alone the Reef as a whole.

The Reef is, I think, our greatest natural asset. It is something of which everyone in Australia is proud. It is our greatest single tourist attraction. It is off Queensland, but it is the property of the whole of Australia. It is our heritage and we must do everything humanly possible to protect this magnificent asset. I am sure that most members on the other side would agree with me. So once and for all, let the Government come out and say that there will never be any drilling allowed on the Reef.

We would like to know more about what is happening with regard to the proposed marine park. I would like to hear the Minister give us a statement on progress in that regard. How long does it take to declare a national park? Progress with the establishment of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park has been ominously slow. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority was set up three years ago, but as yet no areas of the Reef have been declared for the marine park. As I said before, if and when the park is declared, it is to be hoped that it will not be dotted with oil rigs, polluted by drilling wastes and over-run with supply ships and pipelines, et cetera.
I would also like to express some concern in this debate about the problem of oil spills as distinct from oil drilling. As I understand it, the Australian Government has yet to ratify all of the 10 important conventions or amendments to conventions dealing directly or indirectly with the prevention of oil pollution. These neglected conventions are, in general, greatly improved versions of much earlier conventions not having the advantage of enlightened attitudes about pollution, international experience and improved technology. The world has had some quite horrifying experiences over recent years with regard to oil spills. There was of course the celebrated case of the Amoco-Cadiz which ran aground just off the coast of France near Brittany. There have been monstrous and horrifying stories of the damage that was done to the area around there and to the beaches, the wildlife and the marine life and so on.

We could go back, of course, to the case of the Torrey Canyon which went aground on the south coast of England in 1967. It split some 80,000 tons of oil into the Channel, ruining for years tourist spots in England and France and killing marine life and wildlife for miles around. There have been, of course, quite a number of similar experiences. As I understand it, what concerns Australians is that many of the oil super-tankers now come down the coast of Queensland when normally transporting oil to and from the different parts of the world to Australia. They come down inside the Reef and travel along the coast between the Reef and the coast of Australia. Many of those ships fly flags of convenience from Panama and Honduras—

Debate interrupted.

SECURITY IN PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr Speaker—Honourable members will be aware of the incident that occurred at the end of Question Time yesterday when papers were thrown from the public gallery. The incident has highlighted the fact that our search procedures before members of the public are admitted to the public gallery have not been strict enough. Accordingly, I have arranged that as from the resumption of the sittings next week, a more thorough search procedure will be instituted in respect of those people wishing admission to the public galleries.

Mr Cohen—Mr Speaker, we are also concerned that whilst it was only paper yesterday, it could have been something else—

Mr Speaker—I would be glad if the honourable gentleman did not proceed on that matter, for obvious reasons which he will appreciate.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.15 p.m.

GREAT BARRIER REEF MARINE PARK AMENDMENT BILL 1978

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr Cohen—Before the suspension of the sitting for lunch I was referring to the question of supertankers being able to come in between the Reef and the coast, flying flags of convenience from countries such as Liberia, Panama and Honduras, and inadequately equipped to negotiate what are very difficult waters. I quote from an article in the West Australian of 4 April 1978 entitled 'How Safe are we from Oil Spills?':

Noel Mostert, in his chilling book 'Supership' claims that many independent tanker companies which charter hundreds of vessels to the oil industry have very low standards. They fly the so-called flags of convenience of countries like Liberia, Panama and Honduras, where shipping regulations are primitive or inadequately enforced.

Mostert says that many tankers are so dangerous in their design and use that insurance premiums make up about 70 per cent of their operating costs.

Brutal economies are made to cut building costs. The average supertanker, for example, has only one propeller, which means that it becomes a helpless drifting giant if the propeller breaks. The Amoco Cadiz, the supertanker involved in the French disaster, got into trouble when its steering mechanism failed.

It has been said that many of the ships coming down the coast of Queensland between the Reef and the coast do not have adequate navigational aids, and I think those are the sorts of things this Parliament ought to be considering. The amount of traffic coming through that area will increase in years to come, and should a tanker run aground we run the risk of monumental damage to the Great Barrier Reef. I hope that the Minister will be looking to see that safeguards are enforced or increased or improved so that that sort of thing does not occur.

Returning briefly to the suggestions about drilling on the Reef, I refer to an article in the 11-17 May issue of Nation Review. I point out that a similar article written by Laurie Oakes appeared in the Melbourne Sun. A draft submission to Federal Cabinet was obtained. Apparently it was leaked by somebody in the Department who is concerned about submissions being made on drilling on the Great Barrier Reef. The Nation Review article states:

Conservationists are alarmed by the surfacing at the end of last week of a draft submission to federal cabinet proposing oil exploration at the southern end of the reef. The cabinet document, originally prepared in October but abruptly
dropped during the election campaign, has its roots in an uncompromising stand by the Bureau of Mineral Resources under Deputy Prime Minister, Doug Anthony.

Further on it states:

The submission, which will reach cabinet with the imprimatur of both National Development Minister, Kevin Newman, and Environment Minister, John Groom——

I think there is a small error there——

argues that drilling should be allowed to proceed in the Capricorn channel area because it has the best buffer zones should a spill or blowout occur.

What was the Minister saying?

Mr Groom—I did not say anything.

Mr COHEN—The Minister always looks as though he is about to say something and I hate to see him denied the opportunity to answer. Perhaps in his reply he will say that these statements are totally untrue, that there is no foundation for our fears; but I am sure he will concede that there has been considerable rumour about this matter over a long period of time, dating back many years but specifically to just prior to the last election. The Opposition would like an unequivocal ‘no’ from the Government, to indicate that this is not going to occur. I conclude my remarks in this second reading debate, but I will be making further comments during the Committee stage.

Mr ROGER JOHNSTON (Hotham) (2.21)—This amending Bill is historic because it is the first Bill to proceed through this House under the new arrangements. As the Leader of the House (Mr Sinclair) has told honourable members, certain Bills will go through an extra step, that is, through a legislation committee. This Bill is the first and it will be interesting to see what advantages there are.

The Commonwealth Government’s Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act became law on 20 June 1975. The Act was designed to ensure the control, care and development of the Great Barrier Reef as a resource to be enjoyed and utilised by this generation and maintained, with a minimum of disturbance to its natural state, for the enjoyment and utilisation of future generations. The Great Barrier Reef region is a vast collection of islands and coral reefs extending along the Queensland coast for about 1,900 kilometres, from the tip of Cape York Peninsula to just north of Bundaberg and Fraser Island. Its size approximates the size of Victoria. It is internationally recognised as the largest and most complex expanse of living corals and associated organisms in the world. The marine ecosystem is complex and diverse and includes many unique forms of sea life. It is an area of irreplaceable beauty and significant scientific value and attracts numerous tourists, scientists and fishermen from the world over. There has been an increasing public awareness of the fragility of the marine environment generally and of the Reef in particular and an awareness of its vulnerability to further intensification of human activities.

As an indication of the importance this Government places on the Reef, expenditure in this Budget has doubled to $740,000. The Budget also contains a new item—marine quality assessment activities, $100,000. A statutory authority, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, has been set up to establish and manage the marine park, working in co-operation with the Queensland Government and the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee. One of the reasons why these amendments have come forward is that in the near future, and as soon as possible, the first part of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park will be declared. I hope that that answers one question raised by the previous speaker, the honourable member for Robertson (Mr Cohen). The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park includes the Capricorn and Bunker groups of reefs and Lady Elliott Island, the southern area of the declared region. The actual proclamation is subject to some legal investigation now because the ownership of Lady Elliott Island is being questioned. The original Act of 1975 set out the boundaries of the region. It commences at the point on the coastline of Queensland at mean low water that is intersected by the parallel of latitude 10 degrees 41 minutes south and then runs east along that parallel and south along the coastline at mean low water. Unfortunately, this is not a good description of what was meant and, in fact, those lines do not meet. This leaves a gap in the boundaries of the region and this amendment to the Act closes the gap and puts aside any legal doubt about whether a region was declared for the purposes of the Act. The region now commences at the point of low water—not mean low water—being the northernmost extremity of Cape York Peninsula, runs thence easterly along the geodesic to a defined point and runs southerly along that coastline at low water. Modern navigation tends to use geodesics, which are the shortest lines lying on a given surface and connecting two given points.

The amendments exclude all the Suamarez Reef from the region. This reef in fact is a part of the Coral Sea Islands territory. It will be of interest to honourable members to note that the region did not include the reefs north of Cape York because of the continuing discussion over the international border between Papua New Guinea and Australia. However, that region can be extended further north in the future if this
seems desirable. Now that the border issue is about to be resolved, I ask the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Groom) to investigate this area and see whether the region should be extended so that all the Reef can be protected.

The debate on the Bill in June 1975 was extensive. A good part of it was on the appointment of members to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and of the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee. The Whitlam Government accepted the representations of the then Opposition to change certain matters relating to such appointments. This amending Bill widens the range and allows flexibility in respect of possible appointees and representatives. The amending Bill also makes minor drafting changes such as omitting the words 'Australian Government' and substituting the words 'Commonwealth Government'. Let me tell honourable members of some of the on-going work that has been carried out. A two-day workshop of scientists and experts, departmental officers, Aboriginals and Torres Strait pilots was held in April 1978 to discuss the protection of the unique qualities of the northern section of the Reef. Other workshops are planned in the future. The Authority will be playing a major role in the overseeing and the managing of oil spill research, which I hope will satisfy the honourable member for Robertson. It will be making a submission on the future management of Green Island and its reefs. A second section of the maritime park and the reefs between Cairns and Innisfail is being proposed for declaration. The Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) has given a commitment to try to have the Great Barrier Reef listed as part of the world heritage list and the Authority is doing the necessary work to see that this is carried out. It will also be involved in the Iwasaki development and the impact that it will have on the Reef. In all, the Authority is fully and completely involved with the Great Barrier Reef. I am pleased to enter this debate as one of the many Australians who have enjoyed some of this remarkable and wonderful area and as one who wants it to continue to provide some pleasure to future generations. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr HUMPHREYS (Griffith) (2.30)—I have listened with interest as the honourable member for Hotham (Mr Roger Johnston) spelt out in great detail the wonders and magnificence of the Great Barrier Reef. I sincerely hope that the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Groom) takes note of his remarks and is aware of the importance of the Great Barrier Reef. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Amendment Bill amends the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975. For the most part it covers legislative machinery matters. It is perfectly reasonable that the Government has decided to tidy up one or two loose ends or anomalies in the 1975 Act. As my colleague the honourable member for Robertson (Mr Cohen) has already informed the House, the Opposition supports those changes to the Act which will ensure, firstly, that the representative of the Great Barrier Reef Park Authority on the Great Barrier Reef Consultative Committee will remain a member of the Authority; secondly, that the representative's status is that of a direct appointee; and, thirdly, that the Authority's representative on the Committee is a member or an acting member of the Authority.

Further, we acknowledge the legal requirement for delineation of the northern boundaries and precincts of the Great Barrier Reef. My colleague also referred to those matters relating to the Barrier Reef which cause consternation to the Opposition. We have, lying off the coast of Queensland, over one million hectares of natural miracle. The reef is a universal asset. It is a complex system consisting literally of hundreds of thousands of independent marine organisms. It will come as no revelation to any honourable member when I say that this, the world's greatest coral reef, is of interest and fascination to tourists, conservationists and scientists alike. Not only does the Reef attract tourists from all over the world, but also support to preserve it comes from every corner of the globe. Scientists are only beginning to discover the invaluable treasures of the Reef. There are few authoritative ecological studies even of one single sub-system such as the fish on the corals of the Reef, let alone the reef as a whole.

However, the Great Barrier Reef has faced severe threats and menaces. The greatest threat comes not from the elements or organisms of nature but from man and specifically from the misguided maladministration of that strange man from Kingaroy, the Premier of Queensland, Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Forget about the crown of thorns starfish, for all the extensive damage it has created on the Reef. The Premier of Queensland, Joh Bjelke-Petersen, if given half a chance, would wreak more havoc than the crown of thorns could ever do. I do not propose to catalogue the manifold sins and the environmental wickedness of the Bjelke-Peterson Government. But let me say this: if the commitment of this Government is to return Bjelke-Petersen control of the three-mile off-shore zone, it is the Barrier
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Reef which will be endangered. This happens to be a case of the world’s greatest wonder threatened by Australia’s gravest blunder.

There is an element of this amendment Bill which I quite honestly find puzzling and disconcerting. The Government intends to widen the field of qualifications and experience which are necessary for a Government nominee to be installed in the position of permanent chairman of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. The requisite qualifications will be the same for the permanent chairman as for the two part-time members of the Authority. The former acting chairman of the Authority, Dr McMichael, is a universally admired and acknowledged conservation biologist with extensive experience in national parks administration. He certainly had the support of the Australian Conservation Foundation.

Who’s Who for 1977 shows that Dr McMichael has been vice-president of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources since 1975, secretary of the Department of Environment from 1973 to 1975, president of the River Murray Commission for the same period and director of the Australian Conservation Foundation from 1967 to 1968. Dr McMichael earned his Ph.D at Harvard and has written widely on marine subjects. He has since gone to greener pastures as Secretary of the Department of Home Affairs and in doing so he has left something of a vacuum. I would imagine that filling Dr McMichael’s shoes would be a challenge but I find it difficult to believe that the job of securing an adequate eminent replacement with qualifications and experience in terms expressed in the existing Act is so vexing that the Government is compelled to broaden those terms by legislation to enable it to install someone it may already have in mind.

It has been brought to my attention that the Government in fact has decided on who is to be permanent chairman of the Authority. If the Government has someone in mind for the chairmanship, if by legislation it is going to tailor requirements for that position to its anonymous nominee for the chairmanship—that is, setting the qualifications to suit the man rather than setting the man to suit the qualifications—let the Government show its hand. If it refuses to do this, conservationists are liable to suspect that the Government is fiddling the requirements of the job in order to install a permanent chairman who may or may not be acceptable to conservationists and to the Australian Conservation Foundation but who may be acceptable to this Government and to the Government of Joh Bjelke-Petersen in Queensland. This is a suspicion I am sure the Government would not want to create.

The issue is sufficiently serious to warrant complete Government frankness because if the Government is determined to hand over the three-mile off-shore zone to the Premier of Queensland the question of who runs the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park and who has to deal with the likely incursions into the area by the Petersen Government becomes significant and, indeed, crucial. Already the marine park is unrealistically confined in its control of the Reef because the Park Authority’s jurisdiction extends only up to the shallow water surrounding each island in the Reef. The developments and the industrial complexes are not located on the water but on the islands and along the coast. It is the developments and the industrial complexes that represent potential threats to the Reef.

Contractions of the marine park by three miles around the coastline and around each island in the reef would severely restrict the effectiveness of conservation and protection policies adopted by the Park Authority. A map of the Marine Park would end up looking like Swiss cheese and Joh Bjelke-Petersen would have one of a hundred holes into which to crawl. The honourable member for Robertson has alluded to the Petersen Government’s callous indifference to matters of the environment. We know that Government supporters have short memories, but surely they can recall the inflexible attitude of the Premier on oil drilling on the Reef. The stance of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and its chairman is of enormous consequence to Mr Bjelke-Petersen if he is to get his way in respect of “oil rigging the reef”. As we know, the findings of the royal commission into petroleum drilling in the reef were inconclusive. The chairman of the royal commission found that drilling preferably should be postponed while the other two commissioners thought drilling permissible in certain areas. Obviously educated opinion is divided on drilling and just as obviously it matters greatly to the Premier of Queensland which side of the issue the head of the Barrier Reef park favours. One of the part-time members of the Authority is elected by the Queensland Government. At present that member is Mr S. Schubert, the Co-ordinator-General of Queensland. The other member is Dr J. Baker.

The conservationists and scientists of the world are watching the Barrier Reef and its management. National parks in this country are relatively new; national marine parks are even newer. They have a unique problem and require
special and specialised attention. It is no good having in this managerial position and in this sensitive situation second rate or second best or part-time managers or bureaucrats whose experience and qualifications are only tenuously related to the needs of the Reef. Dr McMichael set a standard. He gained wide approval among those whose first and foremost commitment was to the preservation of the Reef, not its exploitation. Professionals not puppets are required in this situation.  

I believe the Opposition amendment is an effective compromise requiring of the permanent chairman qualifications in an area suited to the functions of the Park Authority. Why settle for anything less? Why not the best? It is simply not good enough for a government to choose someone for a position, find he does not have the qualifications which, by law, he must and then set about changing the law and altering those qualifications to enable him to go ahead with its scheme. Of course that is not the right approach. But it is common practice for this Government; it is par for the course. Apparently the Government believes that if one cannot win the game one should go and change the rules. I call on the Minister to front up and clear up what the Government is proposing to do.

Mr Deputy Speaker (Mr Giles)—Before I call the honourable member for Dawson I think I had better explain that I did not interrupt the honourable member for Griffith because he is comparatively new to this House. He referred to the Premier of Queensland as Joh Bjelke-Petersen. I point out to the honourable member that the proper parliamentary phrase is ‘the Premier of Queensland’. The Premier’s name is hard enough for the southerners in this place to pronounce, anyway.

Mr Braithwaite (Dawson) (2.43)—I speak on this Bill with a fairly thorough knowledge of the Great Barrier Reef area. The coastline of my electorate of Dawson is adjacent to some 400 miles of the Reef. As a result I am quite conversant with the area. The Bill which seeks to amend the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act has been adequately described and I do not intend to canvass the personalities that comprise the consultative group or the various authorities that have an input. As I say, this point has been adequately covered by the honourable member for Hotham (Mr Roger Johnston), who spoke for the Government side, and also Opposition speakers.

This Bill offers one a unique chance to indicate the importance that the Great Barrier Reef plays not only to Queensland but also to the nation of Australia. Without doubt the Reef is one of our national treasures and one of the marvels of the world. The honourable member for Griffith (Mr Humphreys) described the Reef as a unique coral reef and I would agree with him on that point. The Opposition obviously holds some fears about the appointment of a chairman to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority. I would remind the honourable member for Griffith, as well as other members of the Opposition, that the chairman should be a person who is given sufficient flexibility both in the nature of his qualifications and in the nature of his appointment to carry out his functions. To hold a person too inflexibly to a standard or too inflexibly to the type of work to be done will not improve the work that is necessary for the protection of the Barrier Reef. I believe that this is a most important consideration.

Mr Cohen—We need one with qualifications like these so at least one of the three should be a scientist.

Mr Braithwaite—As the honourable member says, one has to have the qualifications. I imagine it is likely that all three of the persons who are chosen will have the qualifications that are required. However, I point out that the chairman will play an essential part in this operation and as such he must be allowed flexibility to make sure that he is able to guide the group to the proper decisions. I do not think we should lose sight of the fact that the decisions that have to be made must be proper decisions.

The honourable member for Griffith referred on a number of occasions to the Queensland Premier. Could I say, with all due respect to the honourable member, that possibly somebody else wrote his speech because I am sure that he does not hold those beliefs. There is no evidence of oil drilling. It was a matter of some public interest some five to 10 years ago, but at this time there has been no drilling on the Reef. This is the type of aspect that the group must look at to make sure that the balance of nature is left and so that we can develop and exploit the reef—I do not use the word ‘exploit’ from the point of view of trying to take everything out of the Reef—in harmony with that natural balance. I refer now to the fishing aspect. Possibly the Reef is the biggest untapped reserve for commercial fishing and, as a result, we have foreign intrusion into these areas which is a danger not only to the defence but also to the security of this country. Yet these people are able to fish, exploit and vandalise the Reef to such an extent that I believe Australians themselves should be more involved,
particularly as far as the fishing industry is concerned. We must pay particular attention to oil drilling, fishing, tourist promotion and travel because we must realise that the Whitsunday Passage internationalises the whole of the Great Barrier Reef for the people who go through it.

The point that I would make that has been mentioned already by the honourable member for Griffith is that, while marine national parks are rather new, they are no different to the national parks that we have on-shore; and this is where I believe that we must be careful. There are disciplines that have to be imposed in order to preserve the natural balance of nature. I suggest that, if we had a particularly low tide on the Great Barrier Reef which exposed the seabed, we would find more litter per square metre on that seabed than we would find in any on-shore resort. These are the disciplines that we must keep in balance. The other aspect I would like to mention is the off-shore development of the tourist islands. I have been to most of the major ones because all the major resorts are in the division of Dawson. I believe that the tourist promoters, whether they be large companies or family companies, have sought to build tourist attractions around the natural attractions. They have sought to protect these attractions as much as possible and I believe that they have been successful in this endeavour.

There are other aspects of on-shore development which are just as vital to our tourism in order to take advantage of the potential for international travel and tourism on the Reef. Mr Iwasaki has been mentioned in this context. I know that the Opposition spokesman on the environment has been to the area to see exactly what is proposed. It is a pity that those people who speak about on-shore or off-shore development of the Great Barrier Reef do not go there to see exactly what the potential is. The potential of this area is vastly untapped. The shoreline is untapped. As I mentioned before, the Reef itself is untapped as far as fishing is concerned; the whole tourist aspect is untapped.

What we must do, if we look, for instance, at the Iwasaki project, is make sure that, if Iwasaki commences development because the laws of Queensland and the laws of the Commonwealth are such that he can now start development, that development conforms not only to the laws of local government, the State government and the national government but also to the laws of nature, and that if the development is there it is only to enhance the natural aspects of the area and certainly not to destroy them. Contrary to my colleague's belief—although he comes from Queensland, I am not always sure that we should acknowledge it—I have faith in the Queensland Government and I believe that these laws, through the Public Service, the departments and the people concerned, will be observed and that Iwasaki will get no more than any normal Australian promoter would be allowed.

What I believe we must do, in developing the tourist aspect of the Reef, is ensure that its attractions are made available not only to the people who live in the vicinity but also to all Australians and all international travellers. We are at a stage where we are looking for international trade and tourism and I believe that it is one of the ways in which we can expand so that the Japanese or other tourists who come to Australia will be of benefit not only to Iwasaki at Yeppoon but also because they will travel further within Australia. My own belief is that if Iwasaki develops—I think this aspect is there; the ball is now in his corner—he must make sure that the natural aspect and the lay of the land is preserved.

The other aspect in connection with the Reef that has come in for criticism, especially from this House, certainly in this decade, has been the lack of security and the fact that Taiwanese fishermen and other foreign intruders are able to get onto the Reef. It is bad enough that they poach and take the fish which would naturally be an Australian product but the vandalism that they inflict on the Reef is greater than any inflicted by the crown of thorns starfish. The vandalism from that particular aspect is greater than any other in the natural environment of the Reef. Over a period nature will balance these natural disadvantages but there is nothing to balance the vandalism that is caused by human intruders.

I am not canvassing the technicalities of the Bill. They have been well covered. In regard to the qualifications of the Chairman, I see nothing wrong with the amendment which has been proposed by the Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Groom). I believe that the task of this group is a very important one, not only from Queensland's point of view but also from the point of view of all Australians. I suggest to the Minister that, if he wants to enjoy the real beauty of Australia, the place where the sun shines all throughout winter, the reef is the place to go.

Mr Cohen—Go to Gosford.

Mr BRAITHWAITE—Not to Gosford; that is still in New South Wales. Queensland and the Great Barrier Reef offer a great holiday for a Minister who is hard working and who wants to see these attractions for himself.
Mr GROOM (Braddon—Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development) (2.52)—in reply—I will respond very briefly and perhaps indicate at the outset to the honourable member for Dawson (Mr Braithwaite) that I will certainly be taking up his offer in the very near future. I want to thank all of those honourable members who have spoken in this debate. I appreciate their useful contributions. I think that they have all made serious, sensible speeches. All honourable members who have spoken have shown obvious interest in the Great Barrier Reef and its preservation. I have noted a number of the points that have been made and I will certainly be referring those to the Authority for suitable action to be taken on them and for full consideration to be given to them. I mention particularly the excellent speech made by the honourable member for Hotham (Mr Johnston). His speech was a very sound one. Although he is not a Queenslander, he has shown a particular interest in this subject, the Reef itself and this amending Bill.

I want to comment briefly on one or two points made by honourable members opposite. The honourable member for Griffith (Mr Humphreys) criticised the Queensland Government and in particular the Premier of Queensland, I think, very unfairly and unreasonably. I place on record the very real assistance and encouragement that has been provided by the Queensland Government in the operations of the Authority and also in the operations of the consultative committee. The Queensland Government is right behind these bodies and is assisting us as much as it possibly can. Of course, the Queensland Government has a very real interest in this subject. I want to remove one suspicion expressed by the honourable member for Griffith in his speech. He suggested that perhaps the Government is changing the qualifications provision of the Bill to suit a particular applicant whom it might have in mind. I assure him that the Government has no one in mind at this stage. It is waiting for this provision to be enacted before it seeks applications. There is no particular person in mind. The Government will be seeking a suitable person to take on the position of Chairman. At the moment there is an Acting Chairman in that position.

A number of other issues were raised. Some do not need answering; other perhaps do. I should make a comment on the proposed amendment of the honourable member for Robertson (Mr Cohen). I do not believe that it is a sound amendment. I think that it ignores the purpose of the amendment that the Government has presented to the House. We want to remove the uncertainty. The provision that is suggested in the amendment proposed by the honourable member does not remove that uncertainty. The term "the environmental sciences" is an uncertain term in its form. Again it limits the field.

Mr Cohen—You have made it wide open.

Mr GROOM—I appreciate the spirit in which it has been advanced by the honourable member, but I think that it would only compound the problem. Really it is not helpful and does not solve the issues.

The question of oil drilling has been raised. I want to make one or two brief points on that matter also. Oil drilling certainly will not be permitted in the region of the Great Barrier Reef until full and proper consideration has been given by the Government to the report of the royal commission into exploratory and production drilling for petroleum in the area of the Great Barrier Reef. That report was handed down in 1974. A considerable amount of work has been done since then although I must point out that the matter is not now presently before the Government. We will not rush into this subject. Consultations are taking place between the relevant departments and the Government's scientific advisers, including the Australian Science and Technology Council. At some time in the future an appropriate course of action will be recommended to the Government. Of course no decision will be taken without full and proper consultation with the Queensland Government. Any decision that is made in due course will be subject to the provisions of the Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act. We will certainly not permit any activity to take place on the Reef which will in any sense endanger it.

The question was asked: What progress has been made in actually declaring this marine park? Of course it is essential that an area must be specified in any proclamation. That provision is required by section 31. Prior to proclamation a report must be submitted to the Executive Council by the Authority. That is required by subsection (5) of section 31. One of the problems that we have had concerns the defect which existed in the prior legislation which was promulgated in 1975 whereby the region itself was not closed off effectively. The advice that we received from legal advisers was that in fact we had no region. So it was essential that we covered that problem and that defect. That will be done when this legislation is passed. A report and a draft proclamation for the Capricornia sector of the
park only awaits the passage of this legislation. (Quorum formed).

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Motion (by Mr Groom, on behalf of Mr Sinclair) proposed:

That this Bill be referred to a legislation committee for report by 28 September 1978.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Giles)—Before I put this question, I think it is fair, as the Chair is the custodian of the entire House, that I comment on this historic occasion. This is the first Bill to be referred to a legislation committee. On behalf of the House I congratulate all those people concerned.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

TRADE MARKS AMENDMENT BILL 1978

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 24 August, on motion by Mr Macphee:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Mr MACPHEE (Balaclava— Minister for Productivity)—Mr Deputy Speaker, may I have the indulgence of the House to raise a point of procedure on this legislation. Before the debate is resumed on this Bill I would like to suggest that it may suit the convenience of the House to have a general debate covering this Bill and the Patents Amendment Bill 1978 as they are associated measures. Separate questions will, of course, be put on each of the Bills at the conclusion of the debate. I suggest therefore, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you permit the subject matter of both Bills to be discussed in this debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Is it the wish of the House to have a general debate covering both measures? That course will be followed.

Mr HURFORD (Adelaide) (3.3)—I do not think the honourable member for Banks (Mr Martin) will find this debate of the same riveting interest as he did the last debate. So I will not be disappointed if only those honourable members who take a specialist interest in this very specialised area remain to take part in this debate. First of all, I will make a few points about the Trade Marks Amendment Bill 1978 and then I will turn my attention to the Patents Amendment Bill 1978 before talking about industry policy generally of which these two Bills are a part. The Trade Marks Amendment Bill amends the Trade Marks Act 1955 so that the statutory protection provided by registration of trade marks under the Act is extended to marks which identify and distinguish the services supplied by a particular business and not just goods which hitherto were covered by legislation. Currently the Act is limited to marks identifying only the goods supplied by the business.

The Opposition finds no objection to this logical extension of the Trade Marks Act. It takes this view for a few reasons. Prior to the introduction of this Bill, successive Australian Trade Marks Acts recognised only those marks which related to goods. This restriction was firstly a legacy of British trade mark legislation—we have inherited a lot from Great Britain at a cost as well as a benefit—and secondly a reflection of the relative insignificance of services hitherto at the date of transfer to the Commonwealth of power to legislate on trade marks. Neither proposition would seem to have much relevance now. In this changing world, as I indicated earlier, we can extend to services what has hitherto been applied to goods only. Also, until recently it had generally been accepted that constitutional power to legislate in respect of trade marks did not extend to services. This reflected an earlier judgment by the High Court in the union label case of 1908. The Government’s legal advisers recently have advised, however, that this conclusion is not consistent with subsequent High Court decisions in this area; that the provisions of section 51 (xviii) of the Constitution empower the Commonwealth to legislate in respect of trade marks concerning services.

By the end of 1970, 43 countries, including the United States, France, Canada, Korea and Taiwan, had introduced legislation providing statutory protection to trade marks for services. To this extent, Australia, of course, is lagging behind many of the other main industrial countries. We are glad that this Bill means that we are catching up in this area. Moreover, many countries make the entitlement of foreign businesses to such protection conditional upon corresponding protection in the country of origin of those businesses. This significantly disadvantages certain Australian businesses in their operation overseas until this Bill is passed by the Parliament.

Another point worth making about the Trade Marks Amendment Bill concerns the purpose of the Bill. If that purpose is achieved, firstly by amending the definition of a trade mark in section 6 of the principal Act to include marks used in connection with services and, secondly, by amending, where appropriate, the reference to goods in the principal Act to read ‘goods and services’, then indeed we are achieving the purposes
which I have indicated are important. Industry has welcomed these amendments. As the shadow Minister responsible in this area, I call for submissions when I have the time to do so. I welcome industry, commerce and other sections of the community involved in areas like this taking the initiative in getting in touch with me as the Opposition spokesman opening the debate in this area. In this case there has been very little response from the community which, I suppose, following the old principle of letting sleeping dogs lie, means that industry and commerce are happy that this legislation should be passed. I can go further than that because I have noted that the Australian Chamber of Commerce has said that these amendments will fill a gap in the Australian law. It pointed out that the Bills introduced a principle which is widely recognised overseas. The Confederation of Australian Industry has said that the amendments will bring Australia into line with the internationally accepted standard of affording protection to services marks.

Having recorded those remarks about the Trade Marks Amendment Bill, I turn my attention to the Patents Amendment Bill 1978. This Bill amends section 54A of the Patents Amendment Bill 1952 in order to reduce the period during which the information contained in the patents specification is unavailable to the Australian public to a maximum of 18 months. At present, publication of a complete specification is not required until 18 months after the date of lodgment of that document with the Patents Office. As current legislation also allows for up to 12 months to elapse between the filing of an application for patent protection and the lodgment of the specification document, a delay of up to 2½ years has resulted hitherto between a patent application and the publication of the specification relating to that application.

Industries interested in exploiting such developments are disadvantaged for two reasons: Firstly, during that 2½-year period they are unable to determine whether they are entitled to do so without infringing an Australian patent. Secondly, because of recent and increasing trends in the patents laws of major overseas industrial countries which provide for earlier publication of patent specifications than has been provided for so far in Australia, the technical information in patent applications based on prior overseas patent applications—currently 90 per cent of Australian applications—is available to foreign industries before it is disclosed in Australia. Here we have a real discrimination against Australian industry and in favour of foreign based industry.

For these reasons, the Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee), who is sitting at the table and is piloting this Bill through the House, was correct in saying in his second reading speech:

. . . . it is clearly desirable that the present excessive delay in the publication of Australian complete specifications should be removed.

The Minister has been true to his word. He is reducing that delay from 2½ years to 1½ years in this Bill. Accordingly the Bill, by dating the 18-month blackout from the date of filing of the patent application, rather than from the date of lodgment of the specifications document, which can be up to 12 months later, will result in most complete specifications being published 12 months earlier than is presently the case. For these reasons, this simple change to the Patents Act 1952 is welcomed by the Opposition, as is the Minister's more general foreshadowing of further amendments to the Act designed, as he said in his second reading speech, 'to encourage a positive approach to invention by Australian industries'. The Opposition is clearly on record as believing that there has to be a more positive response and a more positive intervention by government to help Australian industry. We believe that jobs have to be created not only by upgrading our minerals—just to quote one area—but also by using the results of our own research and development. These two Bills help in that latter area.

The two Bills form part of a general attempt by the Minister for Productivity to establish a coherent policy for Australian industry on the operation of the laws relating to patents, trade marks and designs which he foreshadowed in March this year. I repeat: We welcome this part of the general policy to ensure a more healthy Australian industry and to ensure that more jobs are created in Australia in order to reduce the enormous army of unemployed. I repeat that the Opposition supports this legislation as far as it goes. It goes as far as it possibly can in this particular area. The Minister has stated that his aim is to encourage and to assist industrial development and commercial activity in Australia. He is on record as saying that the inclusion of industrial property within the responsibilities of the Department of Productivity signals a new emphasis on ensuring that the system contributes as much as possible to the development and productivity of Australian industry. We heard with interest the announcement made in July that an Industrial Property Advisory Committee has been established to advise on continuing changes in Australia's patent, trade marks and designs laws.
and practices in ways which will boost innovation and productivity improvements in Australian industry.

I repeat: The Opposition supports this wholeheartedly because we believe that this is one of the areas—I am referring to the results of our own research and development—where new jobs can be created. I am sure that the House will not be surprised when I say that this is good only as far as it goes, inasmuch as it is only a very small part—important though it is—of a total coherent and cohesive industry policy. I take this opportunity to raise some questions, in seeking to prod the Government into further activity to help Australian industry. I ask: When will the Government go further than merely restricting itself to the industrial property policy area and the export market and research and development assistance areas? When will we have clearer guidelines as to those industries into which we must put more resources in this country in order to create jobs? When will we learn explicitly what we believe is implicit at the present time, namely, that industries that require tariff protection of 25 per cent or less will be encouraged; that there will be a standstill of those industries which require tariff protection of between 25 per cent and 35 per cent; and that definitely no encouragement will be given to those industries that require more than 35 per cent tariff protection—or is the figure 50 per cent?

I believe that the time is overdue when we should have a clearer statement from the Government on where resources should be concentrated and which industries should be encouraged, so that entrepreneurs in this country will put investment funds into industrial development, knowing that they have the clear support of the Government. It is clear that so far we have not had such a comprehensive statement from the Government. We are having patchwork measures which we can support, such as the two Bills before the House, but these do not add up to an industry policy which is as important and as substantial as we in the Opposition believe that it should be. I am very happy, nevertheless, to support these two Bills and I hope that they will have a speedy passage through the House of Representatives.

Mr DEAN (Herbert) (3.16)—The ownership of inventions, trade marks and designs creates important monopoly rights which are recognised by and large throughout the whole of the industrialised world. These two measures which we are discussing this afternoon are a further step to impress upon the community the benefits which can be obtained from exercising property rights.

So far as the Patents Amendment Bill is concerned, there is considerable economic value for Australia in its patents system. It is an instrument for encouraging Australian inventions and for assisting the adoption of technological developments by Australian industry. To understand what the amendments which we are discussing this afternoon are all about it will be useful to spend a few moments to consider the law about patents.

Generally speaking, if one wants to patent an invention one first lodges an application; and if one is an Australian inventor one usually lodges with that application a provisional specification, not a complete specification. Once that application is lodged it is required that the complete specification be lodged within 12 months of that date. So one has 12 months between the time one first applies for a patent and the time one has to put in the complete specification.

Once that happens the invention is not open for public inspection until 18 months after the lodgment of the complete specification so that in the normal course of events—and this frequently happens—from the time an application for a patent is lodged to the time when it is available for public inspection a period of 2½ years can elapse. Once a patent is granted, of course, for 16 years the inventor who has taken out the patent has the protection that the patents law gives him. That protection gives him the exclusive right to work his invention and the right to prohibit unauthorised use of it.

In the main this amendment seeks to bring forward the date of publication. As I have said, at present the date of publication is not until 18 months after the date of lodgment of the full specification. The change is to make publication 18 months after the first priority date that one gets through the patents system, which is in effect the date that one lodges the application, so that instead of a period of 2½ years going by before notice of the invention can be made public it will be a period of 18 months, thus shortening that publication period by 12 months.

That has some important ramifications. In the first place, it means that industry will know sooner than at present what it can do and what it cannot do so far as using inventions and so on is concerned. Perhaps more importantly it means that there is earlier availability of information about inventions, about technological change and so on, so that businesses which are planning innovation and planning forward will be assisted in knowing what is going on in the invention area. The availability of information at an earlier
point in time is a very important part of this amendment. Thirdly, the amendment increases the effectiveness of the patents system by reducing the period within which a claim for damages for infringement can be made because damages can apply only after the publication date and not for any period before that date. The reduction of the publication date by 12 months means generally that patent rights which are not effective until publication become available to the inventor at that earlier point. That is a third important ramification of this Bill. The amendments are worth while and very desirable; and I commend them to the House.

So far as the Trade Marks Amendment Bill is concerned, what happens with the trade mark is that registration of it gives the person registering it the right to exclusive use of the trade mark and the right to obtain relief if there is an infringement in the use of that mark. Of course, trade marks traditionally in this country have related to goods and this amendment offers the same protection and the same right of relief to persons who will register what we might call service marks—trade marks in respect of services. The services affected, of course, are extensive and I can give some examples of the sorts of services which could and may well use the new trade mark rights in respect of services.

These include the advertising business generally, insurance companies, finance houses and the construction and repair industry. Communications is another important area where a certain design relating to the service may be prepared and can be registered. The transportation and storage industries and the material treatment industries, such as flour milling, bookbinding and metal plating, and the persons who run those industries will be able to devise a service mark identifying their particular business and have it registered as a trade mark. Other examples are education, entertainment and all sorts of miscellaneous services which are available in the community, including the accommodation industry, hire services, beauty salons and computer services. Some examples of the sorts of marks which might be registerable are the rather famous stylised letter 'A' which Ansett Airlines of Australia uses and the certain logos or identifying marks which consultants and others are already adopting as part of their letterheads. These may well be the sorts of things which can be registered and which can give a ready identification of services offered by a firm, to the trading benefit of that firm and to the ultimate benefit of the consumer.

Generally under these amendments the marks which are registered as service marks will gain protection throughout Australia and Norfolk Island, although I understand that there are some cases where the rights of protection and of obtaining relief will be limited to some geographical areas. For example, if somebody in my home city of Townsville has a service which is similar to a service in Perth and there is no real likelihood of either of those services competing anywhere, it is possible that similar marks can be registered in respect of those services. But apart from that sort of thing, generally speaking registration will give protection Australia-wide. I have already indicated that these sorts of mark, I believe, will become a valuable business asset and that proprietors will be able to use them as ready identification of the services that they offer. That ready identification in turn should result in consumers more readily being able to know the services that they want; and that is very important.

So far as the law is concerned, if somebody has a particular logo or service mark the right to obtain relief at present gives him no real protection at all. At common law if a person wants to take an action against a competing firm the only way he can get relief is if that business is passing off its services as the services of his business. But apart from that there is no real protection or relief and this legislation does a mighty service to the community by providing that greater degree of protection and at the same time, as I have said, by providing a ready identification of the services which are being offered.

It is important that these two amendments, which are important, as has been conceded on both sides of the House, should be seen as part of the wider work of the Government in the whole area of productivity, in the whole area of making Australian industry and business generally more productive, more competitive and internationally competitive. All of this sort of work is being carried on by this Government. It has been suggested in the debate this afternoon that these measures which the Government is undertaking represent something of patchwork action and that the Government really has not gone very far beyond the industrial property area, some research and development and export incentives. The Government has gone further than that. No doubt we would all like to see the Government go still further, but the Government, particularly through the Department of Productivity and the Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee), is working on a much wider range of measures which are designed to increase the national and
international competitiveness and productivity of Australian industry.

As a first point to arise from that, I make reference to the industry studies that have been undertaken and are continuing by the Department of Productivity through the office of the Minister. Officers of the Department along with management and along with trade union representatives—in other words, these are tripartite studies—have been conducting direct and detailed studies on many industries. They are examining such aspects as cost structures and all those sorts of matters that have a bearing on competitiveness, productivity and cost efficiency. The first of these studies occurred in the forging industry and there has been widespread publication of the results of that study given to the community. Particular attention is currently being given in the program to technological research and the finding of export markets. Another series of industries now being studied is the footwear, clothing and textile industries where again the Department through the tripartite studies is looking at them from the point of view of their future competitiveness and productivity. So the Government, as I say, is doing far more than perhaps has been conceded by the preceding speaker, the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr Hurford).

Let me consider for a moment some of the other measures that are being handled through the Minister for Productivity. These are measures that this Government has recognised are part and parcel of an important program for an industry policy. As we know from the Budget, the Government has expanded its support for industrial research and development. The Budget this year provides an increase from $14m to $24m in that area. In this program there are three broad types of grants. One is for original research and development. The second type of grant is to enable technology transfer to small business by way of commencement grants to enable small business to take up and to commence using innovative measures. The third is assistance for projects which are deemed to be in the public interest and which cannot be financed by industry. It is very gratifying indeed to see the increased commitment in this Budget in support for industrial research and development.

There is of course the Patents Information Service that the Minister has established. That service has been extended considerably. It will work in conjunction with the Information Technology Council—another of the instruments which have been established through the office of the Minister. All in all, these two establishments are designed to make the community and manufacturing industry in particular better aware of technology—that technology which is available already in this community and available for adaptation so as to improve productivity.

Reference has already been made, of course, to the Industrial Property Advisory Committee which will continue the sort of work that these amendments are the result of and we can foreshadow, I am sure, that there will be considerable further advice coming from that Committee which will result in further changes in the whole area of industrial property for the betterment of the competitiveness and the productivity of Australian industry.

I look further now at the sorts of industry programs being undertaken through the office of the Minister. There is the National Materials Handling Bureau which has been doing some remarkably good work in relation to packaging. In fact, I understand that the Bureau has devised a packaging system which it calls Modpack which will lead to more uniformity and better utilisation of packaging facilities. That is the sort of thing which is vitally important in a country such as Australia which requires goods to be packaged for distribution over long distances and for sale. There is an iron and steel productivity program. Under this program a series of study groups has been established. One of the groups has been considering the rationalisation of steel connections. Again that is very important. It might sound small on its own but it is a very important piece of work to be done when one considers the different sizes and sorts of materials used in connections in the iron and steel industry. That program has led to another significant piece of work through the Department of Productivity, and that is the technology transfer program. I referred earlier to the need to permit the transfer of technology from one section of industry to another and perhaps from large industry to smaller industry and from big business to small business so that all business, including small business, can take advantage of the latest technological developments.

At this point I commend the Government for the support it has given to the development of Interscan because this is not unrelated to what we are talking about here, that is, offering assistance where it is needed in the development of Australian industry. Interscan, as we know, is a microwave landing system which was invented by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation and which now looks as
though it has been adopted internationally. The Government, as we know from previous announcements, has given considerable support to the development and marketing of this invention.

Another piece of work which has now commenced through the office of the Minister is an attempt—and this is a most important item—to try to rationalise the veritable maze of policies, practices and regulations which govern industry throughout the country. There are State laws; there are Federal government laws; there are Commonwealth laws; and there are different laws throughout the whole of the country. If there is an industry which is trying to service the whole of the country, this of course is an impediment to high productivity and an impediment to effectiveness and efficiency. So, the Minister’s Department together with similar departments throughout the whole of the country is trying to find ways of rationalising this maze of laws, simplify them and bring about rather more uniformity. That is a program which again is most important and for which I would commend the Government.

It is worth noting particularly that in relation to the Government’s concern for a productive and an efficient manufacturing industry in this country, the Government has considered its policy on employee participation. Again there is no need for me to go into that in any great detail this afternoon. It has been well talked about but it is another example of how the Government is more and more pursuing a wide ranging approach to the myriad of problems that beset efficient industry in this country.

In the short time left to me to speak I should finally mention that the Government is certainly not inactive in the area of technological and computerised change. It has been suggested in many quarters that the Government has been left behind in some respect in this new technology situation, the sort of computer holocaust type of situation which has been described recently in a national newspaper.

Indeed the Government is not inactive in that area. The Government is concerned to ensure that Australia has high levels of employment in the future. With that, it recognises that there is a need to use new technology, to create new industries and to reap the benefits which can flow from specialisation and diversification. Australia recognises that it needs new technology. This Government is doing nothing to shy away from that: This Government is concerned to assist that. There is already considerable contact and work being done with industry and with unions to implement and to take advantage of technological change which is available in the community.

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

Mr MACPHEE (Balaclava—Minister for Productivity) (3.36)—in reply—Mr Deputy Speaker, we certainly did not have quantity in this debate, but we did have quality. I thank the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr Hurford) for his support on behalf of the Opposition of these measures and I particularly commend the honourable member for Herbert (Mr Dean) for the contribution he made. He most ably replied to the one point of criticism which came from the Opposition and I will not detain the House by repeating what the honourable member so ably said. I do think it is important to stress that the two Bills will do a great deal to improve productivity and to stress again that they are by no means ad hoc, patchwork measures: They are very much part of a concerted program to make industrial property laws in Australia more outgoing and to make them not merely a protection of people’s innovations, but to make them a source of information for other people to be innovative themselves, at least in the adaption of other people’s inventions, if not in their own original inventions.

I believe most strongly that the Trade Marks Amendment Bill, which provides for the introduction of a concept of trade marks in respect of services, will do a great deal to improve competition in Australia in the service sector. It will reward people who work up a business and who identify it with a logo, a symbol or some other mark and which currently has no legal protection afforded to it, although there is, of course, protection in respect of trademarks on goods. So we are now providing a much needed boost to the service sector so that people can mark their services, knowing that the symbol which they use will be protected by legislation in the same way as trade marks in respect of goods. The honourable member for Banks (Mr Martin) might have thought that he was not going to find this a riveting debate, but I think he would have found it so after listening to the two speakers who preceded him.

The industrial property advisory committee, I believe, will be important to continue the work of updating and reviewing our industrial property laws. These measures, when taken in conjunction with the other measures—the industrial research
and development grants, the export market development grants, the moves towards an information technology council, the making available of more information by the patents information service and the pilot programs in respect of technology transfer—will improve the quality of innovation in Australia, the quality of competition and productivity improvement generally.

The one point of criticism which came from the honourable member for Adelaide was that we have not indicated which industries ought to be developed and in which industries people ought to seek to get patents and to extend their services. We do have a White Paper on this matter. It is, as was the work of the Jackson Committee, aimed at encouraging export-oriented internationally competitive industries. I believe that the total of measures to which the honourable member for Herbert has referred and which are conducted by my Department will assist our industries to be that way. We do not believe that as a government we can impose on investors, on management decisions about where they should invest their capital and where they should do their research and development. We believe that we have an obligation to make the maximum information available to them and that with that knowledge they will respond to market trends, both domestic and international, as they assess them.

As the honourable member for Herbert has said, we do have industry programming groups and we have advisory councils. These are all of a tripartite character. They are doing studies and they are applying their findings. They are getting what one might call micro-knowledge, which is instantly being translated into practice. At the same time this is providing a storehouse of information upon which the macro-thinking and planning, whether it be manpower planning or future research programs, can be built. We are approaching this in a most practical way from a government point of view, leaving the market to make its own practical decisions. I commend the Bills to the House.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Motion (by Mr Macphee, on behalf of Mr Sinclair) agreed to:

That this Bill be referred to a legislation committee for report by 26 October 1978.

BILLS RETURNED FROM THE SENATE

The following Bills were returned from the Senate without amendment:

Homeless Persons Assistance Amendment Bill 1978.
Australian Capital Territory Electricity Supply Amendment Bill 1978.

FAMILY LAW ACT 1975: PROPOSED JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE

Consideration of Senate Message

Debate resumed from 23 August, on motion by Mr Killen:

That the House concurs in the resolution transmitted in Message No. 103 of the Senate relating to the proposed appointment of a joint select committee to inquire into and report upon the provisions and the operation of the Family Law Act 1975.

Senate’s resolution.

That—

(1) A Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report upon—

(a) the provisions, and the operation, of the Family Law Act 1975, with particular regard to:

(i) the ground of divorce and whether there should be other grounds;

(ii) maintenance, property and custody proceedings including:

(a) the bases on which orders may be made in such proceedings; and

(b) the enforcement of orders in such proceedings;

(iii) the organisation of the Family Court of Australia and its conduct of proceedings;

(iv) the conduct of proceedings by State and Territory courts exercising jurisdiction under the Act;

(v) whether the Family Court should be more open to the public when hearing proceedings, and whether publication of the details of proceedings under the Act should be permitted;

(vi) the services provided by:

(a) the counsellors attached to the Family Courts; and

(b) approved voluntary marriage counselling organisations;

(vii) the cost of proceedings under the Act; and

(b) any other matters under the Act referred by the Attorney-General.

(2) The Committee consists of five members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Prime Minister, three members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives, three Senators nominated by the Leader of the Government.
in the Senate and two Senators nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate.

(3) Every nomination of a member of the Committee be notified in writing to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(4) The Committee elect as Chairman one of the members nominated by the Prime Minister or by the Leader of the Government in the Senate.

(5) The Committee elect a Deputy Chairman who shall perform the duties of the Chairman of the Committee at any time when the Chairman is not present at a meeting of the Committee, and at any time when the Chairman and Deputy Chairman are not present at a meeting of the Committee, the members present shall elect another member to perform the duties of the Chairman at the meeting.

(6) The Committee have power to appoint sub-committees consisting of 3 or more of its members and to refer to any such sub-committee any of the matters which the Committee is empowered to examine.

(7) The Committee or any sub-committee have power to send for persons, papers, and records, to move from place to place and to sit during any adjournment of the Parliament.

(8) Seven members of the Committee constitute a quorum of the Committee, and a majority of the members of a sub-committee constitute a quorum of that sub-committee.

(9) In matters of procedure the Chairman or Deputy Chairman when acting as Chairman have a deliberative vote and, in the event of an equality of voting, have a casting vote, and, in other matters, the Chairman or Deputy Chairman have a deliberative vote only.

(10) The Committee be provided with all necessary staff, facilities and resources.

(11) The Committee or a sub-committee have power to authorise publication of any evidence given before it and any document presented to it.

(12) The Committee report by 31 December 1979 and any member of the Committee have power to add a protest or dissent to any report.

(13) The foregoing provisions of this Resolution, so far as they are inconsistent with the Standing Orders, have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Standing Orders.

(14) A Message be sent to the House of Representatives acquainting it of this Resolution and requesting that it concur and take action accordingly.

Clause 1.

Upon which Mr Kevin Cairns had moved by way of amendment:

In sub-clause (a), after paragraph (i) insert the following paragraph:

‘(ia) its effects on the nature of marriage and the family.’

Mr LIONEL BOWEN (Kingsford-Smith) (3.43)—Mr Deputy Speaker, I had already spoken prior to the amendment being moved. I understood that the Government wanted to consider the amendment. The Opposition sees no objection to the amendment and if the Government is in favour of it, it can be dealt with.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 2.

(2) The Committee consists of five members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Prime Minister, three members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives, three Senators nominated by the Leader of the Government in the Senate and two Senators nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate.

Mr KEVIN CAIRNS (Lilley) (3.44)—by leave—I move:

Omit ‘five’, substitute ‘six’.

Omit ‘three’ (first occurring), substitute ‘four’. 

As honourable members will see from the amendment, clause 2 would then read: The Committee—

That is, the committee of Inquiry—

consists of six members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Prime Minister, four members of the House of Representatives nominated by the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Representatives . . .

The number of honourable senators would remain the same as indicated in clause 2 at present. The reason for my moving this amendment is quite simple and quite straightforward. On most committees of inquiry of this kind or on committees of both Houses, the ratio of the number of members of the House of Representatives to senators is generally 2 : 1. That applies now. Basically, the proposal was that there be eight members of the House of Representatives and five members of the Senate. The purpose of these amendments is to indicate that there should be 10 members of the House of Representatives and five members of the Senate. The precedent for that ratio is quite overwhelming. It is the kind of ratio that exists in the Public Works Committee, the Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, which are all committees of both Houses. Where there are committees of the two Houses the ratio is generally 2 : 1. I suggest that the representation proposed in this clause for the House of Representatives under-represents this House. There are many members of this House who would want to serve on the committee of inquiry. It is for those very simple reasons, relying on precedent and on the fact that many intelligent contributions can be made by members of this House, that I have moved that there be six members from the Government side and four members from the Opposition side of this House.

Mr LIONEL BOWEN (Kingsford-Smith) (3.46)—The Opposition has no objection to the amendments.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Drummond)—Are the amendments seconded?

Mr Bradfield—Yes, I second the amendments and reserve my right to speak.
Amendments agreed to.

(Quorum formed).

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 5 agreed to.

Remainder of resolution—by leave—taken as a whole.

Mr DONALD CAMERON (Fadden) (3.50)—I take this opportunity to express the hope that when appointments to this committee are made high office bearers such as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hayden), the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and others will adopt an attitude which recognises that over the last three or four years Australia has accepted the vast changes that were made in relation to family law and we will not have the type of committee which would return us to the pre-Family Law Act days.

Mr Martyr—Of course we will.

Mr DONALD CAMERON—It frightens me that the honourable member for Swan responds by saying that he wants to go back to the pre-1975 days. I recognise that the current Act needs alteration. The Bill which was introduced proposed vast changes. Those who supported the Bill knew at the time of its introduction that they were not supporting perfection but rather were supporting a change, bearing in mind that in the years ahead the Act would be re-examined and any weaknesses which showed up as a result of experience could be altered. The interjection of the honourable member for Swan has reinforced my fears rather than allayed them. Whilst I hope that the committee will have on it a representative of the views of the honourable member for Swan, I hope also that it will not be made up entirely of men with views similar to those of the honourable member. That certainly would be an unbalanced committee. It needs to be a balanced committee representing all spectrums of thought. I conclude by making a plea to the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition and others who will decide on the appointment of suitable people to the committee that they put aside their own personal prejudices and views and appoint a balanced committee which can review the Act with the balance that Australia craves at this time.

Remainder of resolution agreed to.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 1978-79

In Committee

Consideration resumed from 20 September.

Schedule 2.

Department of the Treasury

Proposed expenditure, $253,067,000.

Department of Finance

Proposed expenditure, $25,379,000.

Advance to the Minister for Finance

Proposed expenditure, $125,000,000.

Mr BRADFIELD (Barton) (3.53)—I am delighted to be able to speak on these estimates, because they go right to the heart of what is embodied in the Budget. The estimates for the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Finance show up a pattern that outlines this Government's philosophy and the efficiency that this Government has restored to the public sector of Australia, which is financed by the private sector. This year the estimates for the Department of the Treasury are approximately $253m and for the Department of Finance approximately $25m. Honourable members will be aware that the Department of Finance was constituted recently, when it was split away from the Treasury. The Department has been in existence for a little over a year. It helps to put efficiency into Government expenditure. Let me spend some brief time in explaining the operations of the Department of Finance as compared with the Department of the Treasury. Basically the Department of Finance is designed to ensure that estimates for expenditure on behalf of the Government are adhered to.

Let me put the position in business terms. The Treasurer is like the financial director of a company. The Department of Finance acts in an accountant role. It is necessary, particularly in an organisation as big as the Government of Australia, that we have a department such as the Department of Finance to make sure that we adhere to the Estimates of expenditure that have been agreed to in the Budget. As I said, the patterns of expenditure by the Department of the Treasury in particular show the efficiency of this Government. The two major items of expenditure for the Department of the Treasury are the administration of the Australian Taxation Office and the administration of the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

An interesting picture is revealed when we look at the total administrative costs, particularly of the Australian Taxation Office. I know that many people regard this as a big organisation with a lot of overhead. The total expenditure of the Office for this financial year amounts to $174m which is really only $12 per head of population. I think that it is quite an efficient
office that can operate at such a figure. Its operations cover all the States of Australia. It does a magnificent job, even though most people hate it. The Australian Taxation Office is a great necessity for Australia because only when the money comes into that Office can it be tunnelled out to those people in need. I think that a breakdown cost of $12 per head of population reveals the efficient operation of the Australian Taxation Office.

Let me look a little more closely at the costs of running the Office in the previous years and, indeed, the total expenditure for the Department of the Treasury. I think that this Government has done a tremendous job in curtailing the rise in expenditure of Government departments while at the same time maintaining the efficient services they provide for the people of Australia. Let me deal with the position in the years before this Government came into power. The rise in expenditure of these departments was running into the double digit percentages. The total increase in expenditure for the Department of the Treasury for 1976-77 compared to 1974-75 was only 5 per cent. In fact, until 1976-77 the total expenditure of the Department, without taking into consideration the effects of inflation, increased by 5 per cent each year. If the real effect of inflation is taken into account, we find that the people of Australia have benefited from a decreasing cost of administering these departments.

I would also like to make a brief reference to the Australian Bureau of Statistics which also provides a magnificent service to the people of Australia. The total expenditure for the Bureau this year is estimated at $57m. That figure breaks down to a cost of $4 per head of population to run the Bureau. The people of Australia are receiving good value for their money in the running of both those departments. It is costing $12 per head of population to run the Australian Taxation Office and $4 per head of population to run the Australian Bureau of Statistics. I wonder whether the people realise the amount of tax revenue that has been collected by the Australian Taxation Office over recent years. Let me cite the position back in 1973-74. Total tax collections, amounting to almost $11 billion, exceeded the previous year’s collections by 28½ per cent. The collections in the following year, 1974-75, exceeded the previous year’s collections by 30 per cent. Of course, honourable members will realise that at about that time there was a change of government. A Government came to power that was concerned to see that the people of Australia should not be burdened with such massive increases in taxation.

Mr Kevin Cairns—Of course, you were a former employee of the Taxation Office.

Mr BRADFIELD—The honourable member for Lilley, I know, pays a tremendous amount of tax and we appreciate very much the contribution he makes. In 1975-76, this Government cut the increase in total tax collection to 19 per cent and in 1976-77, it cut the tax collection increase to 16 per cent. In 1977-78, the increased tax collected amounted to only 8 per cent. In 1978 supposedly people are rebelling against the so-called 1½ per cent tax surcharge. We have been told that people have been organising protests against the Government's Budget. Tax collected this year will increase by only 11½ per cent over the amount collected last year. I might add that these increases in tax collections I am talking about are expressed in real dollar terms without taking into account the inflation rate.

If we go through the figures over the last 3 years, we see that the total amount of tax collected by this Government has actually decreased when compared to the amount of tax collected during the era of the Whitlam Government when the taxation collections rose annually by 28½ per cent and 30 per cent. This Government has actually decreased the tax burden on the Australian people. Yet people are incensed to go out and demonstrate against the Budget. I submit that people will blindly demonstrate without understanding the true reasons behind the Budget. The people of Australia have had a tremendous tax deal over the last 3 years. I am proud to be associated with a Government that has introduced tax reform for the Australian people.

I wish to talk briefly about the 1½ per cent surcharge that is being imposed on the Australian people this year. Unfortunately, no one wants to pay tax. But we must all look at the situation responsibly. We know that Australia has a Budget deficit. We know that Australia has social security, health and education programs that are the best in the world. I agree that the Australian people should have them. They deserve such programs. But the programs have to be financed and rightly so. The only way that such worthwhile programs can be financed is from taxation revenue. This year, reluctantly, the Government has had to impose this 1½ per cent tax surcharge. The surcharge will remain in force for only this year. It will not continue in operation after this year. The Treasurer (Mr Howard) gave his assurance that a termination date of 30 June 1979
for the 1½ per cent tax surcharge will be embodied in the legislation. Even taking into account the ½ per cent tax surcharge, the rate of taxation revenue collection in Australia, bearing in mind the rate of inflation, has increased only marginally over the previous year's collections.

It is unfortunate that when the people of Australia are incensed to demonstrate against the Budget, they do not look a little more closely at the figures and see what they are demonstrating against. I repeat that over the last three years the people of Australia have had an excellent taxation deal. The figures I have cited show this to be the case. In previous years, taxation was running wild and the people of Australia were suffering. Under this Government, they have received an excellent deal in regard to taxation and will continue to receive an excellent deal. I am very pleased to support these estimates for the Australian Taxation Office and, to a lesser extent the Australian Bureau of Statistics. The Australian Taxation Office is a most efficient organisation. It is doing an efficient job for the people of Australia. I totally support the expenditure of $253m for the Department of the Treasury which, of course, includes an expenditure of $174m for the Australian Taxation Office.

Mr WILLIS (Gellibrand) (4.4)—I shall confine my remarks to the Australian Bureau of Statistics which was referred to briefly by the previous speaker, the honourable member for Barton (Mr Bradfield). Any consideration of what has been happening to the Bureau proves that this Government truly is a vandalising government. Not only has it wrecked the Australian economy by driving it deeper into recession but also it is making it very difficult for anyone to correct the mess that it is making by destroying the information base upon which policies would need to be determined. If we look at what has happened to the Bureau, it can be seen that the collection of a whole array of basic economic statistics is being whittled down or abandoned altogether. This is an extraordinary vandalistic approach for any government to take.

Firstly, I would like to look at the staff of the Bureau. Budget Paper No. 4 shows that average employment in the Bureau will fall by 11.9 per cent in 1978-79 compared with the previous year 1977-78. The Bureau's annual reports show that between 30 June 1975 and 30 June 1977 employment at the Bureau declined by 223 or 5.7 per cent. Public Service Board annual reports show that from 30 June 1978 to 30 June 1979 with staff ceilings there will be a further decline of 4.4 per cent in the Bureau's staff. So over that four-year period—from mid-1975 to mid-1979—there will be a fall of 465 or 12 per cent in the Bureau's staff. Are these staff cuts simply cutting out fat or are they reducing the quantity and standard of service? I submit that there is no doubt that the latter is the true description of what is happening. Mr Cameron, the Australian Statistician, said earlier this year that a rise in the Bureau's staff of 1.7 per cent in this current financial year was required at the very minimum if the Bureau was to be able to carry out its responsibilities at all property.

I have a minute dated 1 February 1978 written by the Australian Statistician to the Treasurer. I will quote various parts of it. On the first page under the heading of 'Staff estimates' the Statistician said:

I should point out that staff numbers at 30 June shown in Attachment A—

This sets the requirements for this year and future years—

understate the increase in resources required to carry out the Bureau's forward work program.

Then on page 9 he said:

The estimates embody a very tough attitude to resource use by project managers and until 1980-81 will not enable us to offer users significant improvements in the statistical services we provide.

He went on later to state:

Should staff ceilings and Budget appropriations for 1978-79 be less than those set out in these estimates, some on-going statistical collections will have to be suspended or further action taken to curtail output.

So there we have very clear statements from the Statistician that if he does not get the staff numbers he requires—at least an increase of 1.7 per cent—there will be considerable curtailment of activity of the Bureau. In fact curtailment of activity has already taken place in previous years.

The deterioration of services began in 1976-77. I can give the Committee a short list of the cut backs in that year. In 1976-77 the Bureau ceased monthly survey of aggregate import orders, reduced the program of studies of foreign ownership and control, excluded unlisted companies from capital raising statistics, reduced the size of the sample for the agricultural finance survey, reduced the frequency of collection of data in some manufacturing production, excluded small businesses from surveys of manufacturing production and reduced samples for surveys of earnings and hours. That was just for 1976-77.

An even much more important decision was taken in that year. I refer to the decision to postpone for one year the processing of the census
and then to process only 50 per cent of it. This was an extraordinary decision—a decision which greatly reduced the value of the census. It was a shocking waste of public money spent on conducting the census in the first place. The rationale was to save $6m in 1976-77 by not processing the census in that year and to save $2m eventually by processing only half of it. The census is of tremendous importance to this country. It is the principal mechanism for the collection of indispensable demographic, social and economic data. The 1976 census was especially important because for the first time it asked questions in regard to income. It is quite clear that the decision to postpone treatment of the census was a shocking one.

The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Environment and Conservation considered this matter and in tabling its report on the Commonwealth Government and the Urban Environment the Chairman of the Committee said:

The Committee received conflicting evidence on the adequacy of using a 50 per cent sample but finds it ludicrous to collect 100 per cent of the data at significant cost and effort, abandon half of it and take what appears to have been a hasty decision to process the other half. The Committee is disturbed at the decision to delay processing. The data contained in the census is vital to many areas of public and private enterprise and the older the data gets the less valuable it becomes.

The Chairman finally said:

The decision was shortsighted and taken without proper recognition or understanding of the implications for the efficiency of decision making at all levels of government and the private sector. We believe that it should not happen again.

That certainly is the attitude of the Opposition. It was decided earlier this year that the cutbacks would apply for 1978-79. This decision was leaked out while the House was in session before the winter recess. The cutbacks firstly were in relation to foreign ownership and control. If there is any area for which it is important to collect data one would assume it would be in respect of the extent to which our industry is owned by people in other countries. Surely that is an important area of statistical collection. But this Government is abandoning collection of statistics on the extent of foreign control of our industries. It has disbanded the whole section of the Bureau which deals with foreign participation. That was an absolutely appalling decision. It was a political decision taken by the Treasurer after he was given a list by the Statistician of areas that could be chopped back given the limited resources that had been made available to him. The Treasurer chose foreign ownership and control and job vacancies. Surely job vacancies is an important area of statistical collection. But, no, this area is also to go.

Job vacancy statistics are collected by the Commonwealth Employment Service. But the CES collects statistics only on job vacancies that are notified to it by employers. Many employers do not bother to notify the CES of their vacancies. So if we want the relevant statistics for employment policy it is important to know how the overall trend of vacancies is going. But this Government is abandoning collection of those sorts of statistics. It is therefore giving us a good indication of the importance it places on employment policy. On the other hand, the Government has decided to conduct a monthly labour force survey to ascertain unemployment statistics. The CES already collects monthly figures. The Government clearly thought that by conducting a monthly labour force survey instead of a quarterly survey it would be able to produce each month figures which would be less than those collected by the CES. But that in fact has not been the case. The labour force survey figures have moved in much the same degree as CES figures and in many months have been higher than those published by the CES. This operation involved 45 staff at a cost of $2.3m per annum. Given the other priorities, it seems an extraordinary waste of funds to have spent money on a monthly collection instead of a quarterly collection.

The Government has also decided that it cannot conduct any more surveys of household income and expenditure. We had such surveys in 1974-75 and 1975-76. It was intended then to conduct such surveys yearly but now the Statistician in his minute to the Treasurer says:

Resource pressures have prevented any further surveys being undertaken and no such surveys will be done in this year or in any future years until there is an increase in the resources available.

The household income and expenditure survey is extremely important. It provides data for economic and social planning and for assessing the need for and the impact of housing, education, welfare and taxation policies. Also it is absolutely basic to have such surveys if one is to be able to adjust the regimen and weighting of the consumer price index from time to time. This Government says inflation is its No. 1 objective. However, by not holding surveys of household income and expenditure it will not even know how inflation is moving. It will not be able properly to measure inflation because increasingly the regimen and the weighting of the consumer price index will be out of date if such a survey of
Household income and expenditure is not undertaken.

The Statistician is clearly quite disturbed about this. On page 7 of his minute he says:

Faced with the task of getting required resources down to a level I have judged likely to be accepted by the Government, I have excluded the survey from these estimates but draw that omission to your attention in particular because of the effect on the consumer price index. In my judgment we will be able to do a patchwork job revising and up-dating the index in the light of various sources of indirect information but it will be far less satisfactory than if survey results were available.

This Government also has not gone on with the consumer finances survey.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Dr Jenkins)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr Burns (Isaacs) (4.14)—I am delighted in my first year as a member of this Parliament to have this opportunity to speak to the Budget Estimates.

Mr MacKellar—I raise a point of order! Could we ask the honourable member for Gellibrand to table the document from which he quoted?

Mr DEPUTY CHAIRMAN—There is no provision under which that can be asked for.

Mr Burns—Estimates get to the basic details of Government expenditures and contain a wealth of detailed information extremely valuable to politicians and members of the Australian community. The Treasurer (Mr Howard) has performed admirably in co-ordinating the Government's many and varied programs under the economic umbrella of the Budget. He has also succeeded in getting the Government's basic message across to the community. This message is that inflation must be brought under control in order to bring Australia to a position to embark once again on a long-term sustainable economic growth path. This sustainable economic growth will lead to a rise in the real living standards of all Australians as well as creating much needed new job opportunities.

I turn now to a brief examination of the Government's economic record since it came to office in 1975. Bringing down the Fraser Government's first Budget, the then Treasurer said:

We have made our first priority the absolute necessity to combat inflation.

Outstanding progress has been made in achieving this goal. In the year prior to the Fraser Government taking office, inflation ran at 15 per cent. That rate has now been cut nearly by half to its current rate of 7.9 per cent. Along with this drop in inflation, the Government also has been able to reduce long term interest rates. Further reductions will accompany the assured further reductions in the inflation rate. The Government has also been able to achieve substantial reforms through a restructuring of the tax scales and partially indexing taxation. These changes represent the first steps in ensuring that Australians get a tax system that will put incentives in front of those wishing to work.

In common with Americans most Australians seek reduced taxation and smaller government. A vocal spokesman in America recently said: 'In America we tax work, growth, investment, employment, savings and productivity, while subsidising non-work, consumption, welfare and debt.' The story in Australia is not dissimilar. I shall be putting the case for smaller government and lower taxes at every opportunity. The taxpayer expects and should get more value from his tax dollar. The Government and my colleagues are willing listeners to this view. The Government has shown that it not only listens; it also acts.

The war against inflation has not been easy. Unemployment is at an uncomfortably high level and neither I nor my colleagues take any comfort from such an unsatisfactory situation. However there is light at the end of the tunnel. Investors are confident. The stock market, which is a leading indicator of future levels of economic activity, is at a five-year high. Businessmen are confident also. Eighty-five per cent of respondents to a recent survey by the economic research group, Syntec, reported that their attitude to new investment had become more favourable as a result of the Government's Budget strategy. In order to maintain this confidence the Government must continue to bring inflation down. This is still the prime goal. Only when inflation returns to a level of 5 per cent or less will there be a sound basis for sustainable long-term growth in employment. Reductions in inflation will put more purchasing power in the hands of the fixed income earner, the home seeker and the home owner. Reductions in inflation will make Australia more competitive in the world's markets for rural, manufactured and mining production. Beating inflation remains the key to reducing unemployment, increasing economic growth and boosting the living standards of all Australians.

One of the groups in the community hardest hit by the ravages of inflation are retirees on fixed incomes. Consider the plight of the fixed income earner over the past five years. In that period average weekly earnings have risen from
$108.20 to $215.50. After adjustment for inflation, using the consumer price index, the $215.50 represents $117.20, a rise of approximately 8 per cent over the five years. Fixed income earners have no increases to offset against inflation. After adjusting for inflation, a fixed income earner receiving $108.20 in 1973 would now be receiving $58.80 in real terms. This represents a deduction of 46 per cent. Is it any wonder that retirees are concerned by inflation? I seek leave to have a table showing details of the impact of inflation on fixed income earners incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The table read as follows—

THE IMPACT OF INFLATION ON FIXED-INCOME EARNERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>($)</th>
<th>Average weekly earnings*</th>
<th>Fixed income earner</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Real†</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 June—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>108.20</td>
<td>108.20</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>128.70</td>
<td>112.50</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>156.40</td>
<td>116.90</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>179.80</td>
<td>119.70</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>198.70</td>
<td>116.50</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>215.50</td>
<td>117.20</td>
<td>108.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From ABS Average Weekly Earnings (Catalogue No. 6302.0), June Quarter, 1978.
† Real = Money Income + CPI Index.
CPI Index calculated from the weighted average of seven capital cities as reported in ABS Consumer Price Index (Catalogue No. 6401.0), June Quarter, 1978.

Mr BURNS—I wish to draw the attention of the House to an issue that could result in a lessening of the taxpayers’ burden while at the same time lifting the efficiency of government. The Commonwealth Government has been called upon, for a variety of reasons, to invest taxpayers’ funds in enterprises which could be conducted by private enterprise. Examples of such investments are the Ranger uranium project, Mary Kathleen Uranium and the Australian Industries Development Corporation. These are by no means all public investments. Others are Qantas, Trans-Australia Airlines, the Pipeline Authority, the Australian National Line and the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories. Questions which are relevant to each of these investments are: What does it cost? What benefits is the taxpayer buying? Do these costs and benefits accurately reflect taxpayers’ priorities? Is there a way to achieve the same benefits at a lower cost? We cannot and should not expect these questions to be answered objectively, either by politicians or by public servants alone. Each group has vested interests in the answers to these questions.

I call upon the Government to institute an independent inquiry into the cost/benefit relationship in the field of public investment. My own view is that such an inquiry will show that the Government should disinvest from many of these business undertakings. Such disinvestment would yield funds at a time when they are much needed in helping to arrest the taxpayers’ burden. As parliamentarians we have a responsibility to ensure that the taxpayers’ priorities are responded to. I believe that high in the order of taxpayers’ priorities is a diminution in the size of the public sector and a reduction in tax.

Mr WILLIS (Gellibrand) (4.22)—With the co-operation of my colleagues, I will conclude the points I was making earlier in respect of various areas of service which have been cut back by the Australian Bureau of Statistics as a result of the limitation of resources which has been applied to it by the Government. I had indicated a number of areas which have been cut back this year. A further one is the consumer finances survey. The Australian Statistician wants to conduct such a survey because most countries in the developed world have such surveys. Indeed various countries in the underdeveloped world have such surveys. Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea and Botswana are all under consumer finances surveys. These surveys collect information on the debts and assets of different types of households. That is basic information which any government which wants to know what is happening in the economy in order to adopt appropriate policies to improve the economy should have. But we have never had such a survey, and the Bureau is unable to conduct such a survey this year or in any foreseeable year because of the limitation of resources.

A further area of cutback is the agricultural finance survey. This survey has been conducted annually over the last several years and its results are used by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the Industries Assistance Commission and the Australian Bureau of Statistics itself for national accounting estimates. This survey will now be conducted every three years instead of every year, indicating another important area of cutback. There is also likely to be, in respect of 1978-79, an abandonment of the manufacturing industry census. The Bureau conducts annual censuses in regard to agriculture, mining and manufacturing. It also wants to run periodic censuses in regard to other parts of the economy so as to provide basic information on the whole structure of Australian industry. According to the
minute to the Treasurer (Mr Howard), the Australian Statistician wants to run a census on construction for 1978-79, on the retail trade industry for 1979-80 and on the transport industry for 1980-81. But scarcity of resources means that other activities will have to go to fit in these censuses. According to the minute it seems that in 1978-79 it is the manufacturing industry census which will have to go. On page 4 the Statistician states:

If it still appears in 12 months time that running a construction census will require an increase in total staff requirements of 3.7 per cent, and that that is more than the Government at the time will agree to, I foreshadow a probable recommendation to you that no manufacturing census be held in respect of the year 1978-79. That would almost certainly bring strong protests from the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Bureau of Industry Economics, the Industries Assistance Commission and from industry organisations.

So there we have another important area of cutback. Also, as the minute makes clear, there are various ongoing projects to which significant staff reductions will be applied in this financial year. They are in the areas of manufacturing, motor vehicle registrations, motor vehicle accidents, mining, agriculture, construction, internal trade, overseas participation, manpower and computer services. Total staff cuts for these ongoing projects are 130 people. Again, the Statistician says that this will damage the service that the Bureau can provide. On page 8, he says, having outlined these cuts in ongoing projects:

These cuts will impose severe pressures on project managers in the Canberra and State Offices and will necessitate a curtailing of statistical output.

So it is quite clear from that minute that there will be a diminution in the services as a result of these staff cutbacks. There have also been various requests for assistance that the Bureau has been unable to meet, quite apart from the program that it wishes to pursue. Attachment C to the minute sets out examples of requests that the Bureau has been unable to meet. I will read these examples to the House. They are:

An Economic Census of the wholesale trade sector was planned in respect of 1977-78, but the then Treasurer did not approve its inclusion in the estimates. The Minister for Industry and Commerce expressed regret at the decision. Reinstatement of the census is not provided for in these estimates.

The ABS survey of tourist accommodation has omitted hotels without facilities, in order to cover caravan parks.

The Department of Environment Housing and Community Development asked that we extend the present collection of information relating to construction activity.

State Governments have asked that ABS undertake estimates of private capital expenditure, including expectations, in each State.

The South Australian Government has asked that ABS compile information on interstate trade to and from South Australia.

Several State Departments have asked that ABS collect information on quarterly or annual production in their State. Several State Departments have asked that ABS compile input-output tables for their State.

There is more or less continuous pressure to improve the accuracy detail and timeliness of the national income and expenditure accounts.

Northern Territory politicians, employers and unions have asked that a consumer price index be compiled for Darwin.

The most recent set of input-output tables relates to the year 1968-69. Requests have been received from the Departments of Industry and Commerce, Trade and Resources and the IAC for more recent data.

EHCD Department asked ABS to assist in its Housing Allowance Experiment by undertaking survey design, sample selection and the conduct of interviews with selected households.

Those are all examples given by the Bureau of requests from other government departments, Federal and State, for the provision of information which the Bureau is unable to provide because it does not have the resources. It is quite clear that there is a whole range of demand for information from other Federal Government departments which a clamouring for this information but cannot get it because the Bureau is absolutely hamstrung by its lack of resources. This is a very, very serious situation indeed. There has not only been this very substantial cutback in what the Bureau itself wants to do but also in this other area of providing information for people who feel that there is a shortcoming in the availability of this published data and which need this information to be produced. The Bureau just cannot do it because it does not have the resources. The Statistician is disturbed about this inability to meet the requests of departments and State governments. On page 9 of the minute he says:

The ABS has not been able to respond to many of the requests received from State Government bodies and it is open to question whether the Commonwealth is meeting its obligations under the Integration Agreements to provide statistical services to the States.

What he is saying there is that under the integration agreements which were reached in the mid-1950s—1956 to 1958—the Commonwealth undertook to supply to the States the statistical services that they need. Five of the six States had statistical bodies which were then integrated into the Commonwealth Bureau of Statistics on the
proviso that the Federal Government would continue to meet the States' needs through the Australian Bureau of Statistics. In fact that is something which clearly is not happening. The examples that I gave showed a number of requests from State governments which the Bureau is not able to meet. Here we have the Statistician saying that not only is the Bureau not able to meet those needs but the situation is now so bad that it is doubtful whether the Commonwealth is meeting its obligation under the integration agreements to provide statistical services to the States. This coverage of the inability of the Bureau to meet the demands upon it and to undertake proper statistical services in this country is, I think, an appalling indictment of this Government.

It is a government which says that it wants to make the economy more efficient. One way in which the economy can be made more efficient is to have statistics upon which the Government can measure the impact of its policies and can devise policies on a sound basis. If the Government does not even bother about providing an information base which will enable it to monitor its programs and to establish whether its resources are being utilised efficiently, how the goodness will it have an efficient economy? This whole situation is a perfect example of being penny wise and pound foolish. As I said in opening, what this Government is doing is not only vandalising the economy in its general macro-economic policy but, by destroying the information base, it is making it infinitely more difficult for any future government to clean up the mess that this Government is creating.

Mr WEST (Cunningham) (4.32)—The Treasury and the Government are to blame for bringing down a most contractionary document to guide our economic fortunes over the next 12 months. The Budget deficit is expected to be $2,800m. More important than this is that the domestic deficit is expected to be $1,669m, which represents a $782m reduction from the previous Budget. The Budget also provided for a number of most regressive taxes, particularly the surcharge on income tax, the extra tax on petrol and the indirect tax on spirits. The point is that this will remove some $2,000m from a sick economy. The economy is in deep enough recession; it is contracting enough without removing such a massive sum from the pockets of consumers.

I am particularly concerned about the attack on the finances of local government. Honourable members may remember that in November last year and again at this year's Premiers Conference the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) promised to raise local government's share of Federal revenue to 2 per cent over the next three years. Of course in this Budget no increase whatsoever has been made, and local government is still stuck with 1.52 per cent of Federal personal income tax receipts. Two per cent would not be enough to fund the needs of local government. If 2 per cent had been granted, another $57m would have been made available to local governments throughout the country. In my electorate of Cunningham this increase would have resulted in another $750,000 being allocated to the Wollongong City Council and the Shellharbour Municipal Council. It is not a great amount; nevertheless, it could have gone some way towards creating jobs for the 9,000 unemployed people in that area.

I turn now to taxation policy. The whole point about the Government's taxation policy is that it is regressive and most unfair. The surcharge of 1.5c in the dollar was an unmitigated attack on lower income earners. The rise in oil prices, caused by the move in one year to full import parity, will produce an extra $670m for the Government. This amount of money could well have been left with the workers this year to increase consumer demand. The increase in indirect taxes, as I have already said, is most inequitable. The Government can be expected to move towards a value added tax because that will be consistent with its taxation policies. A value added tax would be completely wrong for Australia at this time, because it is accumulative at all stages of production of goods and services and, in the end, it is the consumer who pays it. A value added tax is regressive; it is repressive; and it is inequitable.

Whilst the Government makes all these moves with regard to regressive taxation measures, it forfeits completely its rights to impose such measures as a resources tax on exploitation of our non-renewable energy resources, a capital gains tax, or a wealth tax with an appropriate threshold level. Australia is one of the few countries that do not have taxes of these kinds. But this Government has renounced them. It says that now it will be satisfied with a branch profits tax of 5 per cent of taxable income. It will impose that tax on Australian branches of overseas companies resident in Australia. If such a tax were applied to the Utah Development Co. it would raise only about $16m, whereas a properly constituted resources tax at the appropriate threshold of, say 15 per cent to 18 per cent on funds invested—and at the appropriate level of
60 per cent to 70 per cent thereafter—would return at least an extra $110m in revenue to the Australian Treasury.

I move to another section of the Budget Papers. I refer to the balance of payments, which is in a terrible position. The current trade account shows that exports were $12.043 billion and imports were $11.204 billion. This left it $840m in surplus. But when we come to the invisibles we see that there was a haemorrhage out of Australia of $3.25 billion, leaving an overall trade deficit in the current account of $2,411m—or 2.7 per cent of the gross domestic product. What a terrible indictment of the Australian Government's trade policies. The situation also is bad, of course, with regard to the European Economic Community, with a deficit of $2,500m which is virtually more than the total deficit for all Australian trade.

But the point is that the Government worries only about the trade section of it. What is the Government doing about the invisibles section of it? Where are the plans to do something about the biggest two factors involved in this deficit? I refer to overseas charges for freight and insurance on exports and imports. Less than 2 per cent of our exports and imports are carried in Australian ships. There is no national insurance company to provide adequate insurance for our exports and imports. What is wrong with expanding the services of the Australian National Line to arrest this haemorrhage of our funds overseas? The situation with regard to exports of iron ore and coal is that the Australian National Line currently has four large bulk carriers but cargo for only two of them. I understand that two carriers currently are tied up in the Norwegian fiords because of lack of cargo in the immense trade with Japan. There is not one Australian-owned ship in the coal trade with Japan. Yet, the Utah Development Co. alone last year exported $620m worth of coal to Japan.

The private sector exchange transactions section of the Budget also is in a deplorable position. In the first half of the year we were $1.213m in deficit and only $11m was picked up in the last half of the year, meaning that we were $1,200m in deficit. Both of these factors add to the balance of payments crisis—that the Government had to borrow a massive $1,800m to $1,900m from abroad last year to prop up the dollar and to avoid a further devaluation. It seems that there will be no early improvement in the position, because the Budget Papers state:

The present financial year is unlikely to see major changes in Australia's balance of payments position. The conjunction of a number of factors is likely to maintain a deficit in private sector external transactions and there will thus be a need for a continuation of the Government's overseas borrowing program, which has already got underway in 1978-79.

Similarly, regarding the trade position the Budget Papers state:

The current account deficit in 1978-79 is expected to continue running at about the rate recorded in the second half of 1977-78.

This Government's economic policies have failed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Dr Jenkins)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BAUME (Macarthur) (4.43)—The problem one has in looking at this Budget is that the fiction of the response made to it bears no relationship to the facts of it. The facts of the Budget are, of course, that the Government has a serious budgetary problem. It is a situation in which the Government must spend an immense amount of money because of continuing programs; yet it is limited in its capacity to raise that money from the taxpayers of Australia. Despite those overwhelming problems, the Government's capacity to solve them has involved a degree of skill for which neither the Opposition nor unfortunately many members of the public have given it credit.

From reading the headlines in the Press and from listening to the synthetic debate, the synthetic fury, the absurd rage of the manufactured protest which have taken place in some of the cities and which, in my region, have involved the loss of millions of dollars of wages by people who for political purposes have been whipped up into strike action in phoney protests against this Budget, one would not realise that this year taxes will fall, in real terms. No one who reads the newspapers or listens to the extraordinary comments that come from honourable members opposite would realise that after we account for inflation this year taxes will fall. Personal income tax collections by this Government—this Government which is alleged to have done a terrible thing in increasing taxes—will fall. I have sought permission from the Opposition to have some statistics incorporated in Hansard. I now formally ask the Committee for leave to have this document incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The document read as follows—
## PERSONAL INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Collections (a)</th>
<th>Private consumption deflator (b)</th>
<th>((1) \div (2))</th>
<th>'Real' change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td></td>
<td>$m</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>3,887</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>2,858</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>3,178</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>4,701</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>3,769</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>5,235</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>4,089</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>5,359</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>.853</td>
<td>6,436</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>7,714</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7,714</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>9,219</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>7,982</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>11,054</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>8,589</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>12,129</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79 (c)</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td>1.503</td>
<td>8,609</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Collections of PAYE and other individuals income tax less PAYE refunds (Statement No. 6 attached to the Budget Speech).

(b) Budget Paper 9 and Australian National Accounts, 1976-77.

(c) Budget estimate of collections. Deflator assumes a 7.0 per cent increase in line with the discussion in Statement No. 2 attached to the Budget Speech.

Mr BAUME—I thank the Committee. I believe that everyone in Australia should take cognisance of these statistics. We have heard how taxes have risen appallingly. What we have not heard is that the tax scales and the whole tax system have been so significantly reduced by this Government that despite the 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent temporary tax surcharge, personal income tax collections will fall by 0.3 per cent this year. This compares with a rise of 20.1 per cent in one year of the Labor Government and of 19.9 per cent in the following year of the Labor Government. Yet despite this huge rise of something like 40 per cent in real tax collections—that is after accounting for inflation—in the Labor Government’s two years we had no evidence of any synthetic protest or any money mass meetings of rage. All I want to do is to ask the Australian people to recognise that although it is true that some people’s taxes will rise in terms of the amount of money they pay, the fact is that the money which Australians will be paying overall in taxes this year in real terms—that is, in terms of what it can buy—will be less than the taxes they paid last year. The Opposition is not prepared to concede the point, has not recognised the point and, of course, has forgotten the fact that under its regime there was a 40 per cent rise in real taxes in only two years. For heavens sake! In the three Liberal-National Country Party Budgets the total personal income tax rises have been only 7.6 per cent in 1976-77, 0.5 per cent in 1977-78 and down to minus 0.3 per cent this year, a total of only about 8 per cent in real tax rises compared with 40 per cent in two years under Labor. Yet we hear consistently this barrage of nonsense from the Opposition and from people such as the Premier of New South Wales, who by using violent words encourages his listeners to act violently. We hear this continual and phoney attack on the reality of a tax fall this year.

Some people are inclined to say that we must take this in conjunction with the rises in indirect taxes—the rises in the excise on petrol, beer, cigarettes and spirits. The fact is that when we look at this situation, when we take all this into account and when we hear a big whinge in the way that the honourable member for Cunningham (Mr West) has whinged, it is interesting to see what the facts really are. I know that some members opposite have no interest whatsoever in the facts, but the facts are that when we take these matters into account the total rise in direct and indirect taxes in the current year is 7.9 per cent, only slightly more than the inflation rate this year. Yet in one of the years about which I have just talked—the Labor years—the rise was 32 per cent. Did we hear the trade union movement being whipped up into synthetic protest at the way Labor hit the pockets of the taxpayer, of the worker and of all Australians? The phoney protest is sickening. The facts clearly show that the Federal Government is approaching its budgetary responsibilities in a fair way and has done remarkably well in terms of getting off the taxpayers’ back in the circumstances of the very serious problems it has. In fact the increase in indirect taxes has served only to restore exactly the same balance between direct and indirect taxes as existed before the Whitlam days. It is now back to 24 per cent, as it has traditionally been. Certainly the fact that it had to be done in something of a jump may have disturbed some
people, particularly if they are smokers or drinkers, but the fact is that the balance between direct and indirect taxes has been and is being restored in the taxation system, and the reality is that personal income tax has fallen in real terms after we account for inflation. That message just has not come through and is not being allowed to come through by the barrage of nonsense from opposite.

I know that there are some unfortunate things in the Budget and I agree with some of the people who express concern about some of the nit-picking items in it. For example, I am not happy with, and I agree with the opponents of, the paper boy tax, as it has been called. I find unattractive the fact that the children of parents who receive family allowances will now be able to earn only $20 a week before their families are income tested for the family allowance and I would have preferred to see an extra increase in direct taxes rather than this kind of fiddling tax being added on. Let us face it: We must recognise that a government can spend only what it raises, and it is the way that it has gone about raising the money which is the issue here. Unfortunately the Labor Government did not agree with this view and took the view that it could spend money which did not exist with the result that we had enormous inflation. Whilst I am prepared to agree that some of these impost, particularly the one on young people being able to earn no more than $20 a week, are unattractive and I would rather they were not there, nonetheless I totally support the general thrust of the Budget. I welcome the removal of some of the unfortunate aspects. For example, originally a punitive rate was to be applied to holiday pay when paid in a lump sum. I think now that the change to remove that punitive rate is certainly worth while.

My only serious complaint about the Budget is that I believe that there should have been greater reductions in transfer payments. I think that this money should have gone towards many more works programs which provide infrastructure for business and in fact jobs for people. There are still far too many welfare programs which involve transfers of tax from poor people to rich people and these are many of the areas in which the Labor Party seems to be standing up in support of well-off people. Transfer payments through the welfare system should be directed entirely to people in need and an enormous proportion of them are still not being so directed.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Dr Jenkins)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr COHEN (Robertson) (4.52)—The honourable member for Macarthur (Mr Baume), who has just resumed his seat, missed the whole point of the thrust of the Opposition's opposition to this Budget, and that is that this Government went to the people last year on the basis that it was going to cut personal income tax. It fought bitterly against the Australian Labor Party's proposition that this should be forgone to use those funds for employment purposes such as the payroll tax abolition and job creation schemes. The minute it won the election with the appeal of more money in people's pockets it reversed its decision and reimposed the tax. That is the basis of the thrust of our attack.

I want to raise something today to which I really do not know the answer. I am merely asking the Minister Assisting the Treasurer (Mr MacKellar) whether he will look into it. I have been concerned for some time at the amount of Australian money which is going overseas through the number of Australians travelling abroad to purchase cameras and watches. I have tried to get some facts and figures on this matter and I have had some great difficulty in obtaining details of the number of watches and cameras sold in Australia. I raise this point because I do not know the answer. As I understand it, we have now taken off the duty on most cameras and watches. At the moment there is sales tax of about 27 per cent on cameras and watches.

Mr MacKellar—It is 27½ per cent.

Mr COHEN—The Minister indicates it is 27½ per cent. Because these are items which can be easily purchased overseas, particularly in countries near to Australia such as the duty-free ports of Singapore and Hong Kong, people are going overseas, buying these items and bringing them back to Australia. The result is that very few watches and cameras are now being purchased in Australia. I am not opposed in principle to sales tax—I think that we have to raise revenue—and these items are regarded as luxury items. I do not argue that point, but I sense that by imposing some duty or sales tax on these items it is simply denying us local revenue. Because these items are small, easy to transport, and easy to conceal, people no longer buy them in Australia, which in effect is driving the retail photographic equipment and retail watch industry to other countries. The amount of revenue raised from duty imposed on these items is infinitesimal. I got some figures today which show revenue on photographic equipment is about $600,000 and on watches it is about $50,000 a year.
Mr MacKellar—There is no customs duty on watches.

Mr COHEN—These figures relate to the position a couple of years ago. I know that the duty was recently taken off. The Minister is quite right. I am unable to find out the latest figures on revenue from sales tax on cameras. I think this matter is worth while looking at. Merely to gain a few hundred thousand dollars a year in revenue from sales tax on these sorts of items, we may be denying profits to the retail photographic industry.

Mr Haslem—Employment, too.

Mr COHEN—That is the point I am coming to. We may be driving that industry and the retail watch industry out of this country. The imposition of a duty results in a drop in sales, a drop in profits and a drop in employment. I think that this is something that is well worth looking into. I have spoken to people about this. Just recently I bought a camera overseas. I am afraid that almost everyone who goes overseas does this. The situation with motor cars, which are a big sales item, is different. Obviously one cannot say to someone who intends to go overseas: ‘When you go overseas next time bring me back a Honda in your pocket’. Because of the small savings on items such as tennis racquets, golf clubs, golf balls and items like that, it is not worth buying them overseas duty free. But when it comes to cameras such as the Pentax and the Nikon it means a savings of about $200 to $300 duty free. The average savings on a watch duty free is probably $50 to $100 or a great deal more. I believe that this is the problem. People who want to buy these sorts of items say: ‘Well, I will wait till I can go overseas’. Every year one million people go overseas. Alternatively, people say: ‘I will wait till I find somebody who is going overseas and I will ask him to bring me back a watch’. I request the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and Minister Assisting the Treasurer, who is sitting at the table, to ask the Treasurer (Mr Howard) to have a look at this matter with an open mind to ascertain whether we might be better off by removing the sales tax on these items so as to improve the profits of the retail trade and retain or bring back employment opportunities in this country.

Mr Lusher (Hume) (5.58)—I am very pleased to take part in this debate on the estimates in relation to the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Finance, particularly at a time when the policies of the Government are bringing this nation back to the pre-eminent economic position that it had held in the past and which it ought to have held unbroken over the years when this Government was in Opposition and the Labor Party was occupying the treasury benches. I do not think that there is any dispute of any magnitude within or outside this chamber with the statement that the Government is bringing this country back into a period of economic sanity and that the Government’s policies are working. The situation that applies at the moment, of course, is that this Budget is largely directed at continuing the fight against inflation and bringing down interest rates in Australia. Inflation obviously is of vital importance to all Australians no matter what sector of the community they are a part of, no matter what occupation people follow, whether they are in business, whether they work, whether they own homes or whatever. The simple situation is that interest is a cost and regardless of what activity one is involved in that interest is a cost to one’s activity. Inflation and interest rates together add up to a significant burden on people in Australia regardless of the course of activity in which they are involved.

What this Government is doing in applying a very firm hand on the economy in bringing down the inflation rate is helping everybody in the community. Everybody in the community will benefit from the fact that inflation is coming down. Everybody will benefit from the fact that interest rates are coming down. That is the basic thrust behind the economic policy of this Government; and it is succeeding. We are seeking realistic cuts in inflation and it is now coming down almost faster than it was going up in the days when we used to sit back waiting in horrified expectation and anticipation of what the Labor Treasurer would announce the quarterly consumer price increase to be. That is something for which we ought to be grateful and thankful. Interest rates too are falling, and again that is something for which everybody in Australia ought to be thankful. The Government is winding back the whole process that had been going on in this economy for three years under the Labor Administration.

Opposition supporters consistently argue that the price of the economic success that this Government is achieving is too high. I think that is something which needs to be considered and perhaps put at rest. The situation of course is quite straightforward. There are many causes of the unemployment which Opposition supporters blame on the economic policies of this Government. The basic cause of unemployment is the wages explosion that occurred particularly during the 1974 period when Labor, of course,
encouraged the wage fixing procedures to lift wage rates in this economy, and lift them it did. To a large extent the work force has priced itself out of the market. In addition to that, there have been deliberate moves on the part of those people who employ other people to create a situation in their own business in which they use as little labour as they can and obviously in the interests of the survival of the business that is all that employers can do. There are factors related to technology and the development of technology which also add to the situation as it affects the employment market. All these elements need to be taken into account.

It is not good enough for Opposition supporters to stand up and say that the entire cause of unemployment in this country is the fact that the Fraser-Anthony Government is following particular economic policies. It just does not wash. What is important to understand is that most of the problems arose during the period Labor was in office. They were brought about the activities of the trade union movement itself—the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The problems were brought about by the deliberate policies of the Labor Government and this Government is attempting to rectify those problems. The process of rectification will be followed by a boost in economic activity in this country. It will also be followed by an increasing tendency for people to be looking for labour, putting more people on and reducing the level of unemployment that exists in Australia.

Mr Fisher—Farm incomes are rising.

Mr Lusher—As my colleague the honourable member for Mallee says—and it is eminently true—farm incomes are rising. Over recent years the decline in rural incomes has been such that virtually every farm that employed anybody has reduced its work force. When the situation improves, when the farmers get back on their feet, when there is operating again in this economy a situation in which farmers can develop the stability that they need to be able to operate with a degree of confidence, they of course will also be looking for labour. The rural sector employed a large number of people. Obviously the number of people employed in this sector has been reduced significantly over the period of difficulty particularly from the early 1970s to this year. But the rural economy can be looked to to assist greatly in the anticipated reduction in the number of unemployed when that rural sector is properly back on its feet, when it is investing again and when it is doing all of those things which it has put off over the years since 1971 and up to this year. There are so many aspects of the economy which are encouraging and the rural sector is only one of those which really give us cause for optimism and confidence as to the development of the whole industrial base of Australia, whether it be primary, secondary or tertiary.

Mr MacKenzie—We have better rural roads, too.

Mr Lusher—The honourable member for Calare reminds me about the situation as it pertains to roads. It is a very important factor too in terms of the unemployment position because when Labor was in government there was a very significant reduction in the amount of funds that were applied, particularly to rural local roads and rural arterial roads. As a result, local councils had no alternative—

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Dr Jenkins)—Order! I remind the honourable member for Hume that we are in the Committee stage dealing with the estimates for the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Finance and the Advance to the Minister for Finance. I have allowed the honourable member some latitude, but I think that in keeping with the Committee stage procedures, he should return to that area. I hope he finds that helpful.

Mr Lusher—Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman. I will take your advice. I appreciate your comment. I was really only just digressing a little on the economic policy which of course is influenced by Treasury and its advice to government. The estimates that we are discussing at the moment pay those public servants who provide the advice which leads to so much of what happens in terms of economic policy in Australia.

The short point really is that Australia is well and truly back on the road to economic recovery, and this Government is determined to see that that course continues. The whole thrust of the strategy behind the Budget is to see that inflation is continued to be borne down upon, that the consumer price index continues to record falls rather than rises, that the interest rate structure in Australia continues to become a lower one and that we regain the competitiveness with the people overseas with whom we trade and the countries overseas with which we trade. Australia will then be able to project itself as a country which is worthy of foreign investment, a country in which people are prepared to place their money in the knowledge that there is stable government and good economic management. That really is the thrust of the Budget strategy. The Treasury plays a vital role in that, as, of course, does the Department of Finance and in
discussing the estimates for these departments, it is important that we take these things into account. Mr Deputy Chairman, I understand that the chamber has other business before it so I conclude my remarks at this time.

Progress reported.

MIDDLE EAST SITUATION
Ministerial Statement

Mr MALCOLM FRASER (Wannon—Prime Minister)—by leave—I thank the House for granting me leave to make a statement about the agreements reached at Camp David between Prime Minister Begin of Israel and President Sadat of Egypt. As honourable members will know, the 13-day long Camp David talks which concluded on 17 September resulted from the personal initiative of President Carter. The Government very much welcomed this initiative and it welcomes the promising results that have been achieved.

I can mention to the House that President Carter was in touch with me immediately before the talks at Camp David, and that he again wrote to me following the conclusion of the talks. In my reply to the President’s latest letter, I conveyed to him my warmest congratulations on his personal achievement in bringing the two parties to agreement on a Framework for Peace in the Middle East and the Australian Government’s commitment to support his untiring efforts to bridge the distance between Israeli and Egyptian standpoints.

I am sure all members of this House would wish to join with me in congratulating the President on his initiative, and I note that the honourable member for Holt (Mr Yates) on Tuesday gave notice of a motion to this effect in which he was supported by members on both sides of the House. I also pay tribute to the statesmanship of President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin.

All honourable members will be fully aware of the importance of the Middle East region for world peace, and its vital significance to Western interests. In the last 30 years, the region has been in continual turmoil. There have been four wars between the Arabs and the Israelis. This has brought appalling suffering to the peoples of the region. The instability created by this situation has been a constant threat to world peace, and a constant invitation to unwarranted external interference.

The search for peace has been a continuing preoccupation of the United Nations and Western States throughout this period. Under successive American Presidents, the United States has made strenuous efforts to promote a settlement. These efforts, however, foundered largely on the inability of the parties concerned to overcome their deep-seated mutual fear and distrust. It was not until the bold and imaginative initiative of President Sadat in going to Jerusalem in November 1977 that the hope of a breakthrough towards some sort of settlement in the Middle East seemed capable of realisation.

Unfortunately, the negotiations which followed President Sadat’s visit to Israel, and Mr Begin’s return visit to Egypt, did not gather the necessary momentum to enable a proper framework for a settlement to be established. It became apparent after the Leeds Castle meetings in July that if there was to be any prospect of further progress, some new stimulus would be needed.

President Carter took the courageous step of inviting the Egyptian and Israeli leaders to meet him at Camp David for personal discussions. President Carter wrote to me on 15 August about his reasons for initiating the Camp David talks, and what he hoped to accomplish from them. In my reply to him I emphasised the Australian Government’s support for the talks and the importance we attached to them.

The outcome of the talks is known to honourable members. In summary, two agreements were signed by the President of Egypt and the Prime Minister of Israel, and witnessed by President Carter. The first agreement is entitled ‘A Framework for Peace in The Middle East’ and covers the West Bank and Gaza. It envisages a five-year transitional period during which Israeli military forces will be withdrawn to garrisons in specified locations, and the election of a self-governing authority with full autonomy. Negotiations will be held among Egypt, Israel and—if it agrees to participate—Jordan, as well as elected representatives of the Palestinians to determine the final status of the West Bank and Gaza and—it is hoped—to produce a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan.

During the negotiations there will be a freeze on the establishment of new Israeli settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. Security arrangements may include United Nations forces, special security zones, demilitarized zones and early warning stations. There is to be an exchange of letters on the Status of East Jerusalem.

The second agreement, entitled ‘A Framework for the Conclusion of a Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel’, covers the Sinai and future bilateral relations. It envisages a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel to be signed
within three months; full Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai phased over no more than three years from the signing of the treaty; the handing over of Israeli airfields in the Sinai to Egyptian civilian control beginning from three to nine months after that signing; the establishment of security zones; and the establishment of normal relations between Egypt and Israel on completion of the first major Israeli withdrawal.

The Australian Government believes that the two agreements provide a constructive framework for the resolution of the Middle East conflict. President Carter’s timely initiative was clearly a vital factor in bringing the two parties to these agreements, which will surely be regarded as an historic turning point in the search for a settlement in the Middle East.

We particularly welcome the agreement by the leaders of Egypt and Israel that the provisions and principles of United Nations Security Council Resolution 242 will govern the negotiations for an agreed basis for a peaceful settlement between Israel and its neighbours. This is a position which the Australian Government has consistently taken. We also welcome the recognition in the Camp David agreements of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including their right to participate in the determination of their own future. This also accords with the stated policy of the Australian Government.

A difficult road lies ahead nonetheless. Other Arab States, whose support will be essential to any lasting settlement, have yet to be convinced that the Camp David framework can be an acceptable basis for future negotiations. We hope that the Middle Eastern governments, in the spirit of Camp David, will be encouraged to support this framework and to participate in future negotiations in the search for peace.

It is most important that the momentum generated by the Camp David agreements be maintained. Continued diplomatic activity will be critical to the objectives of ensuring further progress in the negotiations in the months ahead. In this context, the present round of talks being undertaken by Mr Vance with key Arab leaders will be of fundamental importance. The Australian Government stands ready to give its support to the terms of any settlement agreed upon between the parties in the Middle East. I have written today to President Carter to inform him that the Australian Government regards the agreements reached at Camp David as a major contribution towards a peace settlement, and that he has our full support in his efforts to bring an end to the threat of war in the Middle East.

I believe that it was a courageous act of the President of the United States to take this initiative in bringing the two leaders together in what has been over a long period a very difficult situation that has resulted not only in war but also in threatened greater war on a number of occasions. We do not always realize or understand the immense burden of statemanship and responsibility that rests on the President of the world’s largest free power. Let me say only that in this instance President Carter has upheld the highest traditions of the United States presidency and all that the world hopes the presidency will be able to achieve for the cause of world peace. I seek leave of the House to have incorporated in Hansard the texts of the two agreements.

Leave granted.

The documents read as follows—

A framework for peace in the Middle East agreed at Camp David.

Muhammad Anwar al-Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and Menachem Begin, Prime Minister of Israel, met with Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, at Camp David from 5 September to 17 September 1978, and have agreed on the following framework for peace in the Middle East. They invite other parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict to adhere to it.

Preamble

The search for peace in the Middle East must be guided by the following:

The agreed basis for a peaceful settlement of the conflict between Israel and its neighbours is United Nations Security Council resolution 242, in all its parts. (Footnote: The texts of resolution 242 and 338 are annexed to this document.)

After four wars during thirty years, despite intensive human efforts, the Middle East, which is the cradle of civilisation and the birthplace of three great religions, does not yet enjoy the blessings of peace. The people of the Middle East years for peace so that the vast human and natural resources of the region can be turned to the pursuit of peace and so that this area can become a model for coexistence and co-operation among nations.

The historic initiative of President Sadat in visiting Jerusalem and the reception accorded to him by the Parliament, Government and people of Israel, and the reciprocal visit of Prime Minister Begin to Damascus, the peace proposals made by both leaders, as well as the warm reception of these missions by the peoples of both countries have created an unprecedented opportunity for peace which must not be lost if this generation and future generations are to be spared the tragedies of war.

The provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the other accepted norms of international law and legitimacy now provide accepted standards for the conduct of relations among all states.

To achieve a relationship of peace, in the spirit of article 2 of the United Nations Charter, future negotiations between Israel and any neighbour prepared to negotiate peace and security with it, are necessary for the purpose of carrying out all the provisions and principles of resolutions 242 and 338.

Peace requires respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and
recognised boundaries free from threats or acts of force. Progress toward that goal can accelerate movement toward a new era of reconciliation in the Middle East marked by co-operation in promoting economic development, in maintaining mutually mutually beneficial security.

Security is enhanced by a relationship of peace and by co-operation between nations which enjoy normal relations. In addition, under the terms of peace treaties, the parties can, on the basis of reciprocity, agree to special security arrangements such as demilitarised zones, limited armaments areas, the presence of international forces, liaison, agreed measures for monitoring, and other arrangements that they agree are useful.

Framework

Taking these factors into account, the parties are determined to reach a just, comprehensive, and durable settlement of the Middle East conflict through the conclusion of peace treaties based on Security Council resolutions 242 and 338 in all their parts. Their purpose is to achieve peace and good neighbourhood relations. They recognise that, for peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most deeply affected by the conflict. They therefore agree that this framework as appropriate is intended by them to constitute a basis for peace not only between Egypt and Israel, but also between Israel and each of its other neighbours which is prepared to negotiate peace with Israel on this basis. With that objective in mind, they have agreed to proceed as follows:

A. West Bank and Gaza

1. Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the representatives of the Palestinian people should participate in negotiations on the resolution of the Palestinian problem in all its aspects. To achieve that objective, negotiations relating to the West Bank and Gaza should proceed in three stages.

   (a) Egypt and Israel agree that, in order to ensure a peaceful and orderly transfer of authority, and taking into account the security concerns of all the parties, there should be transitional arrangements for the West Bank and Gaza for a period not exceeding five years. In order to provide full autonomy to the inhabitants, under these arrangements the Israeli military governments and its civilian administration will be withdrawn as soon as a self-governing authority has been freely elected by the inhabitants of these areas to replace the existing military government. To negotiate the details of a transitional arrangement, the Government of Jordan will be invited to join the negotiations on the basis of this framework. These new arrangements should give due consideration both to the principle of self-government by the inhabitants of these territories and to the legitimate security concerns of the parties involved.

   (b) Egypt, Israel, and Jordan will agree on the modalities for establishing the elected self-governing authority in the West Bank and Gaza. The delegations of Egypt and Jordan may include Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza or other Palestinians as mutually agreed. The parties will negotiate an agreement which will define the powers and responsibilities of the self-governing authority to be exercised in the West Bank and Gaza. A withdrawal of Israeli armed forces will take place and there will be a redeployment of the remaining Israeli forces into specified security locations, the agreement will also include arrangements for assuring internal and external security and public order. A strong local police force will be established, which may include Jordanian citizens in addition to Israeli and Jordanian forces will participate in joint patrols and in the manning of control posts to assure the security of the borders.

   (c) When the self-governing authority (administrative council) in the West Bank and Gaza is established, it is expected that the transitional period of five years will begin. As is possible, but not later than the third year after the beginning of the transitional period, negotiations will take place to determine the final status of the West Bank and Gaza and its relationship with its neighbours, and to conclude a peace treaty between Israel and Jordan by the end of the transitional period. These negotiations will be conducted among Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. Two separate but related committees will be convened; one committee, consisting of representatives of the four parties which will negotiate and agree on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza, and its relationship with its neighbours, and the second committee, consisting of representatives of Israel and representatives of Jordan to be joined by the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza, to negotiate the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan, taking into account the agreement reached on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza. The negotiations shall be based on all the provisions and principles of UN Security Council resolution 242. The negotiations will resolve, among other matters, the location of the boundaries and the nature of the security arrangements. The solution from the negotiations must also recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian and their just requirements. In this way, the Palestinians will participate in the determination of their own future through:

      (1) The negotiations among Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza to agree on the final status of the West Bank and Gaza and other outstanding issues by the end of the transitional period.

      (2) Submitting their agreement to a vote by the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza.

      (3) Providing for the elected representatives of the inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza to decide how they shall govern themselves consistent with the provisions of their agreement.

      (4) Participating as stated above in the work of the committee negotiating the peace treaty between Israel and Jordan.

2. All necessary measures will be taken and provisions made to assure the security of Israel and its neighbours during the transitional period and beyond. To assist in providing such security, a strong local police force will be constituted by the self-governing authority. It will be composed of inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. The police
will maintain continuing liaison on internal security matters with the designated Israeli, Jordanian and Egyptian officers.

3. During the transitional period, representatives of Egypt, Israel, Jordan, and the self-governing authorities will constitute a continuing committee to decide by agreement on the modalities of admission to persons displaced from the West Bank and Gaza in 1967, together with necessary measures to prevent disruption and disorder. Other matters of common concern may also be dealt with by this committee.

4. Egypt and Israel will work with each other and with other interested parties to establish agreed procedures for a prompt, just and permanent implementation of the resolution of the refugee problem.

B. Egypt-Israel.

1. Egypt and Israel undertake not to resort to the threat of the use of force to settle disputes. Any disputes shall be settled by peaceful means in accordance with the provisions of article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. In order to achieve peace between them, the parties agree to negotiate in good faith with a goal of concluding within three months from the signing of this framework a peace treaty between them, while inviting the other parties to the conflict to proceed simultaneously to negotiate and conclude similar peace treaties with a view to achieving a comprehensive peace in the area. The framework for the conclusion of a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel will govern the peace negotiations between them. The parties will agree on the modalities and the timetable for the implementation of their obligations under the treaty.

C. Associated Principles.

1. Egypt and Israel state that the principles and provisions described below should apply to peace treaties between Israel and each of its neighbours—Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

2. Signatories shall establish among themselves relationships normal to states at peace with one another. To this end, they should undertake to abide by all the provisions of the charter of the United Nations. Steps to be taken in this respect include:

(a) full exercise of Egyptian sovereignty up to the internationally recognised border between Egypt and mandated Palestine;
(b) the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the Sinai;
(c) the use of airfields left by the Israelis near El Arish, Rafah, Ras en Naqab, and Sharm El Sheikh for civil purposes only, including possible commercial use by all nations;
(d) the right of free passage by ships of Israel through the Gulf of Suez and the Suez Canal on the basis of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 applying to all nations; the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are international waterways to be open to all nations for unimpeded and nonsuspendable freedom of navigation and overflight;
(e) the construction of a highway between the Sinai and Jordan near Elat with guaranteed free and peaceful passage by Egypt and Jordan; and
(f) the stationing of military forces listed below:

Stationing of Forces

(a) No more than one division (mechanised or infantry) of Egyptian armed forces will be stationed within an area lying approximately 50 kilometres (km) east of the Gulf of Suez and the Suez Canal.

(b) Only United Nations forces and civil police equipped with light weapons to perform normal police functions will be stationed within an area lying west of the international border and the Gulf of Aqaba, varying in width from 20 km to 40 km.

(c) In the area within 3 km east of the international border there will be Israeli limited military forces not to exceed four infantry battalions and United Nations observers.

(d) Border patrol units, not to exceed three battalions, will supplement the civil police in maintaining order in the area not included above.

The exact demarcation of the above areas will be as decided during the peace negotiations.

Early warning stations may exist to ensure compliance with the terms of the agreement.
United Nations forces will be stationed: (a) in part of the area in the Sinai lying within about 20 km of the Mediterranean Sea and adjacent to the international border, and (b) in the Sharm El Sheikh area to ensure freedom of passage through the Strait of Tiran; and these forces will not be removed unless such removal is approved by the security council of the United Nations with a unanimous vote of the five permanent members.

After a peace treaty is signed, and after the interim withdrawal is complete, normal relations will be established between Egypt and Israel, including: full recognition, including diplomatic, economic and cultural relations; termination of economic boycotts and barriers to the free movement of goods and people; and mutual protection of citizens by the due process of law. Between three months and nine months after the signing of the peace treaty, all Israeli forces will withdraw east of a line extending from a point east of El Arish to Ras Muhammad, the exact location of this line to be determined by mutual agreement.

For the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt: Israel:
Witnessed by:

Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America.

Mr MALCOLM FRASER—I present the following paper:
Middle East peace negotiations—Ministerial Statement, 21 September 1978.

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

Mr HAYDEN (Oxley—Leader of the Opposition) (5.17)—The Opposition joins with the Government in offering full support to all parties to the Camp David meeting in their efforts to create a lasting peace in the Middle East. What has been achieved already is, indeed, a major contribution. It would not have been achieved if the three leaders concerned had been any less courageous in their efforts to make real progress. I believe that all Australians of good will welcome the outcome of the summit meeting, as millions around the world must welcome it after these three decades of uncertainty. The Middle East has never posed a mere regional threat; the implication always has been of a world crisis. Obviously, however, the resolution of the threat had to be found in the region itself, and most probably, as we have now seen, with the active assistance of the great powers, or at least one of them.

We cannot assume that the resolution is already in sight. We can, however, see the essential shape it must take. Camp David has been a first step but a critically important one. President Carter’s initiative in convening the meeting, and his political skill and courage in keeping it going, have created the essential momentum for the next steps, which may well be even more difficult. Our hope is that all the parties, and others who must necessarily become involved now, will maintain the momentum. We are confident that President Carter, as he has already demonstrated, will continue to extend the good offices of the United States in support of the continuing search for a lasting peace.

The Australian Labor Party has long held a special interest in the Middle East. We believe that there are certain fundamental principles that must be accepted in the situation, and there is more hope in the wake of the Camp David agreements that this acceptance is, in fact, emerging. Firstly, there is no question but that Israel must continue to exist as an independent sovereign state. Through the efforts of Dr Evatt when he was Minister for External Affairs in a national Labor Government in this country, my Party feels a keen sense of involvement in the future integrity of an Israeli state. Dr Evatt played a central role in the founding of the state of Israel—an event which illustrated dramatically the Labor Party’s long-held commitments to protection of the rights of individuals and minorities. The second, and equally important, principle here is that the Palestinian people also have rights which must be recognised and aspirations which must be respected. After Camp David, it is at last possible to believe that progress is also being made in a positive way in this direction.

These two points constitute the basic policy of the Australian Labor Party towards the Middle East and we are pledged to do whatever we can towards their achievement. In that context, particularly, I am pleased to hear the clear statement of the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) that the Australian Government 'stands ready to give its support to the terms of any settlement agreed upon between the parties in the Middle East', based on the principles already agreed. The House has heard already the broad outlines of the two Camp David agreements. I am sure that none of us, realistically, could have expected more. The prospects of having to settle for far less loomed large at times during the discussions. As the next phase of the search for a lasting peace gets under way, I believe that all of us will join in offering all possible support to the participants.

The Prime Minister’s statement on this matter is a carefully considered one, as is proper in such a complex, sensitive and important matter. I commend him for that and assure him, this House and the nation that on this great matter genuine concern for the achievement of lasting peace in the Middle East is a matter of bipartisan commitment.
Mr YATES (Holt) (5.21)—Taking into account that I have on the Notice Paper a motion covering the subject, I think it would be proper if I said a few words about the Camp David peace treaty. I have been involved in the Middle East for over 20 years. The announcement made by the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and the work he has done as well as the work of the Minister for Foreign Affairs (Mr Peacock) and the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Australian Government are truly commendable. It is not always possible for the Prime Minister or the Minister for Foreign Affairs to advertise exactly what the Department of Foreign Affairs has been doing, but I think it would be a mistake if this House did not take into account their work and at the same time not only thank the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs for what they have done but also extend our good wishes to all those who are intimately involved in obtaining a peaceful solution in the Middle East. This is particularly important in relation to the Lebanon, and there are many Lebanese people in Australia. For example, at this moment an Australian citizen who is a constituent of mine is being detained in Israel and I am hoping to hear either today or tomorrow that he has been released.

In a spirit of cooperation in the Middle East, I hope that the Lebanese, the Syrians, the Jordanians and the Palestinians for once will understand that the United States and Egypt and the state of Israel are most anxious to see that the Palestinian state is re-established and that this step which has been taken is only one step in the long and difficult negotiations ahead. Having been involved for many years in the Middle East, there is only one thing I can say: This nation is particularly thankful for the work of the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, and at the same time acknowledges the views of the Australian Labor Party and hopes that it too will co-operate in trying to bring peace to the Holy Land. The efforts that have been made by this Government are truly commendable and will be accepted by the nation.

Mr COHEN (Robertson) (5.25)—I take this opportunity to congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hayden) on their statements. I think I can safely say that the vast majority of all members of parliament and the vast majority of people throughout the nation would welcome the bipartisanism which now exists on the Middle East question. I also take this opportunity to congratulate President Carter on his initiative. Hopefully, it will stand out as one of the great foreign affairs achievements of any American President in recent years. I do not wish to make a long speech because the sitting of the House will be suspended in a few minutes. I do not know whether it is proposed that this statement will be debated at a later stage but I know that there are other honourable members who would wish to speak on the matter.

Of course, past experience in the Middle East has shown that one should not get too excited about this settlement proposal. The negotiations on the original initiative proposed by President Sadat looked as if they would collapse at one stage. Fortunately, and largely through the efforts of President Carter, those initiatives taken by President Sadat almost a year ago today have now borne fruit. It is up to Australia and other nations to use whatever good offices they have on the moderate forces in the Middle East. In particular, I mention Jordan. Although one can see a cessation of hostilities on the Sinai Peninsula and in the area of the Gaza Strip, there is still a big question mark in respect of the West Bank. That cannot be resolved unless Jordan is a participant in future negotiations.

Of course, we will expect sections of the Middle East to continue to dissent from this view. One can only say to those people that if they continue to refuse to negotiate with Israel and with President Sadat in the negotiations that are going on now, there can be nothing short of another bloody upheaval in the Middle East. I congratulate the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition on their excellent statements, their bipartisanism and their moderation in this matter.

Debate (on motion by Mr Bourchier) adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 5.27 to 8.30 pm.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Assent to the following Bills reported:

Excise Amendment Bill 1978.

Pig Slaughter Levy Amendment Bill 1978.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1) 1978-79

In Committee

Schedule 2.

Consideration resumed.

Mr DAWKINS (Fremantle) (8.31)—In considering the estimates for the Department of the Treasury specifically we find that what is revealed in terms of this Department is the total
deficiency of the Government's ability adequately to plan the future course of the economy. Nowhere do we find in the estimates an appropriation for the funding of any appropriate planning mechanism and, indeed, within the Department itself no proper planning mechanisms exist. This seems to be based on an obsession by this Government against the concept of planning rather than an objection by this Government to the idea of intervention in the economy which planning implies. The Government does not seem to be opposed to intervening in the economy in a number of ways but it does seem to be obsessionally opposed to the idea of embracing the concept of planning itself.

There are plenty of examples of where this Government has intervened in the economy in the past and continues to intervene at the moment. We only have to look at the areas of marketing. We find the marketing of agricultural commodities riddled with statutory authorities and boards of one kind or another which are specifically given the task of marketing those products. In other words, we are not leaving to the free market forces the marketing of agricultural products but rather we are putting this function more often than not in the hands of some sort of monopoly institution. In fact, only the other day the Minister for Trade and Resources (Mr Anthony) threatened to intervene belatedly in the marketing of iron ore and instructed the iron ore producers, mainly in Western Australia, to get together to improve the processes by which they present their products to the world markets.

In the area of investment we find numerous instances of where this Government continues to adjust the processes of the allocation of resources by various inducements or penalties. The investment allowance which has been available over the last few years is a direct intervention in the economy to encourage investment in capital resources rather than manpower resources. That is a quite direct and specific intervention into the free market process. We have other instances, particularly in agriculture.

Mr Roger Johnston—Are you saying it is wrong? Is that wrong?

Mr DAWKINS—Listen my friend, there is nothing wrong with intervening in the economy. I am saying that on the one hand this Government sets its face against the idea of planning but on the other hand it is not opposed in any ideological sense apparently to the idea of intervening in the economy. What I am saying, if the honourable member will allow me to get on and develop the argument, is that if one is to intervene in the economy one ought to do it in a rational sort of way so that we know what we are doing rather than having a mish mash of ad hoc decisions and processes which in effect can lead to the misallocation of resources and the dislocation of the whole economy and can in many cases be entirely counterproductive. There are instances in the area of research and development of direct intervention in the economy to encourage that sort of activity. There is direct intervention in the area of export promotion to encourage the promotion and expansion of exports and so on.

Mr Roger Johnston—And should we not encourage them?

Mr DAWKINS—I wish the honourable member would listen. I am saying it is fair enough and entirely appropriate for a government, particularly a national government, to intervene in the economy. But it is entirely inappropriate to do it while at the same time pretending not to be in favour of economic planning. The Government is not in favour of economic planning because it does not have any of the institutional processes to allow it to plan adequately or properly. Take the example of subsidies. Only this week we have seen yet another brawl in the Liberal Party over the question of subsidies to the Mount Lyell Mining and Railway Co. Ltd company in Tasmania. Here again there is a selective intervention in one part of the mining industry as a result of direct government intervention. Again, I am not particularly opposed to that but it would be far more preferable if it were done against a general background of intervention backed up by some sort of reasonable economic plan.

The real problem, as these estimates reveal—not that we have discovered this for the first time by any means—is that there is no coherent method of determining the nature or the extent of intervention in the economy. This Government refuses to accept the need for establishing the necessary institutional framework. This refusal, I suspect, arises from a misguided faith in the processes of the so-called free market. What one must realise is that, as I have indicated and as the honourable member for Hotham (Mr Roger Johnston) has already acknowledged, there are many instances in which this Government is prepared to intervene in the economy and therefore necessarily distort the free market processes. On the admission of the Government itself, the free market processes are, therefore, quite inadequate in determining the proper course of this economy. For instance, the free
market processes are entirely inadequate in terms of achieving broad social goals. There is absolutely no natural market force which encourages the economy to a point of equilibrium which also coincides with full employment. I defy anyone to tell me of any market forces which would aid the economy to a point which ensured full employment. Therefore on the acknowledgement of the Government and in the Opposition's view there should be adequate processes by which we can intervene in the economy in order to achieve this and other social goals. For instance, there seems to be absolutely no point in saying that one believes in a full employment economy if one does not have the processes of intervention to ensure that one has some chance of achieving that goal. It is absolute nonsense to express a faith in a goal without having the processes to achieve it. That is one of the real problems with any approach to the economy which relies on a faith in the free market processes.

We have seen in this Budget more than any other probably this Government relying more and more on some sort of faith in the free market process to bring the economy out of the present incredible crisis. The Government's strategy is based on hope, and hope alone. If this hope is not realised we will find in 12 months time that the economy will be in an even worse mess than it is today. It is not easy in this country to institute a process of economic planning. I would be happy to acknowledge that. For instance we have the problem of the States having a significant role in some areas of the economy. In addition, partly related to that problem is the fact that there are serious inadequacies as far as the constitutional powers of the national Government are concerned. But these difficulties more than anything else require us to concentrate on the problem of economic planning. It is because these problems exist that the whole question of economic planning becomes more urgent and more important. Let me give the House one example at least. In the Australian economy there is a vast number of regional problems which the economies of particular areas face. If we do not have some sort of sensible approach, we cannot expect those economies which are specifically related to particular regions and are particularly determined by conditions which exist in those regions to improve just as a result of some free flow of the market forces. If we do not intervene, we are going to find that the economies of those regions which are depressed—I point to Tasmania as one example and particularly the area in which the Mount Lyell Mining and Railway Co. operates—will get worse and worse.

The CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr MacKELLAR (Warringah—Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) (8.42)—I think those members who have contributed to the debate this afternoon and this evening. A number of questions have been asked by various members in relation to various matters and I will see that wherever possible answers are provided to those questions. I might mention that the honourable member for Robertson (Mr Cohen) asked about the rate of customs duty applicable on cameras. For his information I have just received a message that there is no customs duty on cameras. There is one point, though, to which I would draw attention which disturbs me more than somewhat and that is that the honourable member for Gellibrand (Mr Willis) quoted at length from a document which was obviously a memorandum from the Australian Bureau of Statistics to the Treasurer (Mr Howard). Obviously it is an internal document. I think that one of the great things the British have left not only Australia but also many other parts of the world is a non-political Public Service. If we ever get away from that non-political public service, this country and other countries which have been blessed with this heritage will be very much the poorer.

Mr Roger Johnston—Shades of 1975.

Mr MacKELLAR—I do not excuse it whether it happens with a government of this complexion or a government of any other complexion. I just make the point generally that public servants hold a very privileged and very distinguished position within the community. They fulfil a task of great responsibility and I believe that all public servants should be aware of the very real trust and the very real responsibility that their position entails. I think that those people who may from time to time be tempted to make available internal working documents to people who have no right of access to those documents demean themselves very greatly and, more importantly, demean this great tradition of an apolitical public service. I am sorry that the honourable member for Gellibrand took the occasion to make use of the document. He could have made just the same arguments without the document. I am even more sorry that the document came into his possession. I say to those people or that person who made the document available to him that they or he should consider very carefully
their or his position within a great organisation like the Australian Public Service.

Proposed expenditures agreed to.

Mr MacKellar—I suggest that the order for the consideration of proposed expenditures agreed to by the Committee on 14 September be varied by next considering the proposed expenditure for the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and the proposed expenditures for the Department of the Northern Territory, the Department of the Capital Territory and the Department of Home Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN—Is the suggestion of the Minister agreed to? There being no objection, that course will be followed.

Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs
Proposed expenditure, $59,018,000

Dr CASS (Maribyrnong) (8.46)—The allocation for the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs appears to be one of the very few areas which does not seem to have suffered from the severe cutbacks in the recent Budget. I can understand the smile on the face of the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar), who is at the table, and why he is feeling very pleased with himself. In a sense I share with him that satisfaction but there are some minor—in some people’s eyes they are major—doubts about some of the areas, and I would like to deal with them. The Government has made much of its acceptance of the Galbally Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants and the financial obligations that this entails. I well recall that when the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser), presented the report to Parliament he made it quite clear that the Government had accepted the recommendations, particularly the financial recommendations, in toto. The Review recommended that an extra $7.88m be spent on migrant post-arrival services and programs for the coming year 1978-79. The Government claims in its own papers that it has allocated $6.55m for that purpose. Thus, it is spending $1.3m or about 17 per cent less than the Review recommended in the first year.

Mr Roger Johnston—Inflation is down, so we didn’t have to spend as much.

Dr CASS—I am glad the honourable member raised that point. When the Prime Minister presented the report and I was able to make some comments I made the observation that, if in fact the amounts recommended in the original review did not take inflation into account, it could well be that migrants would be worse off rather than better off. I fear that in some areas this may still be the case although at the time the Minister assured me that the effects of inflation would be taken into account.

Let us examine more closely the funding of the Galbally initiatives. As I said earlier, the total amount is $1m less than was recommended in the Review, so obviously some programs have had lesser amounts allocated to them than was recommended by the Review. I refer, for example, to adult migrant education. I must confess that I find it exceedingly difficult to be sure that I have cornered all the nooks and crannies wherein funds may have been allocated for this purpose. I hope the Minister can correct me, but from my attempt to bring all the figures together, excluding expenditure for initial settlement programs for which there is a considerable sum available for adult migrant education—I should have thought that that was meant to be encompassed in that allocation because the review specifically mentioned allocations for these initial settlement programs—as far as I can estimate an amount of $0.54m has been allocated instead of $0.59m as was recommended. It is a minor point only, but there is a measure of doubt whether the Government is living up to its promise. Again, that does not take into account the effects of inflation. It is a minor point but these small points were seized upon by the migrants as a great boost and I think that in that area it is not quite as it seems. Funds recommended by the Galbally Review have in some cases replaced past allocations for particular programs and I would like to deal with a couple of examples.

I refer to division 360.3.06 which appears at page 42 of the Explanatory Notes to the Estimates. In 1977-78 $100,000 was spent on once only grants. The amount spent on information in the ethnic Press was nearly $99,000 making a total of nearly $199,000. We now have in the new enlightened age, after the Galbally report, acceptance of the proposal that once only grants of up to $150,000 should be provided. That amount has been allocated, but nothing has been provided for information in the ethnic Press. That item has been wiped completely. In sum total, for that item in the Budget migrants are down about $30,000. No, I am sorry, it is more than that. It is a very significant drop. It is not an increase, which was recommended by the Galbally review. In that item there has actually been a reduction.

To analyse this matter further, to get a better perspective on the sums of money involved, if the spirit of the Galbally report had been accepted—in other words to fulfil the Review’s
intention—expenditure on this item should have been $348,000. That is made up of last year's allocation plus a $150,000 increase, as recommended by the Galbally report. Incidentally, that figure does not take inflation into account. If inflation is taken into account, the figure should be nearly $360,000. In fact the allocation is $150,000.

We then come to the funding of the multicultural resource centres. These are seen as being very important by the migrant communities because they hope that through these centres they will have an increased opportunity to participate in helping themselves, initiating programs of support for fellow members of the communities and so on. Again, in the spirit of the Galbally report, the emphasis was on encouraging participation by migrant communities. The Government was advised to allocate $40,000 extra for this first year. This the Government has done. It has allocated such an amount but only by taking away $40,000 from the Clearing House on Migrant Issues, an organisation which has provided invaluable resource and research material over the past few years. It has provided services for migrants and an enormous amount of material for the enlightenment of all of us. Yet that money has been taken away from it.

The amount for next year, as listed in the Budget Papers, for the Clearing House on Migrant Issues, is nil, whereas that organisation received $40,000 last year. I rang a representative of the organisation to find out what was happening because I was shocked when I heard the news. Apparently there is some hope that funds will be available for special projects in order to keep them afloat, but the funds will be much less than the organisation received last year, or at least so it fears. In other words, this cut, taking inflation into account, is a cut of over 40 per cent for one of the very few organisations providing real services to migrants and research information about them.

Under the same item the pilot resource centres in Melbourne and Sydney are also funded. Funding for the Melbourne resource centre which is run by the Australian-Greek Welfare Society has been provided only up to 31 January. Of course if the document is read carefully one would note from the explanation that in the first instance funds were provided for only two years. I accept that fact. I would have thought even at this stage without any formal review having taken place—I presume that the review has not yet taken place—that there is a pile of evidence to suggest that it is performing an enormously valuable function. I will not damn the Minister, but on the strength of it it looks as if this is the end of the centre; it looks as though it will fold up at the end of January. I hope that is not so. I am suggesting to the Minister that if he is waiting for a review of the functions of the centre and an assessment of whether it is any good, he should get that review under way immediately so that a decision can be taken, hopefully before the end of this year. If it is not taken soon a lot of people who are working in the centre will be worrying about the future and will be tempted to leave because jobs are difficult to get. One cannot live on hope, so they will be looking for other jobs. It may well be that a very valuable centre will fail simply because of the doubts engendered in the minds of those people who are involved in it. In like fashion, the same situation might happen with the centre in Sydney.

The third point that worries me is what guarantee is there that migrant communities will receive the money that has been allocated. In a couple of areas, such as the telephone interpreter service, funds that were allocated were underspent by 15 per cent last year. Although more money has been allocated this year, how do we know that it will be spent? Finally, of course the Government has failed to fulfil many of its election promises in all directions. One of the glowing promises was that it would spend $2.3m for ethnic health interpreters. To date, as far as I can ascertain, not a cent has been spent. For all these reasons I think the migrant communities need to assess very carefully the impact of the Government's promises. Many of those promises are as yet unfulfilled.

Mr McLEAN (Perth) (8.56)—I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the estimates for the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs because, in my view, the activities and initiatives of the Government in this area represent one of the major success stories of this Government over the past 2½ years. I thank the honourable member for Maribyrnong (Dr Cass) who is the Opposition spokesman in this area for the way in which he has really given strong basic support to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar) and the Government. In a time of general expenditure restraint we find that the Government is providing a wide range of new benefits and programs to migrants and migrant organisations. Expenditure by the Department in the coming year will rise by some 25 per cent.

I will look briefly at the record. When the Labor Government came to office it did not even see fit to establish a separate department for migrants. It was the present Government which saw
the need to establish a separate Department of Immigration with which migrants would establish contact initially and which would continue to provide a special contact point for migrants during their subsequent settlement in Australia. It is always Labor spokesmen who state that the Government sees migrants as being 'factory fodder'. That is the crude expression that they use and it is one which I think is a great insult to all Australians, whether they were born in this country or not. Yet it was the Labor Party which did away with a separate Department of Immigration. What did it do? It combined that department with the Department of Labour. So, in other words, it was the Labor Party that saw migrants as being manpower units and little more than that.

On the other hand this Government reintroduced the Department of Immigration and expanded it to include ethnic affairs, a recognition of the fact that the Government does not see migrants as being just workers but rather as people with a unique and cultural heritage which we should encourage them to foster as they become Australian citizens. In other words, it does not just want their labour; it wants them instead as total beings who are able to add to the vitality and richness of the total Australian social fabric. It has backed that ideal by action. It has also sought to integrate migrant services in a way which will better enable migrants to handle the Australian bureaucracy. Previously, if they had particular problems, they would be sent from department to department to seek assistance. In order to rationalise this situation sensibly, the Government has assisted migrants by adding settlement services, the telephone interpreter service, adult education services and other services within the one department.

The Government has also established the first migrant resource centres in Sydney and Melbourne. I believe that another three centres will be established in the first half of next year. These represent a significant initiative in the provision of additional services to migrants, both individually and in organisations, in the form of a contact and reference point with which people can develop some affinity and to which they can go for assistance and additional information. As it is envisaged that some 18 of these centres will be established in the next three years, I would like to stress to the Minister the need for Perth to be given a high priority for such a centre. My electorate of Perth has a total population in excess of 113,000 people. At least 20 per cent of the total number are persons who were born outside Australia or the United Kingdom. In relation to other capital city seats in this country—I have had the figures drawn up by the Parliamentary Library—that of itself should accord Perth a high priority.

The Opposition spokesman mentioned migrant education. Very significant advances have been made in this area. The Commonwealth Government has almost doubled funds for the adult migrant education program in Australia over the past two years. Expenditure in this area has risen from $8.8m in 1976-77 to the $17.2m which has been provided in the 1978-79 Budget. I congratulate the Government and the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, who is at the table, on this. In the area of child migrant education there has been an increase in expenditure in each of the years since this Government took office. Perhaps the major achievement of this Government has been the establishment of the Galbally Committee and the subsequent adoption of its major recommendations regarding post-arrival programs and services for migrants. In line with the Galbally Committee recommendations, $6.5m will be committed for the coming year. Over the next three years the implementation of these recommendations will involve a total expenditure in excess of $50m. In all of these areas, the Government has a very proud record of achievement.

I would like to say a few words about the Government's recently announced intention to increase Australia's immigration intake. Firstly, I state that under the Labor Government in 1975-76 Australia's immigration reached the lowest level since 1947 when there was an intake of 52,000 people. This Government, on the other hand, has decided to increase the net annual immigration intake to 70,000 for the first year of the triennial rolling program which commenced in the year 1978-79. On balance, in my opinion, this expanded immigration program should be welcomed by all Australians; but it must be done sensibly, with caution and with a certain degree of flexibility. It is difficult in times of high unemployment to gain widespread acceptance of the need for an expanded immigration policy. Most of the objections which generally come from the trade union movement are based on economic grounds.

I think these objections can be countered on several grounds: Firstly, few people could fail to recognise the long term correlation which has existed in Australia between population growth and economic development, particularly since the last war. Also, immigration can provide a labour force mobility which might not otherwise exist. This is very important for a country with a
population distribution such as ours. In addition, immigration can meet occupational shortages and help to overcome lags in domestic retraining schemes. For each skilled worker entering Australia, jobs are created for additional semi-skilled and unskilled workers. This is what the bulk of the unemployed in Australia are. In this context, as the Australian labour force ages—as it will do on present projections—it will become less mobile in terms of both geography and occupation. Also, immigration can help to provide a balance to the work force component of the population which would grow only at diminishing rates with the present and projected combination of a declining natural population growth rate and an aging of that population.

Immigration also can improve expectations of the business community regarding future markets, thereby influencing its output and investment decisions, and it can, of course, create economies of scale. I also make the point that those who state that higher immigration rates, coupled with capital intensification, will lead automatically to higher unemployment should realise that historically Australia has been able to maintain near full employment at times of high immigration and increasing capital to labour ratios. In other words, productivity improvement leads to further economic achievement and higher living standards rather than to higher unemployment over the longer term.

In addition to those economic considerations, I suggest that defence, foreign affairs and humanitarian considerations—particularly in view of our place in this region of the world—may well justify Australia seeking a higher population by the end of this century. But there are also a number of unknowns which could influence the nature of the immigration program. We must be able to respond to these factors as they take a clear form. In particular, I refer to the studies which will be undertaken with respect to the extent and nature of structural unemployment in Australia, whether it be social or technological. There may well be a case, if the rate of technological change is increasing, for revising some of these plans. We may have to respond to the findings of these studies.

I mention the need to refer to the various refugee problems, both actual and potential, which we may need to accommodate in the future. In particular, with events in Rhodesia happening very quickly, we may have to respond immediately and sympathetically to that situation in the near future. On balance, I support an expanded immigration program on both economic and non-economic grounds; but it must be implemented with caution, flexibility and good sense. I also mention that immigration policy has to be framed within a long term perspective. The fundamental decision has to be made as to whether population is desirable and, if this is agreed to, action should be taken now. It would be tempting to defer a decision in the light of short term problems because long lead times are involved in making and implementing decisions about population policy. Decisions taken now, and within the next few years, about immigration matters will have a permanent, long term effect on the size and composition of the Australian population. I congratulate the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs, who is at the table. He is the best Minister for Immigration that we have seen for several decades.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Hon. Ian Robinson)—Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Dr JENKINS (Scullin) (9.6)—Those honourable members who have in their electorate a large number of citizens of migrant origin have very little opportunities in this chamber to raise some of the common problems they find amongst these people. It should be recalled that often the presence of a high proportion of people of various migrant origin means that honourable members have to deal with not only their electors but also many thousands of people who are yet to be naturalised. The first matter I want to raise is the guidelines and tests used for entry qualifications. The family reunion test generally has been accepted as a not unreasonable test to be applied in the present circumstances. However, there is a great deal of confusion amongst migrants in the use of that term and in understanding just how far the relationship extends. I believe that we have to give some consideration to that matter.

Another question I should like to raise deals with the rigidity of the application of this particular test. I would like to give an example that was brought to my notice recently. A migrant—an Australian citizen—who has a responsible position with a bank, supports his mother who lives in his home country of Yugoslavia. He has two brothers, one living in Austria and the other living in Yugoslavia. The only son who provides finance to support the mother is the one who lives in Australia. It was obvious to him that the best place for his mother was in Australia with him and his family. His own efforts to have her brought out under the family reunion arrangements were unsuccessful. The matter was brought to my attention and the attention of my staff. I am happy to say that after some time the
mother has now been allowed to come to Australia where the supporting son is able to look after her. It illustrates the problem that arises if the family reunion test is applied too rigidly. There can be circumstances in which, although all the members of a family do not reside in Australia, important members of the family who are supporting relatives overseas are residing in Australia.

It is not a bad idea to reflect on the amount of money that migrants send overseas to support relatives in other countries. I believe that this Government's true attitude to migrants is illustrated by the discriminatory move of abolishing tax rebates for the maintenance of overseas dependents. This hits only immigrants and former immigrants and their families. The Government has justified the withdrawal of the rebate by claiming that the provision has led to flagrant abuse. It has given next to no evidence in support of this claim. The so-called saving made by the Government will be somewhere around $8m in 1978-79. It is a relatively small and paltry sum but the suffering and hardship which it will cause the lower income families who are supporting relatives overseas are immeasurable. I think that the Government must either put up or shut up about its suggestion of flagrant abuse. If it is so ineffective that it cannot stop these abuses it should not be penalising families for whom this has been a worthwhile measure.

Another question with regard to the admission of migrants is the possession of special professional or trade skills. In the Estimates we see that there is a Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications which has been going for some years and which produces an annual report. I find it terribly difficult to ascertain whether particularly a trade qualification is one that is acceptable in Australia. I do not doubt the work done by the committee and I acknowledge the courtesy with which one is received when one makes an inquiry, but the fact is that when migrants come to see a member of parliament and talk about one of their relatives whom they wish to see migrate to Australia and who they say has a particular skill in some area, they produce the certificates of that qualification or copies of them from some overseas school or institution and it is the devil's own job to find out whether that qualification is accepted. It is not of much use their putting up an application unless they know that it is going to be accepted. It is not of much use a member of parliament advising them to do that. It raises false expectations. I think it is a matter of common sense that we should perhaps have some consolidation in this area of professional and trade qualifications which would allow members of parliament and migrants to identify clearly the acceptability or otherwise of their skills.

In a local area, of course, another matter which frequently comes before one involves tourist visas. One strikes two main problems with tourist visas. One finds the complaint that people cannot obtain such a visa to visit their relatives in Australia. So often those people who are refused a tourist visa have made an application some years previously to be migrants to Australia and either have been refused or have allowed the application to lapse when it has been accepted. This appears to produce a great atmosphere of suspicion amongst the officers handling the application when such people want to come here as tourists, and I think that this is one area about which we have to be careful. Also with regard to tourist visas, I am sure that many other honourable members have had the experience of interviewing people with visitor's visas who have been working in Australia and who want to stay. They appear to have no understanding of what that visitor's or tourist visa means. Frankly, I believe that many of them are being given false information by individuals who probably make a dollar out of it in their countries of origin. I think that is to be deplored. Any step that we could take to warn such migrants who are issued with these visas that the visas give them no right to work and no right to expect preference for permanent residence in the country has to be taken. Otherwise, people will try to overcome the system by doing this and I am sure that there are crooks and entrepreneurs who will take advantage of this sort of thing to convince unsuspecting people that this avenue is open to them.

Another matter is the question of citizenship ceremonies. Some months ago the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar) wrote to us and gave us guidelines as to what we were to say at those ceremonies, gently rapped our knuckles and said that we should not be political. I have accepted that although I mention the party to which I belong and the fact that I am in the Opposition. Most of these ceremonies are conducted by the local municipalities. In the old boundaries of my electorate there were two principal municipalities which always invited me to the ceremonies and sent me a list of those who were naturalised. There are now three major municipalities in my electorate, two of which extend this courtesy to me and another which does not. When the query is raised I am told in a second-hand verbal way that if I make a written
application I might get a list of those who are naturalised. I think that the Minister ought to instruct local government bodies that as Australian citizenship is granted by the Australian Government they ought to inform the Federal member for the area of who the new citizens are so that he can advise them of where he is and how he can be of assistance. I think that this is quite important. In closing, I would hope that at some stage, instead of leaving it to the Galbally Committee, advisory councils and so on, we can have what the British Parliament has, namely, a parliamentary committee that looks at these questions of immigration and ethnic affairs.

Mr SAINSURY (Eden-Monaro) (9.17)—Immigration and ethnic affairs have to be a very big policy area in a country such as ours where something like one-quarter of its population was born overseas. I might say, with respect, that at present we have a big man with big capabilities heading that portfolio. Immigration is an emotional problem to many people. Obviously the decision to migrate to Australia is never arrived at lightly. That is one of the very big reasons that one needs a sensitive government which is able to put thought for people into the administration of this area.

I was impressed with the case history which I have just heard from the honourable member for Scullin (Dr Jenkins), although one thing he said offended me. I seem to remember speaking after him on another occasion not long ago. It offended me to hear him use the words 'crooks' and 'entrepreneurs' in the same breath because I think that we should remember that there are crooks in all parts of society, and thank heavens that we have entrepreneurs in Australia. I should say that many of the entrepreneurs we have in Australia who are making money—that is a very good idea in my opinion—have come to this country since the war. They are people of enterprise who are prepared to have a go. That is why they came to this country and that is why so many have come to love this country.

I would like to comment on the Galbally report which was so quickly put into operation by this Government in such an effective way. I have only time to say that there is one item of the implementation of that report which I feel was a mistake and which needs to be said. I fear that Mr Galbally had the wool pulled over his eyes with respect to the Good Neighbour Council, but that is something I hope to be taking up with the Minister.

There is a theory that immigration adds to unemployment. I have heard in this debate some mention of that possibility. I am very pleased to know that in the past year or so, for a change, the immigration question has been removed somewhat from the emotional area and the debate has become much more informed. I was pleased to read through the proceedings of the residential workshop of the Department of Continuing Education at the University of New England last year. This is a publication which was recommended to members by the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar). The subject of the residential workshop was 'Australia's population A.D. 2000'. A particular paper presented by Ainsley Jolley was headed 'The Macro Economics of Immigration'. I believe that this is one of the signposts of the immigration debate and that people are beginning to realise just where and when in the trade cycle immigration causes stresses or benefits on employment and other matters such as the balance of payments. I do not agree with all of the things that Ainsley Jolley has said but I do commend the paper for reading by all honourable members. Too often in this place debates on immigration become emotional. Sometimes people get up and say: 'If we have an increased level of immigration we are bound to have to that same extent an increase in the level of unemployment'.

Mr McLean—Rubbish!

Mr SAINSURY—That is complete rubbish. If anything should be said, I quote from the paper to which I have referred. I quote one of the conclusions. It reads:

If immigration were to be used as a means of economic stabilisation there would be a need to cut immigration at the peak of the trade cycle and increase immigration at the beginning of economic recovery.

That is reasonably well proved. In the present situation, of course, we hope that we are at the beginning of economic recovery. But, even so, I think that Ainsley Jolley has overlooked one or two things that also need to be said. One of the things that is spoken about in this paper is the fact that at the bottom of the trade cycle when there is an excess capacity immigration in the first instance tends to use up only that excess capacity, so the increased demand from the new immigrants will not add so much to employment levels and, therefore, may add to unemployment. I think we need to bear in mind, however, that the goods and services that are required immediately by migrants tend to be goods and services in areas where there is not usually an excess capacity. For instance, I refer to the building industry. We do not have an excess capacity in the building industry in the sense that there are people who could produce more at the same
level of employment. It is an industry in which
an additional level of demand more people
are immediately required. The food industry—
the essentials that migrants require when they
first arrive—is an industry which requires extra
people for each extra cabbage or potato.

Even though I admit that perhaps at the bot-
tom of the trade cycle immigration will add less
to demand than it would at the peak, there is a
case to be made, perhaps more strongly than
even Ainsley Jolley has put it, that immigration
at all stages of the trade cycle will add to demand
especially of course at the top of the trade cycle,
and that is a time when immigration perhaps
needs to be cut. But when we are feeling the first
very fragile commencement of a very solid
movement forward in the Australian economy,
now—right now—is, in my view, the time to in-
crease immigration heavily in the way that it is
apparently being done.

Often there is a feeling in the Australian
community—certainly this applies in my elector-
ate too—that a low level of immigration is a
means of cutting back on unemployment. Many
people forget, however, that a low level of immi-
gration is in many ways a contributor to our
present condition. It does need to be said that it
was the previous Labor Government that appar-
ently did not believe in immigration. It was the
Government that cut back the levels of immi-
gration which made it so difficult for qualified
brothers and sisters of migrants already in
Australia to enter this country. It was the
Government that created a situation in which in
one year the net immigration to Australia was
only about 20,000. I think it would be fair to say
that the previous Labor Government was an
anti-immigrant party, despite the fact that the
propaganda it has managed to create in some of
the ethnic radio programs would appear to have
convinced many immigrants that the Labor
Party is on their side. I think that the facts of re-
cent history show that that has not been true and
that the present situation under the Liberal-
Country Party Government is quite the opposite.
There has been a steady increase in the net immi-
gration intake. In the last year instead of about
20,000 new migrants net there were over 60,000.

There are still plenty of problems to get over.
The problem of qualifications, as was mentioned
by the honourable member for Scullin, is a very
important one. No doubt all honourable
members have come across people who want to
sponsor people from overseas who have
qualifications but have great difficulty in having
their qualifications accepted in this country. We
still have plenty of problems with the number of
illegal immigrants to this country. I must say that
those people are only making it more difficult for
the people who are at the top of the queue and
people who are trying to act within the law.
Nevertheless, these matters cannot be argued
fully in such a short debate as this. I repeat that
Australia has a pro-migrant government. I want
to see good and steady increases in immigration
to this country as one of the prime methods of
getting this country back on its feet. I am very
confident that the Minister for Immigration and
Ethnic Affairs sees it that way.

Mr HOWE (Batman) (9.27)—One would
have hoped that the whole question of the mi-
gration policy could in the present circumstanc-
es have been a bipartisan policy. Indeed, a success-
ful migration policy really depends not on the
support of particular parties or sections of the
community but on a degree of concensus about
what are the goals of the migration policy and
what is the basis of that policy. I think it is quite
wrong for the honourable member for Eden-
Monaro (Mr Sainsbury) to suggest that there
was anything about the Labor Party when it was
in office or in Opposition which could possibly
suggest that the Labor Party was against immi-
gration or that it was against migrants. I think
that a good deal of assessment is often made of
policies, particularly in respect of the Labor
Party, on the basis of the very brief period that
Party was in office. I think that one ought to
recognise that for 23 years there was a Liberal
Party government in this country which certainly
did not talk about multi-culturalism, which cer-
tainly did not introduce programs on migrant
education, which certainly did not support
centres like the Ecumenical Migration Centre or
the Migrants Clearing House and which left vol-
untary agencies with limited resources to fight
alone in the whole field of migration welfare.
I believe that in many respects the Galbally re-
port continues that process of change.

I do not want particularly to criticise the
Government for what it is doing in implementing
the various recommendations of the Galbally re-
port. Rather, I think the Government ought to be
congratulated. But, having said that, one ought
to recognise that migrant welfare cannot be
separated from the whole question of the welfare
of the community in general. One cannot look at
a policy in relation to migrants in separation
from the policies which, for example, a govern-
ment adopts in relation to the management of
the economy and the management of employ-
ment. I had intended to spend rather more time
on the Galbally report and on some of the excellent products of that report which are embodied in these estimates, but because of the remarks of the two previous speakers from the other side in relation to employment I think it is important to indicate to the Committee and to draw attention to the fact that conflicts which divide this society and conflict with which government must grapple are not always conflict between labour and capital. Sometimes there is written into the nature of a government itself and into the nature of the departments of which it is composed, a conflict of interest between various departments.

I think that conflict which exists and which, to some extent is reflected in these estimates, was underlined by what was said by the previous speaker. He spoke optimistically about how migration would not produce increased unemployment. Indeed, he spoke as though unemployment was just a passing phenomenon. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations (Mr Street) does not suggest that unemployment is a passing phenomenon. Indeed, only the other day he said to members of the Government side as well as to members on this side that there was no escaping the fact that we are suffering from a great deficiency of jobs. There are people who are genuinely and earnestly seeking employment but who cannot find it. We owe it to ourselves to face this fact. I put it to honourable members that whilst the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations may have faced the facts about unemployment, we see reflected in the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs an inability on the part of that Department to face that kind of reality. It is unable to face the reality that we are not at the beginning of some great recovery: We are in the middle of the most extended recession this country has faced for 40 years.

There is evidence that the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs is suggesting that in those circumstances, where we now have 6.2 per cent of the work force unemployed—by the new year, the percentage will be considerably higher—we ought to increase the rate of immigration which, I believe, will therefore increase the rate of unemployment. The Department of Employment and Industrial Relations suggested in its submission to its Minister:

The direct effect of immigration for two decades (that is, excluding the inflows from Australian born children of migrants) was to contribute at least 40 per cent of the annual increase in the Australian labour force: Indeed in the 1950s the contribution would have been in excess of 50 per cent per year.

Migration has historically, within the post-war period, contributed massively to the work force in this country. It is within that context that the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr MacKellar), in April of this year, was arguing for increasing the levels of migration from their current net levels of around 50,000 odd to 110,000. The Minister was unable to persuade the Cabinet that there should be a White Paper on this matter. However, he was able to make a ministerial statement in this chamber in which he suggested that the target this year as part of a triennium would be an intake of 90,000 a year or 70,000 net, because 20,000 people could be expected to emigrate permanently from Australia.

The Minister further estimated at that time and as part of that statement what this would mean for the work force. He estimated that the gross worker intake in a single year would be 35,000 and the net intake that is, after allowing for workers leaving the country permanently, would be 27,000. I emphasise that figure—27,000. If one takes that figure of 27,000 contained in the statement of the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs in June of this year, well after the parameters of the Budget had been set, and compares it with what the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations said in his statement of Thursday of last week, one finds a great difference. The Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations estimates that the work force will grow overall by 110,000 next year and that migration will contribute 20,000—not 27,000 or 35,000—to the work force. The Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs who, in April was advocating 110,000 immigrants a year and whose Department has an interest in the highest possible figures, is clearly in conflict with the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations who has an interest in the lowest possible figures. He knows that if there is increased unemployment, he is the one who will have to bear the blame.

I do not want to be emotional, but I think we have speak strongly on this issue. The credibility of this Government depends a great deal on the credibility of its projections. However, this Government is increasingly being shown to be the victim of its own propaganda. I refer the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs to a paper recently released by Dr Birrell of Monash University, who has drawn attention to the way in which the Minister and his Department have manipulated figures to their own advantage. There is a particular example of this manipulation, but I will not go into that now. There was the suggestion in the Minister’s statement earlier this year that the gross intake of migrants for 1977-78 could be only 77,000, less 7,000 leaving
the country. Quite clearly the figures are very different from that.

I wish very briefly to draw the attention of honourable members to one or two other facts which are relevant to the question of unemployment. I think firstly that we have to recognise that something like 18 per cent of those people who have recently arrived in this country are unemployed. I repeat: Eighteen per cent of recently arrived migrants are unemployed. Finally, I want to draw the attention of honourable members to a table which sets out the unemployment levels and settler arrivals by occupation. It tries to relate the whole question of people's occupations as against the unemployment which exists in this country. It shows that at this time of high unemployment we are bringing people such as teachers, nurses and typists to this country. Mr Deputy Chairman, I have shown this table to the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs and I now seek leave to have it incorporated in Hansard.

Leave granted.

The table read as follows—

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 July 1977</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unfilled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Unfilled</th>
<th></th>
<th>Settler inflow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>vacancies</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>vacancies</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1,498</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrons, nurses</td>
<td>1,634</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typists and office machinists</td>
<td>11,776</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>13,269</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td>1,860</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bricklayers, etcetera</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2,376</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>407</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>5,011</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>7,322</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitters and turners</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2,986</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welders</td>
<td>1,296</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor mechanics</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr BRAITHWAITE (Dawson) (9.37)—The estimates set out in terms of costs Australia's immigration policy for the year 1978-79 and the extent of its assistance to ethnic groups. Many comments have been made and many people use this opportunity to support the particular theories they have. I thought I just might add to this without taking the time to rebut or go over other people's arguments.

It is nearly 200 years since Australia received its first immigrants and because of the nature of our first colonisation, Australia became less of an Aboriginal community and more of a British or European community over those 200 years. Since World War II our population has accelerated and has become more of a European blend because of the immigration policy directed towards getting our skilled workers from that general geographic area. In those 200 years Australia has seen an influx of other ethnic groups. I mention the Chinese who, in the 19th century, joined in our rush for gold as the fields were discovered, explored and exploited. Many of them remain today as first-class business people, as workers, but more importantly, as Australians. Also, the Kanaka slave trade of the late 19th century left within our Australian community, particularly in the north of the nation, the distinctive characteristic of the South Pacific Islander, a person of whom we can be very proud. These are only two of the groups which have lent their cultures to the European culture and absorbed some in return. Their financial cost to the nation for immigration was absolutely nothing, but their financial and cultural contribution to Australia today cannot be calculated.

These estimates provide an amount of $440,000 to voluntary agencies for assistance to refugees, $8.58m to the assisted migration program, $17.17m for migrant and refugee education and nearly $1m by way of grants to Good Neighbour Councils. These appropriations show in human terms our preparedness to accept, to educate and to assimilate migrants, wherever they may come from, and also to take our share of responsibilities for refugees, particularly those from South East Asia.

The long-term implications of the decisions we now make are important and perhaps exciting. What we now call the average Australian is a mixture, mainly with European origin. Within 50 years the nature of the average Australian must change—and it will change. On my recent visit to Japan, China and Hong Kong, the aspect that
interested me most was the density of population in those countries—the number of people living within a limited space. In Japan 110 million people are living on 25 per cent of the land surface. In China 800 million to 900 million people use every scrap of available land. In fact, we saw hills and mountains being denuded in order to terrace for agriculture. In Hong Kong there is limited land available—again with a very large population—and the problem is being increased daily by the influx of refugees from adjoining countries. Incidentally, the white Australia policy is still found in some Japanese educational terminology, and perhaps that could be corrected.

In comparison with those mass populations and limited land, Australia, with its vast spaces suitable for almost any type of enterprise and its population of a mere 14 million, cannot expect to continue its unique role, particularly when geographically we belong with those densely populated nations. Geographically we are part of that area of the world that has well over one-half of the world's population. I believe that within 50 years our population will reflect changes that are inevitable. It will be a larger population, a population no longer particularly European, a population reflecting a little of a lot of other nations, possibly mainly from South East Asia or the Pacific area. As I said, I feel that these changes will envelop us whether we want them to or not. Therefore the policies we adopt, which this appropriation reflects, are important for their eventual long term results.

Our choice of migrants must reflect people possessed of the work ethic, people who are prepared to adopt our country, to focus on opportunities, and to work to fulfill ambitions born out of the opportunities they see. It is rather sad to have to say that, but we realise that it is a fact when we look today at the average Australian. The same opportunities are there if we want to exploit them, if indeed we have a work ethic. Multinationals reveal this day after day—coal in the Bowen Basin, tourism on the Barrier Reef, and so on throughout Australia. Multinationals can see the opportunities; we cannot. The experience with the early Chinese immigrants was one of success so far as enterprise was concerned, irrespective of the difficulties of the terrain, the climate, or whatever they had to face at that time. In my experience, the Japanese possess a greater productivity—possibly 20 per cent to 25 per cent greater—than the average Australian. These are the people who, because of the inevitability of what I have described earlier, would strengthen the Australian economy and the character of the average Australian.

Refugees have been described as queue jumpers, and in some ways I agree with that. Whilst I agree with our outlay of funds to assist refugees, we must do it on our basis and not necessarily on someone else's. Our guidelines must be clear, concise and constructive in order to build up our future society in the most orderly fashion. How we accept our 10,000 refugees this year will determine our policy for future years. The honourable member for Perth (Mr McLean) has indicated other potential areas from which refugees probably will come. Rhodesia is one area to which we must apply the same rules of compassion as we do to others today or tomorrow. Personally, I believe that if the crisis comes to a head from the Rhodesian quarter those people, black or white, would add something to our Australian character and community. The policies we adopt towards Vietnamese refugees will also have to be applied to other nationalities as other nations adjust their affairs, peacefully or otherwise.

It is important that migrants be not only accepted but also encouraged to enter the mainstream of Australian life. The educational commitment of $17m in these estimates is important, but the commitment to assist in assimilation is probably just as important. The decision to cut oneself off from a way of life and to adopt another is a heartbreaking one for the migrants who make it, and in those circumstances assimilation is most important. I have noted also the amount of $720,000 allocated for deportation fares. Whilst I can see no alternative, it does offend me to know that other nationals, who vandalise our national assets such as the Great Barrier Reef and trespass on our fishing grounds, upon capture commence a chain of events for which the Australian taxpayer is called upon to pay—detection, quarantine and repatriation. Our defence, our security, our health, and also the problem of drugs are all areas of concern in this regard.

The total appropriation of $59m for 1978-79 represents a rather large increase over that for the 1977-78 year. It is comparatively insignificant in terms of cost, perhaps; but it has to be made significant in the value it buys for Australia in the type of migrant or refugee we take this year and in the years to come. The best value migrant is the one who will help to develop a nation that is basically underdeveloped. The best value migrant will expand our culture and enrich our community.

Mr MacKellar (Warringah—Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs) (9.46)—Thank you, Mr Deputy Chairman, for the opportunity
to speak to these estimates. I also thank those honourable members who have contributed to the debate this evening. It has been a constructive approach to the question of immigration and ethnic affairs. I should like to take up a couple of points made by the various speakers.

The honourable member for Maribyrnong (Dr Cass) drew attention to the discrepancy between the $7.9m recommended by the Galbally Committee for expenditure in the first year of implementation of its report and the amount of $6.5m provided in the Budget. I reiterate to honourable members that the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) announced in a statement to the Parliament on 30 May that the Government has accepted the financial commitment entailed in the Galbally proposal and stands by that commitment to implement the Galbally report. The $6.5m provided in this year's Budget to implement the Galbally report does not include costs of additional Public Service staff proposed by Galbally. Those staff costs will now be met from within proposed Budget appropriations for staff salaries. In addition, part of the funding for teaching English, ethnic languages and multicultural studies in schools will be included in the 1979-80 appropriations as the school funding is on a calendar year basis. I want to make it absolutely clear to the Committee and to people listening to this debate that the Government stands committed to implementing fully the Galbally proposals, and the expenditure of $6.5m in the first year in fact does allow that implementation to take place.

The honourable member also raised the question of the Clearing House on Migrant Issues—CHOMI. The fact is that last year CHOMI was advised that it would have to make more effort to find funds itself for the continuation of its existence. Despite the efforts it made, it still ran into real financial problems. The Government has looked very closely at the problem experienced by CHOMI and I am glad to say that some funds will be found by the Department to ensure the continuation of CHOMI at this stage. The honourable member for Maribyrnong also raised the question of information advertising in the ethnic Press. I make the point that once-only grants will be increased from $100,000 to $150,000. In answer to another question he raised, I point out that the grants will increase this year as proposed by Galbally. In relation to advertising in the ethnic Press, a pilot project which the Department undertook did not produce a sufficiently large response to warrant further expenditure. In fact, the response to the project we initiated last year was surprisingly small, in my view.

The honourable member also drew attention to the fact that the amount made available last year for the telephone interpreter service was underspent I do not subscribe to the view that every cent available in the appropriation must be spent. I would subscribe to the view that the amount of money spent should be spent properly and effectively. If the money cannot be spent properly and effectively, there is no sense in wasting it. After all, it is the taxpayers' money and we have a responsibility to make certain that it is spent effectively and efficiently.

The honourable member for Perth (Mr McLean) raised the question of the establishment of a migrant resource centre in Perth. He pointed to the high concentration of overseas born people in his electorate. I am glad to be able to say that the Galbally program makes provision for a resource centre to be established in Perth as early as possible in 1979-80. We hope and anticipate that a further centre will be established there in 1980-81. The honourable member for Scullin (Dr Jenkins) raised a number of points. He seems to be a little confused about the job that the Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications is required to do and also that responsibility which adheres in the technical area. I point out to the honourable member for Scullin that we have technical advisers at key posts overseas to evaluate trade qualifications on the basis of criteria established by Australian tripartite missions. There is a regular program of these tripartite missions and the central trades committee and the local trades committees in Australia to evaluate trade skills. These are set up under the Tradesmen's Rights Regulation Act. I wish to deal with some of the criticism of COPQ dealt with by the honourable member. The terms of reference for COPQ have been expanded and we will be seeking to do what we can to get a more ready evaluation of overseas skills and professions in relation to Australian equivalents.

I note also the suggestions made by the honourable member in relation to publicity of shady operators overseas. He really was talking about tourist visas. I point out to him that all people who come to Australia on tourist visas sign a document in their own language. The document which they sign and which, theoretically at least, they should understand, points out that they are not able to take employment in Australia or enter any educational institution in Australia and that they must leave Australia within the time period specified in their visas. I
take on board the suggestion from the honourable member about additional publicity. We will have a look at that matter. I also note his suggestion about citizenship and the provision of lists of new citizens to all Federal members of Parliament.

Other honourable members have stressed the importance of immigration as a contributor to the economic well-being of the Australian nation. The honourable member for Batman (Mr Howe) took exception to some of the arguments put forward by honourable members on this side of the House. All I can say to the honourable member for Batman is that he seemed to be a little confused in relation, firstly, to the history of migrant education and, secondly, to the contribution that migrants make towards the economic well-being of this nation. I gently point out to the honourable member that, in fact, the previous Labor Government was not responsible for the initiation of migrant education in Australia. In fact, it started in the 1960s under the previous Liberal-Country Party Government. The honourable member made the statement in fairly direct terms that immigration equates with unemployment. He advanced the simplistic argument that if immigration is increased, inevitably it will increase unemployment. Of course, this argument does not take into account the composition of the migrant intake. If I can take as a guide the number of representations the honourable member makes to me in relation to immigration, I am sure that he was not arguing that we should be stopping family reunion migration. I am sure that the honourable member would not be arguing that we should completely cut out the refugee intake. Of course, these are the two areas that can result in some people being admitted to Australia who do not have the requisite skills or qualifications which are in long-term demand in Australia and which can add to the unemployment situation. However, the Government has made a conscious decision in relation to these two categories of migrants which states that the humanitarian and international obligations override the purely economic considerations. I believe that on further reflection the honourable member for Batman may agree with that.

In relation to those migrants selected on an occupational basis, surveys both in Australia and overseas have shown quite conclusively that the recruitment and employment of one skilled person can lead to the additional employment of up to four or five semi-skilled or unskilled people. I am not arguing for a moment that selective recruitment overseas should take the place of training or re-training in Australia. I am saying that the two must go together. But there are occasions when bottlenecks occur in the production process in Australia. The only way in which these bottlenecks can be overcome is by the selective recruitment of skilled personnel overseas. We find that that recruitment leads to further employment of up to four or five semi-skilled or unskilled people.

Other points were raised in the debate. They will be looked at closely and if I can provide answers to the honourable gentlemen who raised the points I will do so. In the meantime I thank honourable members again for their contributions to the debate.

Proposed expenditure agreed to.

**Department of the Northern Territory**

Proposed expenditure, $1,247,000.

**Department of the Capital Territory**

Proposed expenditure, $80,303,000.

**Department of Home Affairs**

Proposed expenditure, $71,426,000.

**Dr Everingham (Capricornia) (9.57)—**This debate is about much more than the estimates presented for the Department of the Northern Territory. It has become a wide-ranging debate which takes into account not only the handover of limited rights and the imposition of hard State responsibilities on the people of the Northern Territory but also northern development. This Government has provided a flat untied amount of $280m for the Northern Territory which, according to the Minister for the Northern Territory (Mr Ademann), will enable the Territory to meet operational and capital expenditures in respect of the functions transferred on 1 July 1978 and for health services which are to be transferred on 1 January 1979. The amount provided will not meet the expenditure on these functions at the previous year’s rate of spending if we allow for inflation. That is, Territorians will have to tighten their belts like the rest of us, despite the fanfare and flourish associated with the provision of the $280m.

Self-government or de facto statehood in the Northern Territory in one of the greatest political confidence tricks of the Fraser Government era. Without referendum, self-government has been force-fed to the Northern Territory by the Liberal-National Country Party Government in Canberra and its Country-Liberal Party collaborators in the Territory. Statehood has been
force-fed to Territorians simply because conservatives in Canberra want to be rid of responsibility for the Territory's problems and because their novice colleagues in Darwin are obsessed with power. Sadly, it is only after the event that people have experienced the consequences and have had an opportunity to judge the wisdom of the Territory Government's avid acceptance of self-government. This is a Government which, by the way, gained less than 41 per cent of the primary votes at the Territory election last year.

The Northern Territory this year has already seen massive rises in electricity charges, cuts in library grants for the Northern Territory Education Department, a 54 per cent increase in third party vehicle insurance, increases in motor registration fees and stamp duty. Sewerage, water and other household charges have risen by half. As well, the Territory has to rely on raising $37m in taxes when the population of 110,000 people contains only an estimated 30,000 tax paying units. It has to rely on $24.8m revenue from interdepartmental recoveries and loan repayments by statutory authorities.

Stamp duty on cheques, mining agreements, company documents, deeds, hire purchase and real estate agreements has been increased by up to 500 per cent. The betting tax has been doubled. Business confidence in the Territory is down. Watkins Ltd, a major construction firm, is pulling out of the Territory entirely. A second medium-sized construction company has gone into liquidation and several others are in dire straits. What this Government should have realised is that without adequate enterprise to support the Northern Territory as a State the main result of its self-government policy will be financial disadvantage to residents of the Territory. It is not only through actions of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly that these residents will be financially disadvantaged as they are at present through increased charges.

There has been a 50 per cent rise in household electricity costs and a 70 per cent rise in commercial electricity rates. Much of this increase will have to be paid by government departments. All the latest houses, for instance, are air-conditioned. All these enormous costs have been loaded on to make the Territory a viable concern standing, as it were, on its two feet. It is not only, as I have said, through actions of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly that the residents will be financially disadvantaged. Under the Federal Government Budget salaries paid by the Northern Territory Department of Education are down 1.37 per cent in real terms despite a planned 48 extra staff. While the allocation has grown from $47.3m to $59.9m, this is a drop in real terms if we allow for a 7.9 per cent rate of inflation. Independent schools will be marginally better off but state school budgets will be drastically cut.

The library services will receive $70,000 which means that there will be no new books at all for existing schools and their library services will fall below national standards within 12 months. This is especially damaging to Aboriginal students. The media centre allocation has dropped by two-fifths from $150,000 to $90,000 despite $1.8m promised to provide a new media centre. Today 250 Northern Territory teachers stopped work in protest at this vicious chopping off of all library facilities at existing schools. These are the features of the decline in resource centres for students. It may be that further stop work meetings will be necessary to draw attention to the Fraser Government's ruthless attitude to an area where many schools provide for deprived families.

On examination of the Budget Papers we do not even know how much Federal money will be spent on Aboriginal education in the Northern Territory. The Government has disguised the figure by incorporating it in the Budget category 'Government Schools and Pre-Schools in the Northern Territory' rather than giving Aboriginal education in the Northern Territory its own category as has been the practice in the past. There are numerous industries which could be developed in the Territory if Federal Government finance was available. Northern development to bring the Territory to the take-off point of a viable State economy depends on the support of the Commonwealth Government not on a share of a 'State' or 'State-like' budget.

If the Northern Territory is to establish industries that will take it part of the way towards operation as a normal State it will need far more investment than the $280m the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) has given for his House of Assembly colleagues to distribute while cutting back in real terms by a greater amount in departments from which the Darwin Parliament will now have to take over. Let us look at what the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly was able to do with that money. The tourist industry, if properly established and developed, promises to be a major income earner for the Northern Territory. Within the untied grant provided by the Federal Government the Territory Government was able to devote only $1.1m to the establishment of a viable tourist industry. Tourism could be a lucrative money spinner for the Territory. But it will not bear fruit until more formal
People of Galiwinku

Mr Hodgman—Sent from the office of the Leader of the Opposition.

Dr EVERINGHAM—To the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Mr SIMON (McMillan) (10.8)—I comment on three matters tonight. The first is the necessity for the national Parliament to adopt a policy in relation to museums in Australia. I am particularly concerned about historical museums. Secondly I comment on the new and permanent parliament house and I will leave any development of that subject to the honourable member for Canberra (Mr Haslem). Thirdly I comment by way of reference, bearing in mind that the National Capital Development Commission comes under the estimates we are discussing, to the question of the status of planners in the Australian fabric of professionalism in relation to urban development.

The question of national museums received a great deal of consideration some years ago. A report of the Committee of Inquiry on Museums and National Collections entitled ‘Museums in Australia 1975’ was tabled in this Parliament. That report included the report of the planning committee on a gallery of Aboriginal Australia. I am not concerned at this stage about the necessity to establish a national museum in the Australian Capital Territory. I am concerned that the Government should adopt a national policy in relation to museums, particularly historical museums, because there is a crying need for such a policy. I am sure that every member of this place has an historical society in his electorate. Each historical society has a collection of artefacts which date back to the early days of this country which in terms of cultural and historical precedent is very recent. For that very reason there are still people coming forward every time there is a meeting of an historical society with artefacts of historical significance which should be catalogued, preserved and made available for future citizens to look at, consider and include in any sort of analyses of what the history of this country is all about.

One of the difficulties which presently exist is the need for professionalism to be applied to a national museum policy. At the present time we have a great many enthusiastic amateurs very concerned to preserve what artefacts remain of our historical past but at the same time very concerned also to ensure that they be preserved for
the future. Without any sort of standardisation whatsoever, many well intentioned people in this country are battling insurmountable odds including, for example, such basic needs as a building in which to put their artefacts and preserving those buildings from damp to ensure that a local government authority supports them in their efforts to preserve the various artefacts which are presented to them. All of these factors are against a background of the lack of a national policy or standard of preservation or recording of the artefacts which are presented regularly to these societies.

One of the first factors which I believe needs to be stipulated and understood by every local historical society is that there is a national body concerned, firstly, to establish a standard and, secondly, to maintain it. There ought to be a standard means of recording every artefact which presently exists in historical societies or local museums on a national register and that those people who are so surely amateurs and who would concede that they are amateurs have some body of expertise to whom they can turn to ensure that the artefacts which are presented to them usually by old families in the community, will be preserved for the future benefit of Australian citizens.

The report to which I referred, *Museums in Australia 1975* made one specific point which I would like to quote because I think it is very important to recognise the educational value of historic museums. In paragraph 2.4 of its Major Recommendations, the report states:

> As museums have unique advantages as a means of education, and as a large proportion of school children rarely visit them, or visit them without adequate preparation or proper briefing, museums should be used more as a source of formal education and by universities. If necessary, this development should be funded at the expense of certain other facets of the Australian Government’s education program.

I think that that particular aspect of an historical museum within every community throughout Australia should be recognised by this Government and should be part of a national museums policy. To date we do not have that policy. I believe that we should adopt one and do so very shortly, and publicise it to make sure that everybody in the community is well aware of the aspects of that policy. One important element is that it will not cost a penny, not one cent, to adopt the policy but at least all those people who are concerned for the preservation of historical artefacts and the preservation of material which will be beneficial to future generations of Australians will benefit from such a recognition.

The second point I refer to is the new and permanent parliament house. There is a Joint Committee of the Parliament on the New and Permanent Parliament House which has deliberated regularly, in fact each week the House has sitting, determined to have the new and permanent parliament house at least habitable by the bicentennial of Australia, 26 January 1988. I think that the Department of the Capital Territory ought to make representations to the Government to ensure that a decision is finally made to start the planning and the issuing of invitations to Australian registered architects to compete for the design and construction of the New and Permanent Parliament House. Unless that is undertaken very shortly we will certainly lose the possibility of celebrating the bicentennial with the opening of that new Parliament House. I urge the Minister for the Capital Territory (Mr Ellicott) to do what he can to have a commitment in this financial year, which will be relatively minor in terms of the monetary contribution, and to have it quickly. Because of lack of time I seek leave of the Committee, if I may go back to the subject of national museums, to incorporate in *Hansard* some eight reasons why there is a need for a national policy.

Leave granted.

*The document read as follows—*

**A NATIONAL MUSEUMS AUTHORITY**

**Why Museums?**

Museums are the cultural storehouses of the art, the natural history, the science and technology, and the history of Australia. Museums in Australia also contain evidences and interpretations drawn from the whole of our universe and examples of the whole culture of the human race. Museums are therefore repositories of priceless specimens and artifacts which should be held for future generations. Museums make possible significant research for the better understanding of our natural and cultural history. Museums are the means of explaining and interpreting that natural and cultural history to the whole population.

One special characteristic of the museum is receiving increasing attention overseas. It is now recognised that museums and all their communication extensions—temporary exhibitions, travelling exhibitions, museumobiles and other moving museum systems—are cultural communicators of very great potential. In combination they can use all the communication devices available to man, the object itself, the written word, the spoken word, film, and personal interaction. They have the potential to engage their audiences directly and to give them opportunity to participate actively in exhibitions or other associated events.

It was a recognition of all these roles and potentialities which caused the Canadian Government to decide in 1972 to give priority to museums in its national cultural programs.*

* See speech by the Hon. Gerard Pelletier, Secretary of State, to the Canadian Club of Calgary, 28 March 1972.

**Why do Australian Museums need help?**
Museum standards in Australia, with a few exceptions, are well below those of other western countries. This can be measured by the absence of clearly defined individual museum policies, by the storage and conservation problems of the collections, by the inadequacy of museum documentation, and by the lack of communication skills.

It can also be measured by the imbalance to be found between different categories of museums. Art galleries have received massive financial support both for new acquisitions to their collections and for grand new structures to house them. At the opposite pole history museums, museums of man, have received virtually no government support at all. There is no major museum anywhere in Australia devoted solely to Australian history, Aboriginal or European. The Australian War Memorial is the single possible exception. The Australian War Memorial is, however, concerned with one very limited facet of Australian history only.

The Australian War Memorial and the new Australian National Gallery are the only two major national museums in the country. This is in marked contrast to other federal countries. In the USA there is the great Smithsonian complex of museums. In Canada there are four major national museums, the National Gallery, the National Museum of Natural Sciences, the National Museum of Man, and the National Museum of Science and Technology. It should be noted that these four museums cover all the four major categories of museums and collections.

Why Commonwealth involvement?

One policy for the Commonwealth is to leave State Governments to supply all the support and professional services needed by museums across the country. There are, however, many powerful arguments against such a policy. They are:

1. Standards vary greatly between individual museums and between different States. Some States are developing well organised programs. Others are doing very little. Only a national body can ensure that standards are raised everywhere.

2. Resources are now wasted. Skills and information available in one State are not always shared with others. There is no body to collect information and ideas from overseas and disseminate them to all museums.

3. There is at present a serious imbalance between different categories of museums. The absence of major history museums and the lack of help for local history museums are serious deficiencies. They are not likely to be redressed without Commonwealth involvement.

4. High cataloguing and documentation standards are essential requirements for museums. All other activities of the museum depend upon documentation. Only a national body can prepare national lexicons and terminologies or start to develop a national inventory of collections. A national inventory, such as the Canadian National Inventory, improves access to individual collections and permits comparison and cross research between collections. It also reduces time spent by staff on routine enquiries (identified as an important problem in Canada), and helps to rationalise collections.

5. Only a national body can exploit the full potential of the communication opportunities of the museum. A national body can not only draw attention to new communication possibilities. It can itself organise travelling exhibitions, museums on wheels, museums on rails, museums at sea, to travel the continent to reach out to all communities, no matter how remote, and to act as a model for museums. It can also organise essential research on museum audiences, as the Canadian Government has done.

6. The conservation problems of Australian collections are acute. A major national conservation institute is needed to serve all museums in Australia.

7. A national policy is needed to give clear direction to all these activities. A national program is required to coordinate action across the country and to disseminate information and advice.

8. One of the major recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into Museums and National Collections was that a new national museum body should be established. 'Museums in Australia 1975' lists detailed arguments for the setting up of such a body.

Why a Commission?

Museum skills are in short supply in Australia today. Any new national body should seek access to the widest range of skills available in the community. The professional skills within the staff of a new national museum authority should therefore be supplemented and supported by a commission or other similar body. The commission can then draw upon the people with the greatest practical and theoretical knowledge on museums in the country.

It has been traditional for all individual museums to operate with boards of trustees. The national body should use the same administrative concept. The US Museums Services Institute, the new federal body in the US, is constituted in this form. The National Museums Corporation (National Museums of Canada) is similarly constituted as an independent authority with a board of trustees drawn from all over Canada.

The new authority should be an independent authority as are the bodies referred to.

What do other countries do?

It is now generally accepted overseas that effective museum development must have national policies, national funding and national coordination. For example:

United Kingdom

A Standing Commission on Museums and Galleries has been in existence since 1931. Its function is to advise on the most effective development of the national institutions and to promote cooperation between national and provincial institutions.

United States

A new National US Museums Services Institute has recently been formed. Its initial task is to distribute grants, but its role is expected to expand into other areas. Although the US has not had a national coordinating body before the Institute was established, the Smithsonian Institution has been providing national leadership in many areas of museum activity in the US for years.

Canada

A National Museums Corporation was established in 1968. Canada now has a National Museums Policy, a network of major national affiliated museums, National Exhibition Centres, a National Inventory of Collections, and a Canadian Conservation Institute.

Sweden

In Sweden there is a National Board responsible for museums under the Swedish Council for Cultural Affairs. There is also a national Swedish Travelling Exhibition Group which not only produces travelling exhibitions, but
also carries out museum audience research across the country.

Priorities

The highest priority should be given to the establishment of a Museums Commission or other similar body. The major problems facing Australia today relate to professional museum standards and skills. That they are absent is not necessarily the fault of the individual museums. Too often the museums have been expected to work without adequate resources of staff, skill, advice, or money.

Even in the absence of major grant funds, a new Museum Commission could start to work on the vital development of national policies, priorities, and programs.

Australia is a long way behind the rest of the world in its museum development. Only a national body and a national program can improve this situation rapidly.

Eva Rosander, M.A.
July 1978

Mr SIMON—In the 30 seconds left to me, I say that I hope this matter will be developed further. The National Capital Development Commission has many town planners involved in its responsibilities. There are many in this community who would say that planners are destroying our society. That is absolute rot. Planners are involved in the future of our country and they must be protected and encouraged.

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

Mr UREN (Reid) (10.18)—I confine my remarks tonight to the estimates for the Department of the Northern Territory. I speak particularly about the indigenous people of the Northern Territory, their struggle for self-determination and their struggle, particularly in the last few weeks, to try to get a just decision on the question whether uranium should be mined and exported from their land. I think it is very important that we give—

Mr Goodluck—Stir up a bit more trouble.

Mr UREN—The honourable member interjects and says that I am stirring up more trouble. The whole basis of the Government's legislation in regard to this decision and in regard to the decision of the Northern Land Council is so important that I refer honourable members to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act. Section 23 (3) of that Act states, in part:

a Land Council . . . . shall not take any action, including, but not limited to, the giving of consent or the withholding of consent, in any matter in connection with land held by a Land Trust, unless the Land Council is satisfied that—

(a) the traditional Aboriginal owners (if any) of that land understand the nature and purpose of the proposed action and, as a group, consent to it; and

(b) any Aboriginal community or group that may be affected by the proposed action has been consulted and has had adequate opportunity to express its views to the Land Council.

That is what the legislation of this Parliament provides. The Government says that these people are troublemakers. Generation after generation of these people have been raped of their basic rights. Here we have an opportunity to treat them in a just and decent way. We pass legislation in this Parliament, but we give only lip service to it and do not try to carry out policies in regard to those people. We try to intimidate them both directly and indirectly. The Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser), the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr Anthony) and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Viner) tried to put pressure on these people. The Government wanted this agreement signed with indecent haste. It wanted the signature of members of the Northern Land Council so that it could proceed with uranium mining in the Northern Territory.

No consideration was given to whether the traditional people had been consulted, whether the agreement had been translated into the Aboriginal language so that members of the Northern Land Council could examine it and take their time in deciding whether the agreement was just. That is the situation. The Government does not really want the Aboriginal people to adjudicate at all. It wants to railroad the agreement through and to make sure that the Aboriginal people succumb to the Government. The Aboriginal people, to their great credit, I think for the first time in the history of this nation, have stood up to the power of the establishment, the mining companies, financial institutions and the bureaucracy and they have demanded that they be heard.

Today they have decided—it will be official at 2 p.m. tomorrow—that they want time to discuss the matter. Under section 23 of the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act the traditional Aboriginal owners of the land will discuss all aspects of the uranium mining to be carried out in the Northern Territory. After they have discussed all the conditions that have been put forward, there will be a further Land Council meeting to determine whether members will sign that agreement. The Aboriginal people themselves will make that decision.

Mr Calder—I raise a point of order, Mr Deputy Chairman. I would be obliged if you could get the honourable member to mention the Northern Territory estimates at least once.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN (Mr Armitage)—This question has been raised by way of points of order on many occasions. It has been pointed out
that the debate on this legislation is very wide ranging and, provided the honourable member touches on the area concerned and the administration of the area concerned, it is in order.

Mr UREN—For some time now the Aboriginal people have been described in the newspapers as having no morality and that all they are interested in is the money they receive from royalties on uranium mining. That is how they have been depicted in the Australian Press. The establishment, those members on the Government side, tries to encourage the view that all the Aboriginal people are interested in is money. To a great extent, the newspapers of this nation have been saying exactly the same thing. Clearly that is not the view of the Aboriginal people presented to Mr Justice Fox. At page 9 of the second report of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry it is stated:

The evidence before us shows that the traditional owners of the Ranger site and the Northern Land Council (as now constituted) are opposed to the mining of uranium on that site.

One group of Aboriginal people in the Northern Territory sent a telegram to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hayden) this afternoon. It stated:

Bill Hayden
Leader Opposition
Parliament House Canberra

800 people on Galiwinku community marched today in full support to the traditional land owners to stop uranium mining agreement this day we march and fly the NT flag at half mast to express our sorrow in digging up the real incoming of our life our blood our mother who gave us birth. Uranium is dangerous not only to Aboriginal people but to the whole world. The NT flag and Australian flag will stay at half mast until we are listened to.

People of Galiwinku

One of the leaders of the Aboriginal people of Elcho Island is presently meeting with the Chairman of the Land Council, Mr Galarrwuy Yunupingu. He is Mr Wesley Lanaphuy. The Minister knows that the people are demanding the right to discuss this agreement in their own time. It must be translated into their language so that they can understand it. They will make their decision. It will be their decision; not anyone else’s decision. I think it is about time that the jackals on the other side stopped trying to exploit these people on the basis of greed. I conclude on the point that this is a great historical day because the Aboriginal people of the Northern Territory will see justice done.

The DEPUTY CHAIRMAN—Order! The honourable member’s time has expired.

Mr Yates—You call us jackals again. Scum. Progress reported.

Mr UREN—Mr Deputy Speaker, as you were taking the chair, the honourable member for Holt used the word ‘scum’ to describe me. I ask that it be struck from the record because I object to it. I expect an apology from the honourable member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—The honourable member has put his point of order. The Chair, in entering the chamber, did not hear the remark from the honourable member for Holt. If the honourable member admits that he made the remark, I require him to withdraw it in appropriate terms.

Mr Yates—The honourable member for Holt, having heard the remark of the honourable member for Reid that we were jackals, withdraws his remark ‘scum’ and he regrets making it.

Mr UREN—Mr Deputy Speaker, I expect a withdrawal. I do not expect a speech from the honourable member on the other side. What I said in Committee was not unparliamentary.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—The honourable member for Reid will appreciate that the Chair is not in a position to make a judgment on what was said in Committee. I draw his attention to the fact that the honourable member for Holt has withdrawn his remark and expressed his regret. I rather feel that that meets the situation.

Mr UREN—Mr Deputy Speaker, you heard what the honourable member said in reply. As a member, I am not prepared to accept a speech such as that as an apology. He made an unparliamentary remark about me. There is no evidence that in any way I made an unparliamentary remark about him. I am asking for a withdrawal; otherwise I intend to continue to debate this question tonight.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Would the honourable member for Reid indicate to the Chair the particular remark to which he takes exception?

Mr UREN—He withdrew with reservations. I am asking you, Mr Deputy Speaker, to seek from the honourable member an apology and an unqualified withdrawal, not a withdrawal such as he made.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—As the Chair recalls the withdrawal by the honourable member for Holt, it was in the terms that the offensive expression was withdrawn with regret. I suggest to the honourable member for Reid that that must come very close to accommodating his request.

Mr UREN—No. I do not accept that proposition.
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Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Would the honourable member—

Mr Uren—I find that you, as a Country Party Deputy Speaker, are offensive and that your rulings are biased—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for Reid will resume his seat. The honourable member for Reid is an experienced parliamentarian and he must appreciate that his remarks are a serious reflection on the Chair. I am required to ask him to withdraw them.

Mr Uren—I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. I rise again to ask you to get the same withdrawal from the honourable member for Holt—a withdrawal without making a speech.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—What does the honourable member for Reid want the honourable member for Holt to withdraw?

Mr Uren—I am asking him to withdraw the comment he made about me, without a preface, a speech or anything else.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—I am afraid that the honourable member for Reid and I must remain in disagreement on this matter. The Chair has no knowledge of the remark to which he refers. As I was not occupying the chair at the time, I can hardly be expected to be in possession of that knowledge.

Mr Uren—When an honourable member is asked for a withdrawal, it should not be a limited withdrawal or a withdrawal with reservations. The honourable member for Holt has not withdrawn his remarks in an unreserved way. I withdrew without comment, and I expect the same withdrawal from the honourable member for Holt.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Will the honourable member for Holt confirm that he withdrew the offensive expression without qualification?

Mr Yates—I confirm that in honour of the Parliament I withdrew my remark without reservation and apologised to the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT

Flood Mitigation—Nomad Aircraft—
The Parliament—Pecuniary Interests of Members of Parliament

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—Order! It being past 10.30 p.m., I propose the question:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr JOHN BROWN (Parramatta) (10.33)—On 6 April last, I had the unhappy duty to come into this House and report to the House the drowning of two young people in my electorate in a system known as the Toongabbie Creek system. In drawing the attention of the House to the drowning of these two young people I requested the Government to continue a scheme that was started by the Labor Government between 1972 and 1975 to do something about repairing this problem in Parramatta. The Labor Government provided money for the Snowy Mountains Engineering Corporation to draw up a plan to alleviate the flooding in this creek system. Subsequent to the adjournment debate speech that I made, the Minister for National Development (Mr Newman) came into the House and read me a lecture for not observing the conventions of the House and warning him about what I was going to say. Strangely enough, I thought that the conventions of the House disappeared somewhat after 1975. But, apart from that, on that day the Minister said to me:

. . . I would suggest that he go to the Government of New South Wales, to the appropriate Minister in the Government of New South Wales, and put his case. If he can convince the New South Wales Government that the problem is as bad as he suggests, he will have no difficulty in having that Government give it a high priority in the programs that it will furnish to me for 1978-79. I can assure the honourable member that if it has that priority it will be funded. It is as simple as that, because the money is there.

Subsequent to that, the Minister announced a $200m, five-year program to alleviate flooding in Australia—a flood mitigation program. I was prepared, along with other local members including the honourable member for Mitchell (Mr Cadman), to accept, if that was the case—we believed it to be the case—that the money might be forthcoming. But yesterday in the House the honourable member for Macquarie (Mr Gillard) asked a question. The Minister for National Development answered it in this way:

First of all, may I remind honourable members that the Government announced a $200m program for a national water resources program starting this year. In February—I think that this is known to most honourable members—the Prime Minister wrote to all the Premiers inviting them to give us their projects in order of priority. Every State has responded except the State of New South Wales.

That was picked up by the Sydney Daily Telegraph and reported in this way:

A $200m program which would make some of the State's most dangerous flood areas safer has been temporarily shelved—because the NSW Government has not nominated how it wants to spend its share of the money.

The National Development Minister, Mr Newman, said yesterday that the Commonwealth was ready to allocate funds immediately to NSW for its flood mitigation program.

This money could be used to reduce the danger of flooding at Toongabbie Creek, he said.
It went on in a similar vein and finished by saying:

Federal government officials claim that the Wran Government does not want to offend any groups by leaving them off the priority list.

They claim that Mr Renshaw and Mr Gordon will delay any announcement until after the State election.

I felt that that was trivialising a very important human problem. People have drowned in this creek system. I remind the House that this area is only two miles from the demographic centre of one of Australia's great cities. Only two miles from the demographic centre of Sydney, 11 people have drowned in seven years. This is not a small issue. When the Budget was released I searched through the Budget Papers and found that $17.961m was allocated for water projects this year in payments to the States. Of that $17.961m, over $12m was last year's allocation. There was really only $5m of new money.

Mr Armitage—For the whole country?

Mr JOHN BROWN—Yes, for the whole country. I mentioned this to the honourable member for Mitchell. I said that because it was a human issue and people had drowned I did not want to make a political issue of it; that I did not intend to say anything about it in the local Press or locally because I did not want to offend the relatives of people who had drowned there—people who believed that money was forthcoming to solve the problem. When I find that the Minister is prepared to give this sort of drivel to the House and to have it sensationalised in the Sydney Press, pointing out that the money could be available if the New South Wales Government gave it priority, I am rather alarmed at his sentiments.

Mr Armitage—He has allocated only $1m this year.

Mr JOHN BROWN—The point is that New South Wales has only $1m available this year for flood mitigation programs for the whole of the State. On 30 May the New South Wales Government asked for $360m to alleviate flooding in the State.

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

Mr SHACK (Tangney) (10.38)—I would like to raise tonight a matter which in recent days has been of concern—in my view, rightly so—to both chambers of this Parliament and to both sides of those chambers. It is a matter which involves the Australian Nomad aircraft and its potential role in the Australian civil coastal surveillance program. To put the matter into context let me say briefly, that on 9 July the Minister for Transport (Mr Nixon) made a statement about the Australian civil coastal surveillance program. The first paragraph of that statement reads:

The Government has considered a detailed report on Australia's civil coastal surveillance needs, prepared by a specially-convened Committee of Permanent Heads, and has decided on a new program to upgrade existing coastal surveillance and enforcement capabilities.

The statement and the attached document go on to list a whole range of excellent measures which will improve Australia's civil coastal surveillance. The matter on which I want to concentrate tonight is the recommendation which calls for the use of three specialised, radar equipped aircraft to be chartered for special Customs response. Arising out of the recommendations, tenders were called on 19 August for the supply of three twin-engined Customs surveillance aircraft for a contract period of two years. Tenders closed on 19 September. One of those specifications on which I would like to concentrate further said that the aircraft should have an airspeed capability of 220 knots. The real rub of my speech tonight is that this rules out a priori the Nomad aircraft which has an airspeed capability of 160 knots. That led to Press speculation in recent weeks—last week especially—that the Nomad was being specifically ruled out. I raised this matter in this House the other day, other people raised it in this House and also it was raised in the Senate. I refer to the Minister's answer. He said:

Tenders will be drawn in such a way as to allow all aircraft manufacturers to put in a bid for the operation. There is absolutely no truth in the story that the Nomad aircraft is being specifically or in any other way excluded from the operations.

Of course, I accept that, but the point I make is that when the tender specifications were drawn up—I understand that they were drawn up by the Bureau of Customs and the Department of Transport—it must have been known that that particular specification would rule out the Nomad before it even got to first base. What concerns me is that proposals based on the Nomad aircraft might not have been submitted because of that one point—the airspeed—and what concerns me even more now is that tenders based on the Nomad aircraft, when submitted, will be chucked out of the window immediately because they will not be looked at beyond the airspeed.

Let us look at the airspeed. It has been put to me that the aircraft are needed not exclusively for surveillance but for pursuit purposes. If that is the case we are talking about a civil surveillance program which is not quite the one that I understand. These aircraft are going to be on charter to...
the Government and they are going to be piloted by civil pilots. Are we going to have the case of aircraft careering over Australia's northern skies and attempting in some Biggles-like operation to force down some drug smugglers? If that is the type of scheme that is being envisaged, it is not what I thought it was. I thought that we were going to have surveillance and reporting to the appropriate authorities—the Army perhaps and certainly the Navy and the Air Force. I thought that is the sort of scheme it was going to be and if it is not going to be that sort of scheme perhaps we should have given it back to the armed Services in the first place.

The Nomad is being used extensively overseas. It has a whole range and list of suitable qualifications to be used in this work. As I am running out of time, I am simply left with the opportunity of calling on the three Ministers involved—the Minister for Transport, the Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs (Mr Fife) and the Minister for Productivity (Mr Macphee)—to get together and make every effort to ensure that the Nomad aircraft can be considered for this type of operation. If we do not support Australia's own aircraft in Australia what sort of chance have we to sell it overseas?

Mr SIMON (McMillan) (10.44)—Over the past three weeks in this House and particularly in the Victorian lower House we have heard a number of matters which can be described only as discussions which lead to the denigration of Parliament and of every member of the Victorian Parliament and of this House. We have seen tabled in the Victorian Parliament by one Jennings a statement which, because of the denials which have been made subsequently by all those who have been referred to in this commentary—it contains not allegations but comments—can be described only as the inane ramblings of a man who is concerned to destroy people who do not agree with his views on the development, planning or use of land in Victoria. They are the inane ramblings of a man who is determined to destroy and to bring down in chaos everything around him. I have no doubt that the people of Victoria and of Australia generally, of whatever political persuasion, have identified the Jennings' document as no more than a document which is aimed at destroying particular people, namely, the Premier of Victoria and certain of his Cabinet Ministers, because they enunciate a policy which is different from that of the author of the document. What concerns me and what I speak of tonight is the fact that the Opposition has chosen to adopt a tactic similar to that of Jennings by fishing, by using smear tactics and by adopting innuendo which is aimed not at policy or at governments but personally against people, without there being any foundation in fact.

Mr Holding—That is a very wrong statement and you know it.

Mr SIMON—The honourable member for Melbourne Ports interjects without knowing to what I am referring. The honourable member for Melbourne Ports knows full well that the Leader of the Opposition in Victoria has chosen to agree, as we have agreed, that the explanation of the honourable member for Melbourne Ports is acceptable, that the allegations against the honourable member for Melbourne Ports which are contained in the Jennings' documents have no basis in fact, and that at the same time some strange differentiation should be made when talking about the Government in Victoria and members of this Federal Parliament. I must suggest that whether they be against the honourable member for Melbourne Ports or the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch) the scurrilous statements, allegations and innuendo which have been made have no foundation in fact and ought not to be the subject matter of debate in this chamber. People who associate themselves with Jennings and with the allegations and comments which have been made label themselves as people who are bent on one purpose only—to get some cheap political advantage at the expense of a member of parliament.

There is very little time left, but might I ask whether it is being suggested by the Opposition that all those public servants in the Department of Urban and Regional Development, the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet and the Department of Overseas Trade who were referred to today and who were associated with the document of 10 April, and those people who are associated with Mallesons, Irish, Young and Outhwaite or Stephen Charles, Q.C., are part of a conspiracy which is aimed at the denigration of members of this House. I would have thought that members of parliament in Victoria who are associated with this matter, the member for Lalor (Mr Barry Jones) and the member for Melbourne Ports would recognise the professionalism of those particular people.

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

Mr KEATING (Blaxland) (10.49)—I rise in this debate more out of sorrow than in anger to see that another young man on the Government
side is involved in the defence of the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Lynch).

Mr Cotter—What rot!

Mr KEATING—He was heard in silence and I suggest that honourable members opposite do me the same favour. First the Treasurer (Mr Howard) was today dragged into the debate and now it is the honourable member for McMillan (Mr Simon). Two issues are involved. The first issue is simply this: The former Treasurer’s personal affairs are in the market place of politics. They are there by virtue of the dismissal by the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) of the Minister as Treasurer during the election campaign and the unsatisfactory public explanation of his affairs. There has been a so-called investigation by a firm of accountants which is close to the former Treasurer and by a Queen’s Counsel who is close to the former Treasurer. There was a report which the former Treasurer is not prepared to make public so an assessment as to the bona fides of the report has to be made. The simple fact is this: If the former Treasurer is not guilty of any misdemeanour, the best way that he can demonstrate it is to table the documents.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! In using that expression the honourable member for Blaxland has allowed for the possibility of the person nominated as being guilty. Therefore it comes within the area of reflection.

Mr KEATING—I will withdraw the reflection or imputation. May I say this? It would be in the best interests of the former Treasurer to table those documents and to let the public judge on the basis of the Prime Minister’s acquittal of the Minister. There are two issues involved here. There is the Stumpy Gully issue and there is the Golden Gate issue in Queensland. What was raised today by the honourable member for Lalor (Mr Barry Jones) and on a previous occasion by the honourable member for Melbourne Ports (Mr Holding) was the fact that a home unit in Surfers Paradise was financed on an equity participation of 2.5 per cent—I emphasise that, of 2.5 per cent—regardless of any of the interest repayments, of moratorium on interest payments or the rest. There was a 2.5 per cent equity involvement by the former Treasurer. If there happened to be a downturn in the market and if QBE Insurance Ltd was the mortgagee in possession it was very likely that losses might impact on the loan. That is the issue—not the interest rate but the equity involved.

In the second project I believe that the former Treasurer, the Minister for Industry and Commerce, apparently took out a mortgage of $16,000 over his Mount Eliza property. Well, so be it. But the questions concern the terms of interest on the first property; when did he sell it; and what was the capital gain on the basis of 2.5 per cent equity? Honourable members in this place will know that there is not a financial institution in this country which will finance any property development on 2.5 per cent equity. This deal involves a $2,300 deposit on capital value of $92,000. That is the simple issue.

I can say this. It is a shame to see the honourable member for McMillan, a member of this chamber whom I respect, and the present Treasurer feeling that it is their bounden duty on behalf of the Government parties to defend the Minister for Industry and Commerce who today refused to enter the debate after the House agreed to a motion to suspend the Standing Orders to discuss a matter affecting him personally. There are now other people coming into the debate on the adjournment to defend them.

Mr Simon—I raise a point of order, reluctantly, against the honourable member for Blaxland. He is imputing a point which unfortunately in relation to the Opposition tends to confuse the whole issue.

Mr KEATING—That is not a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member for McMillan will state his point of order.

Mr Simon—The point is that Opposition members unfortunately cannot get their feet out of the muck in which they are currently treading.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER—Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. There is no point of order.

Mr KEATING—I will conclude on this point. The Minister for Industry and Commerce can clear himself of any allegations of alleged impropriety. He can do that. He can make public the statements of Irish, Young and Outhwaite and Mallesons. In fact it was he who on 16 December said ‘I believe there is a need to review the procedures of disclosures by Ministers of their pecuniary interests’. He has not done that and we on this side of the House want to clear the issue the same as honourable members opposite do. Let him table the documents and let the public be the judge.

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

Mr BAUME (Macarthur) (10.54)—I had not intended to discuss the well worn matter that the honourable member for Blaxland (Mr Keating) has rolled over in the same grooves even to less
effect than previous Opposition speakers but, as a result of his speech, I say that there is no doubt that the most innocent, the most pure, the most responsible and respectable of actions can be made to seem disgraceful when someone with intent sets out to do so. I say to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr Hayden) that allegations of the kind that have been made by Opposition members could just as easily be made against colleagues of his and of the honourable member for Blaxland who sit opposite. While I have great respect and admiration, I might say, for the honourable member I am about to name, the honourable member for Adelaide (Mr Hurford), he has been a director and a shareholder of North Park Developments Pty Ltd which used to borrow money to speculate in suburban houses in Adelaide. I raise this matter because honourable members opposite——

Mr Holding—I take a point of order. If the honourable gentleman has accusations to make there are forms of the House which require a substantive motion. He is not entitled to make accusations in this way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—The Chair is well aware of that requirement. If the honourable member for Macarthur is citing an illustration of how a matter may be misrepresented that is acceptable. I am sure that the honourable member for Macarthur is fully alert to the Standing Orders that determine the manner in which reflections on other honourable members must be made.

Mr BAUME—That is exactly so. Having been subject to continual attacks myself from ill-informed and mischievous members of the Opposition in the past two and a half years I am well aware of the extent to which the Standing Orders can be bent by honourable members with malicious intent endeavouring to destroy the spirit of honourable members on this side of the House. I can assure them that they will fail with the honourable member for Flinders (Mr Lynch) as they have failed with me. I am not saying that the honourable member for Adelaide has been involved in any impropriety whatsoever. I am not saying that he has used his position as a member of parliament to gain financial benefit, but such allegations as have been made against the honourable members for Flinders——

Mr Armitage—You ought to hang your head in shame.

Mr BAUME—The same sorts of allegations that have been made by the honourable member for Rent-a-mouth against me have been made under privilege in the South Australian Parliament to the detriment of the reputation of the honourable member for Adelaide. This company was involved in many transactions in North Adelaide, Walkerville, Medindie and Leabrook. Allegations could also be made under privilege in the New South Wales Parliament about the real estate transactions which have been carried out by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr Lionel Bowen) through a series of trust arrangements. I refuse to make any such allegations. I have been on the receiving end of that kind of nastiness. I know how easy it is for honourable members opposite to distort the truth. I am warning them that if they persist in their particular kind of attack, some of their colleagues are equally open to the sort of villainous and vicious attack, which I had hoped would never come from this side of the House, that has been levelled by honourable gentlemen opposite. The transactions of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition include, for example, a shopping centre at Mount Gravatt in Queensland, a housing development on the New South Wales coast and a proposed shopping complex in Sydney. Many of them took place when he was a Minister of the Crown. Neither the Leader of the Opposition nor his predecessor, Mr Whitlam, has ever sought to obtain in the way the present Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) has declarations of pecuniary interests from his colleagues. For example, in the Melbourne Age——

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

Mr HUMPHREYS (Griffith) (10.58) —I would like to speak on a matter which I, as a Queenslander, consider important. I represent many citizens who could be described as affluent. They have asked me to raise a matter which is of very great interest to them because they, like honourable members opposite, are interested in buying properties in Queensland. As a result of the matters raised in this House today, I sat down this afternoon and attempted to do a few simple sums. I do not consider myself to be a mathematician. If the figures I am about to quote are wrong I am sure that I will be corrected by a Minister in this House. I have listened to some of my fellow members on this side of the House, particularly the honourable member for Loral (Mr Barry Jones). If an ordinary resident of Queensland were to borrow $95,000, $16,000 from a bank and $79,000 from an insurance company, I am told that at normal bank interest the repayments of principal and interest on the bank loan within a term of five years would be approximately $110 a week. The normal rate of interest charged by an insurance company is 12½
per cent but from a Queensland insurance company, for the benefit of Queenslanders, money may be borrowed at 11¾ per cent. Because it is such a good insurance company—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar)—Order! It being 11 p.m., the debate is interrupted. The House stands adjourned until 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday next.

House adjourned at 11 p.m.

NOTICE
The following notice was given:
Mr McLeay to move—

That, in accordance with the provisions of the Public Works Committee Act 1969, it is expedient to carry out the following proposed work which was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works and on which the Committee has duly reported to Parliament: Construction of Enoggera Military Area Stage II development, Queensland.
The following answers to questions upon notice were circulated:

**Hydrogen Gas**

(Question No. 21)

Mr Les Johnson asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice, on 21 February 1978:

1. Has any Australian Government funded research been undertaken or planned into the use of hydrogen gas as a fuel source.
2. Can he say whether an American company, Hydrogen Fuels Inc., has claimed to have found a cheap method of producing hydrogen fuel solar energy.
3. Will he provide details of Australian Government funded resources projects in the field of alternative energy sources.

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

1. Yes.
2. Not known.
3. It has not been possible to breakdown Australian Government funded resource projects into the field of alternative energy sources.

**Coal Research**

(Question No. 740)

Mr Hayden asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice, on 4 April 1978:

1. Has he appointed any research advisory committees under the provisions of the Coal Research Assistance Act 1977; if so, (a) for what purposes have these committees been appointed and (b) what is their membership.
2. Has he declared any body to be a research advisory committee under the provisions of the Coal Research Assistance Act 1977; if so, (a) for what purposes have the committees been so declared (b) for what purposes were they otherwise constituted and (c) what is their membership.
3. Has he requested any research advisory committee to furnish him with recommendations on any matter; if so, (a) which committees are concerned and (b) which matters have been referred to the committees.

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

1. Yes. See (2).
2. Yes. National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council (NERDCC):
   a. under Section 7 of the Coal Research Assistance Act 1977.
   b. The Council has been established to advise me in the co-ordination of the national energy research, development and demonstration effort, in addition to providing advice on the disbursement of both the funds from the coal research trust account as well as other funds which the Government has provided by way of direct appropriation for an expansion of energy R and D.
   c. National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council—list of members:

   Chairman—

   Mr J. B. Kirkwood, Chairman and Chief Executive, State Energy Commission of Western Australia; Member, National Energy Advisory Committee (Chairman of NERDCC).

   Members—
   - Dr D. D. Brown, Deputy General Manager, CSR Limited.
   - Professor Emeritus S. T. Butler, Head, Nuclear Science and Technology Branch; Australian Atomic Energy Commission.
   - Sir Alan Cooley, C.B.E., Secretary, Department of Productivity.
   - Dr J. L. Farrands, Secretary, Department of Science.
   - Professor L. E. Lyons, Professor of Physical Chemistry, University of Queensland.
   - Mr R. C. Sprigg, Consultant, First Chairman, Australian Petroleum Exploration Association.
   - Dr R. G. Ward, General Manager, Research and New Technology, BHP, Member National Coal Research Advisory Committee.
   - Professor C. N. Watson-Munro, O.B.E., Wills Professor of Plasma Physics, University of Sydney; Member, National Energy Advisory Committee.
   - Mr A. J. Woods, Secretary, Department of National Development.
   - Dr H. K. Worner, C.B.E., Chairman, Victorian Brown Coal Research and Development Committee; Member, Victorian Solar Energy Research Committee.

3. Yes. (a) NERDCC. (b) All applications for grants in support of research, development and demonstration of coal.

**Public Servants: Payment of Telephone Charges**

(Question No. 1100)

Mr Bungay asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 9 May 1978:

1. How many officers and employees of his Department have their home telephone rentals or charges fully or partially paid by the Department.
2. What was the cost to the Department of this expenditure in 1976-77.

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

1. Out of a staff of 5,800 in Central and Regional Offices, and some 250 Offices of the Commonwealth Employment Service in all States and Territories at 30 June 1978 there were 141 officers of the Department who had their home telephone rentals paid or charges partially paid by the Department in the 1977-78 financial year.
2. The cost to the Department in 1976-77 amounted to approximately $27,600.
Advisory and Consultative Committees:  
Inclusion of Members of Parliament  
(Question No. 1140)

Mr Lloyd asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 10 May 1978:

(1) What advisory or consultative committees has he established or continued which include members of parliament.

(2) Which members and senators are included on these committees.

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

(1) I have not established or continued any advisory or consultative committees which include members of parliament.

(2) See the answer to question (1) above.

Reports on Hearings before United States Congressional Committees  
(Question No. 1300)

Mr Scholes asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 26 May 1978:

(1) Are officers of his Department responsible for providing the Government with reports on hearings before the United States Congressional committees.

(2) Is coverage of the various armed service and defence committees proceedings and reports part of the responsibility of officers of his Department in Washington.

(3) Were reports on the Congressional hearings at which documents disclosing the proposal to locate an expanded satellite facility at North West Cape, reported upon by the Australian Mission in Washington; if so, was this information transmitted to the Department of Defence.

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

(1) Within the limits of staff resources the Australian Embassy in Washington attempts to keep in touch with the Committee hearings which appear to be of direct interest to the Australian Government. In practice approximately half the time of one Foreign Affairs officer is devoted to following and reporting on Congressional Committee hearings relating to matters for which Foreign Affairs has primary responsibility. That officer also assists in the handling of Congressional matters for which other Departments are responsible to the extent practicable. There are 21 Senate Committees and 114 Sub-Committees; and 33 House Committees and 183 Sub-Committees holding an average of 20 to 25 hearings a day. Hearings are frequently not printed until months after the hearing and transcripts are only provided on request. It is impossible to predict which hearings will be of interest to the Australian Government, and the Embassy must therefore rely to an extent on advance notice from relevant United States officials of hearings that touch on Australian interests.

(2) Coverage of armed services and defence committee proceedings and reports are not a part of the responsibility of Foreign Affairs officers. There are, however, certain aspects (such as SALT and troop withdrawals from Korea) which require political input as well as some broader issues in the defence budget that have foreign policy implications. Foreign Affairs officers have also assisted in matters relating to Australian defence purchases under the Arms Control Act and defence purchasing offset arrangements.

(3) Foreign Affairs officers did not attend or report on Department of Defence budget hearings for FY78. In the event that the Embassy was aware in advance that hearings were to be held specifically on any aspect of Australia/United States defence relations, particularly relating to joint facilities, the Embassy would certainly cover them. The 35 volumes of hearings relating to the FY78 Defence Budget, including 8 volumes on House Appropriations Subcommittee Hearings, were not transmitted to the Department of Foreign Affairs.

National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council: Priorities  
(Question No. 1420)

Dr Everingham asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice, on 31 May 1978:

Will he announce or publish the priorities set by the Government from time to time for projects considered or to be considered by the National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council.

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

Yes. The following is an excerpt from the information supplied to current applicants for energy research, development and demonstration grants being provided by the Government on the advice of the National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council.

The primary purposes of the grants are to make more effective use of existing research resources and to foster and support additional research, development and demonstration directed towards achieving the following objectives:

more effective use of existing energy resources
increasing the availability of indigenous liquid fuels production and use of synthetic fuels
the use of alternative fuels
improvements in the production and utilisation of coal.

Examples of more specific areas of interest, covered by the above broad guidelines are:

increase in effectiveness of the methods and techniques for exploration and for the assessment of reserves of petroleum, coal and other fossil fuels;

improvements in production, processing, transportation, storage and utilisation of Australian coals;

the production of liquid fuels—including methanol—from coals, natural gas and oil shale and production of ethanol from agricultural materials;

methods to conserve energy in transportation, in industry and in the design of buildings;

utilisation of the various forms of renewable energy, particularly solar energy;

relevant aspects of nuclear energy and nuclear fuels;

research into solar electricity, magneto hydrodynamics, and other advanced energy technologies;

environmental aspects of energy production and use.

The above publicly-available information will be kept under review in the light of the continuing advice which I receive on priorities from both the National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council and the National Energy Advisory Committee.

Recycling of Waste Materials  
(Question No. 1451)

Mr Uren asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice, on 2 June 1978:
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(1) What arrangements are made in his Department and statutory authorities under his control for the recycling of waste materials such as paper, metals and glass.

(2) If no arrangements for recycling presently exist, will he implement, or investigate the implementation of, procedures for the recycling of waste materials.

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

(1) and (2) Waste materials appropriate for recovery and reuse are recycled, where possible, by my Department and the authorities for which I am responsible. For example, scrap metal from workshops of the Bureau of Mineral Resources, the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, the Snowy Mountains Hydro-electric Authority and the Pipeline Authority is recovered and sold to local scrap metal dealers. Silver is recovered from photographic film used by the Division of National Mapping and sold to a recycling firm. Some waste paper is distributed to primary schools for use by children and to charitable organisations. Most other waste paper is collected by cleaners employed under contract by the Department of Administrative Services by the statutory authorities or by the owners of leased accommodation. Some of this paper is also recycled.

Energy Research and Development

(Question No. 1539)

Mr Hayden asked the Minister for National Development, upon notice, on 8 June 1978:

(1) When did his Department begin its survey of energy research and development in Australia.

(2) Has this survey been completed.

(3) Has a report of the survey been completed.

(4) When will the report be made public.

(5) Will the report be available to the recently established National Energy Research, Development and Demonstration Council before the Council’s advice is sought by him on the disbursement of energy research funding.

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

(1) A pilot survey within CSIRO was begun by the former Department of National Resources in June 1976. The survey proper was begun in July 1977.

(2) Yes.

(3) No. The report is in the final stages of completion.

(4) I shall release the report in the near future.

(5) Yes. The Council members have already received a first draft of a report on the survey.

Surveys of Household Expenditure

(Question No. 1659)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, upon notice, on 15 August 1978:

Has his Department itself conducted any surveys of household expenditure in the past 5 years, or co-operated with any other Branch of Government to do so; if so, when were these surveys conducted.

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

No.

Distribution of Cables to Parliamentary Advisers at Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly

(Question No. 1662)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister for Foreign Affairs, upon notice, on 12 August 1978:

Are any of the cables received by the Australian Ambassador to the United Nations during the period that the United Nations General Assembly is sitting withheld from the Parliamentary observers attending such sittings.

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

The Parliamentary Advisers included each year in the Australian Delegation to the United Nations General Assembly participate fully in its work. They attend Delegation meetings. Like other members of the Delegation, they are provided with a daily set of cables relating to their particular interests in the Assembly and to the work of the Session in general. The cables distributed to the Parliamentary Advisers, as to other members of the Delegation, would not include all cables received by the mission in New York.

Mr Zulfikar Ali Bhutto

Mr Barry Jones asked the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, the following question without notice:

Following the last question on this subject to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, what further representations have been made to the Government of Pakistan about the trial of Mr Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and the death sentence imposed on him.

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

Mr Bhutto’s counsel has now concluded his case to the Supreme Court appealing against Mr Bhutto’s conviction and death sentence handed down by the Lahore High Court on 18 March 1978. The Australian Government continues to follow closely developments in the case and when the Supreme Court’s decision is known, the Government will promptly decide what further action is appropriate.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1564

(Question No. 1972)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1564.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1565

(Question No. 1973)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1565.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1566
(Question No. 1974)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1566.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1567
(Question No. 1975)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1567.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1568
(Question No. 1976)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1568.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1569
(Question No. 1977)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1569.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1570
(Question No. 1978)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1570.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1571
(Question No. 1979)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1571.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1572
(Question No. 1980)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1572.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1574
(Question No. 1981)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1574.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1579
(Question No. 1982)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1579.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1580
(Question No. 1983)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1580.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1581
(Question No. 1984)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1581.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1582
(Question No. 1985)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1582.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1583
(Question No. 1986)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1583.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1584
(Question No. 1987)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1584.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1585
(Question No. 1988)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1585.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1586
(Question No. 1989)

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1586.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1587
(Question No. 1990)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1587.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1588
(Question No. 1991)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1588.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1589
(Question No. 1992)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1589.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1590
(Question No. 1993)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1590.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1591
(Question No. 1994)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1591.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1592
(Question No. 1995)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1592.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1593
(Question No. 1996)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1593.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1595
(Question No. 1998)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1595.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member's question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1596
(Question No. 1999)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1596.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1597
(Question No. 2000)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1597.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1598
(Question No. 2001)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1598.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1599
(Question No. 2002)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1599.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1600
(Question No. 2003)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1600.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1601
(Question No. 2004)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1601.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1602
(Question No. 2005)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1602.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1605
(Question No. 2006)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1605.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1607
(Question No. 2007)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1607.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1563
(Question No. 2008)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1563.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1608
(Question No. 2009)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1608.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1609
(Question No. 2010)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1609.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1610
(Question No. 2011)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1610.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1611
(Question No. 2012)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1611.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1613
(Question No. 2014)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1613.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1614
(Question No. 2015)
Mr Clyde Cameron, asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1614.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1615
(Question No. 2016)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1615.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1616
(Question No. 2017)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1616.
Mr Viner—The answer the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1617
(Question No. 2018)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1617.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1618
(Question No. 2019)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1618.
Mr Viner—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1619
(Question No. 2020)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1619.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1620
(Question No. 2021)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect and answer to question No. 1620.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1621
(Question No. 2022)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1621.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1622
(Question No. 2023)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1622.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
**Answers to Questions**
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**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1623**
*(Question No. 2024)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1623.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1624**
*(Question No. 2025)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1624.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1627**
*(Question No. 2028)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1627.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1630**
*(Question No. 2029)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1630.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1631**
*(Question No. 2030)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1631.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1632**
*(Question No. 2031)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1632.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1646**
*(Question No. 2045)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1646.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

**Answer to Parliamentary Question 1647**
*(Question No. 2046)*

Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Minister Assisting the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:

When may I expect an answer to question No. 1647.

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

In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.
Answer to Parliamentary Question 1648
(Question No. 2047)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1648.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1650
(Question No. 2049)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1650.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1651
(Question No. 2050)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1651.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1652
(Question No. 2051)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1652.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.

Answer to Parliamentary Question 1654
(Question No. 2053)
Mr Clyde Cameron asked the Prime Minister, upon notice, on 14 September 1978:
When may I expect an answer to question No. 1654.
Mr Malcolm Fraser—The answer to the honourable member’s question is as follows:
In view of the number of questions asked by the honourable member, some of which require detailed inquiry, there necessarily must be some time taken to provide answers. I notice in passing that the honourable member when he was a Minister took up to 21 weeks to answer some questions on notice.