THIRTIETH PARLIAMENT

FIRST SESSION—SECOND PERIOD

Governor-General

His Excellency the Honourable Sir John Robert Kerr, Knight of the Order of Australia, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, Knight of the Most Venerable Order of the Hospital of Saint 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 from 11 July 1974.

Second Fraser Ministry

(From 8 July 1976)

*Prime Minister
The Right Honourable John Malcolm Fraser

*Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for National Resources and Minister for Overseas Trade
The Right Honourable John Douglas Anthony

*Treasurer
The Honourable Phillip Reginald Lynch

*Minister for Primary Industry and Leader of the House
The Honourable Ian McEwen

*Minister for Administrative Services, Vice-President of the Executive Council and Leader of the Government in the Senate
Senator the Honourable Reginald Greive Withers

*Minister for Industry and Commerce
Senator the Honourable Robert Carrington Cotton

*Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Public Service Matters
The Honourable Anthony Austin Street

*Minister for Transport
The Honourable Peter James Nixon

*Minister for Education and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs
Senator the Honourable John Leslie Carrick

*Minister for Foreign Affairs
The Honourable Andrew Sharp Peacock

*Minister for Defence
The Honourable Denis James Killen

*Minister for Social Security
Senator the Honourable Margaret Georgina Constance Guilfoyle

Attorney-General
The Honourable Robert James Ellicott, Q.C.

Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs
The Honourable John Winston Howard

Minister for Health
The Honourable Ralph James Dunnett Hunt

Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs
The Honourable Michael John Randal MacKellar

Minister for Aboriginal Affairs
The Honourable Robert Ian Viner

Minister for the Northern Territory and Minister Assisting the Minister for National Resources
The Honourable Albert Evan Adermann

Minister for Post and Telecommunications and Minister Assisting the Treasurer
The Honourable Eric Laidlaw Robinson

Minister for Construction and Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence
The Honourable John Elden McLeay

Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development
The Honourable Kevin Eugene Newman

Minister for Science
Senator the Honourable James Joseph Webster

Minister for the Capital Territory
The Honourable Anthony Allan Staley

†Minister for Veterans' Affairs
Senator the Honourable Peter Drew Durack

* Minister in the Cabinet
† Title changed from Minister for Repatriation on 5 October 1976
Second Fraser Ministry
(From 8 November 1976)

*Prime Minister
*Deputy Prime Minister, Minister for National Resources and Minister for Overseas Trade
*Treasurer
*Minister for Primary Industry and Leader of the House
*Minister for Administrative Services, Vice-President of the Executive Council and Leader of the Government in the Senate
*Minister for Industry and Commerce
*Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Public Service Matters
*Minister for Transport
*Minister for Education and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs
*Minister for Foreign Affairs
*Minister for Defence
*Minister for Social Security

Attorney-General
Minister for Business and Consumer Affairs
Minister for Health
Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs
Minister for the Northern Territory and Minister Assisting the Minister for National Resources
Minister for Post and Telecommunications and Minister Assisting the Treasurer
Minister for Construction and Minister Assisting the Minister for Defence
Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development
Minister for Science
Minister for the Capital Territory and Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in the Arts
Minister for Veterans' Affairs
Minister for Productivity, Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Women's Affairs and Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations

*Minister in the Cabinet

The Right Honourable John Malcolm Fraser
The Right Honourable John Douglas Anthony
The Honourable Phillip Reginald Lynch
The Honourable Ian McCahon Sinclair
Senator the Honourable Reginald Greive Withers
Senator the Honourable Robert Carrington Cotton
The Honourable Anthony Austin Street
The Honourable Peter James Nixon
Senator the Honourable John Leslie Carrick
The Honourable Andrew Sharp Peacock
The Honourable Denis James Killen
Senator the Honourable Margaret Georgina Constance Guilfoyle
The Honourable Robert James Ellicott, Q.C.
The Honourable John Winston Howard
The Honourable Ralph James Dunnet Hunt
The Honourable Michael John Randal MacKellar
The Honourable Robert Ian Viner
The Honourable Albert Evan Adermann
The Honourable Eric Laidlaw Robinson
The Honourable John Elden McLeay
The Honourable Kevin Eugene Newman
Senator the Honourable James Joseph Webster
The Honourable Anthony Allan Staley
Senator the Honourable Peter Drew Durack
The Honourable Ian Malcolm Macphee
MEMBERS OF THE SENATE
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President—Senator the Honourable Condor Louis Laucke,

Leader of the Government in the Senate—Senator the Honourable Reginald Greive Withers

Chairman of Committees—Senator the Honourable Thomas Charles Drake-Brockman, D.F.C.

Temporary Chairmen of Committees—Senators Neville Thomas Bonner, Ruth Nancy Coleman, Gordon Sinclair Davidson, Donald Michael Devitt, Ronald Edward McAuliffe, Charles Ronald Maunsell, Jean Isabel Melzer, James Anthony Mulvihill, Ian Alexander Christie Wood and Harold William Young

Leader of the Opposition—Senator the Honourable Kenneth Shaw Wriedt

Deputy Leader of the Opposition—Senator James Bernard Keeffe

Leader of the National Country Party of Australia in the Senate—Senator the Honourable James Joseph Webster

†Archcher, Brian Roper (Tas.)
†Baume, Peter Erne (N.S.W.)
†Bishop, Hon. Reginald (S.A.)
†Bonner, Neville Thomas (Qld)
†Brown, William Walter Charles (Vic.)
†Button, John Norman (Vic.)
†Cameron, Donald Newton (S.A.)
†Carrick, Hon. John Leslie (N.S.W.)
†Cavanagh, Hon. James Luke (S.A.)
†Chaney, Frederick Michael (W.A.)
†Coleman, Ruth Nancy (W.A.)
†Colier, Stanley James (Qld)
†Colston, Malcolm Arthur (Qld)
†Cormack, Hon. Sir Magnus Cameron, K.B.E. (Vic.)
†Cotton, Hon. Robert Carrington (N.S.W.)
†Davidson, Gordon Sinclair (S.A.)
†Devitt, Donald Michael (Tas.)
†Drake-Brockman, Hon. Thomas Charles, D.F.C. (W.A.)
†Durack, Peter Drew (W.A.)
†Georges, George (Qld)
†Gietzelt, Arthur Thomas (N.S.W.)
†Greenwood, Hon. Ivor John, Q.C. (Vic.)
†Grimes, Donald James (Tas.)
†Guilfoyle, Hon. Margaret Georgina Constance (Vic.)
†Hall, Raymond Steele (S.A.)
†Harradine, Brian (Tas.)
†Jesap, Donald Scott (S.A.)
†Keeffe, James Bernard (Qld)
†Kilgarriff, Bernard Francis (N.T.)
†Knight, John William (A.C.T.)
†Lajovic, Milivoj Emil (N.S.W.)
†Laucke, Hon. Condor Louis (S.A.)

(2) Lewis, Austin William Russell (Vic)
†McAuliffe, Ronald Edward (Qld)
†McClelland, Hon. Douglas (N.S.W.)
†McClelland, Hon. James Robert (N.S.W.)
†McIntosh, Gordon Douglas (W.A.)
†McLaren, Geoffrey Thomas (S.A.)
†Martin, Kathryn Jean (Qld)
†Maunsell, Charles Ronald (Qld)
†Melzer, Jean Isabel (Vic.)
†Messner, Anthony John (S.A.)
†Missen, Alan Joseph (Vic.)
†Mulvihill, James Anthony (N.S.W.)
†O’Byrne, Justin (Tas.)
†Primmer, Cyril Graham (Vic.)
†Rae, Peter Elliot (Tas.)
†Robertson, Edward Albert (N.T.)
†Ryan, Susan Maree (A.C.T.)
†Scott, Douglas Barr (N.S.W.)
†Sheil, Glenister (Qld)
†Sibraa, Kerry Walter (N.S.W.)
†Sim, John Peter (W.A.)
†Tehan, Thomas Joseph (Vic.)
†Thomas, Andrew Murray (W.A.)
†Townley, Michael (Tas.)
†Walsh, Peter Amanda (W.A.)
†Walters, Mary Shirley (Tas.)
†Webster, Hon. James Joseph (Vic.)
†Widdershoven, Hon. John Murray (W.A.)
†Withers, Hon. Reginald Greive (W.A.)
†Wood, Ian Alexander Christie (Qld)
†Wriedt, Hon. Kenneth Shaw (Tas.)
†Wright, Hon. Reginald Charles (Tas.)
†Young, Harold William (S.A.)

†Death reported 13 October 1976
†Filling casual vacancy

Dates of retirement of Senators—† 30 June 1978 † 30 June 1981
THE COMMITTEES OF THE SESSION

(First Session: Second Period)

STANDING COMMITTEES


House—The President, Senator Coleman, Senator McLaren, Senator Melzer, Senator Messner, Senator Sheil and Senator Young.

Library—The President, Senator Donald Cameron, Senator Colston, Senator Davidson, Senator Harradine, Senator Mullivihill and Senator Walters.

Privileges—Senator Button, Senator Drake-Brockman, Senator Jessop, Senator O’Byrne, Senator Thomas, Senator Wheelion and Senator Wright.

Publications—Senator Missen (Chairman), Senator Archer, Senator Bonner, Senator Donald Cameron, Senator Robertson, Senator Ryan and Senator Tehan.

Regulations and Ordinances—Senator Wood (Chairman), Senator Brown (to 18 August), Senator Cavanagh (from 18 August), Senator Collard, Senator Devitt (to 18 August), Senator Durack (to 18 August), Senator Georges (from 18 August), Senator Missen (from 18 August), Senator Ryan and Senator Wright.

Standing Orders—The President, the Chairman of Committees, Senator Brown, Senator Chaney, Senator Sir Magnus Cormack, Senator Cotton (from 16 November), Senator Greenwood (to 13 October), Senator McAuliffe, Senator Douglas McClelland, Senator O’Byrne, Senator Webster, Senator Withers and Senator Wriedt (from 16 November).

LEGISLATIVE AND GENERAL PURPOSE STANDING COMMITTEES

Constitutional and Legal Affairs—Senator Missen (Chairman), Senator Button, Senator Chaney, Senator Devitt, Senator James McClelland and Senator Rae.

Education and the Arts—Senator Davidson (Chairman), Senator Button, Senator Collard, Senator Martin, Senator Robertson and Senator Ryan.

Foreign Affairs and Defence—Senator Sim (Chairman), Senator Knight, Senator McIntosh, Senator Primmer, Senator Scott and Senator Silbrias.

National Resources—Senator Durack (Chairman) (to 26 August), Senator Maunsell, Senator McAuliffe, Senator McLaren, Senator Robertson, Senator Thomas (Chairman, from 5 October) and Senator Townley (from 26 August).

Science and the Environment—Senator Jessop (Chairman), Senator Bonner, Senator Colston, Senator Melzer, Senator Mulivihill and Senator Townley.

Social Welfare—Senator Baume (Chairman), Senator Brown, Senator Grimes, Senator Melzer, Senator Tehan and Senator Walters.

Trade and Commerce—Senator Sheil (Chairman), Senator Archer, Senator Donald Cameron, Senator Colston, Senator Lajovic and Senator Walsh.

SELECT COMMITTEES

Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders—Senator Bonner (Chairman), Senator Baume, Senator Keefe, Senator Melzer, Senator Mulivihill and Senator Rae.

Mount Lyell Mining Operations—Senator Wright (Chairman), Senator Devitt, Senator Grimes, Senator Harradine, Senator Messner and Senator Townley.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

Estimates Committee A (Administrative Services; Parliament; Prime Minister and Cabinet; National Resources; Foreign Affairs; Defence)—Senator Sim (Chairman), Senator Knight, Senator Douglas McClelland, Senator McLaren, Senator Scott and Senator Silbrias.

Estimates Committee B (Industry and Commerce; Overseas Trade; Treasury; Primary Industry)—Senator Maunsell (Chairman), Senator Archer, Senator Gietzelt, Senator Messner, Senator Primmer and Senator Walsh.

Estimates Committee C (Education; Transport; Postal and Telecommunications; Environment, Housing and Community Development)—Senator Martin (Chairman), Senator Collard, Senator Colston, Senator Mulivihill, Senator Townley and Senator Wriedt.
ESTIMATES COMMITTEES—continued

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE D (Social Security; Health; Immigration and Ethnic Affairs; Aboriginal Affairs)—Senator Baume (Chairman), Senator Bonner, Senator Brown, Senator Grimes, Senator Melzer and Senator Shiell.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE E (Science; Northern Territory; Construction; Capital Territory)—Senator Wright (Chairman), Senator Devitt, Senator Kilgariff, Senator Robertson, Senator Ryan and Senator Thomas.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE F (Veterans' Affairs; Employment and Industrial Relations; Attorney-General's; Business and Consumer Affairs)—Senator Rae (Chairman), Senator Bishop, Senator Jessop, Senator James McClelland, Senator Tehan and Senator Wheeldon.

JOINT STATUTORY COMMITTEES

BROADCASTING OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS—The President, Mr Speaker, Senator Sir Magnus Cormack, Senator Douglas McClelland and Mr Donald Cameron, Mr Corbett, Mr Graham, Mr Scholes, Mr Antony Whitlam.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Mr Connolly (Chairman), Senator Baume, Senator Colston, Senator Messner and Mr Armitage, Mr Crean, Mr Dobie, Mr Lusher, Mr Martin, Mr Short.

PUBLIC WORKS—Mr Kelly (Chairman), Senator Kilgariff, Senator Melzer, Senator Young and Mr Bungey, Mr James, Mr Keith Johnson, Mr Les McMahon, Mr Miller.

JOINT COMMITTEES

ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS IN THE NORTHERN TERRITORY—Senator Bonner (Chairman), Senator Cavanagh, Senator Chaney, Senator Coleman, Senator Kilgariff, Senator Robertson and Mr Bryant, Mr Calder, Mr Drummond, Mr Les Johnson, Mr McLean, Mr Ruddock, Mr Wallis, Mr Wенworth.

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY—Senator Knight (Chairman), Senator Archer, Senator Georges, Senator Ryan and Mr Baume (from 13 October), Mr Bungey (to 13 October), Mr Crean, Mr Fry, Mr Haslem, Mr MacKenzie, Mr Sainsbury.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND DEFENCE—Senator Sir Magnus Cormack (Chairman), Senator Bishop, Senator Dureck (to 26 August), Senator Scott, Senator Sibrae, Senator Sim, Senator Wheeldon, Senator Young (from 26 August), and Mr Armitage, Mr Beazley, Mr Brown, Mr Bryant, Mr Fry, Mr Garland, Mr Hamer, Mr Jacobi, Dr Klugman, Mr Neil, Mr Ian Robinson, Mr Shipton, Mr Short, Mr Sullivan.

NEW AND PERMANENT PARLIAMENT HOUSE—The President and Mr Speaker (Joint Chairmen), the Minister for the Capital Territory, Senator Drake-Brockman, Senator McIntosh, Senator Melzer, Senator Missen, Senator O'Byrne, Senator Young and Mr Kevin Cairns, Mr Garland, Mr Keith Johnson, Mr Keating, Mr Lloyd, Mr Scholes.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE SYSTEM—Senator Sir Magnus Cormack (Chairman), Senator Gietzelt, Senator McAuliffe, Senator Mulvihill, Senator Rae, Senator Tehan and Mr Cadman, Dr Jenkins, Mr Peter Johnson, Mr Morris, Mr Ian Robinson, Mr Yates, Mr Young.
AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

DELEGATION FROM THE AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT

Members appointed by the Senate:

*Liberal Party of Australia*—Senator Withers, Senator Durack (from 16 September) and Senator Greenwood (to 16 September).

*National Country Party of Australia*—Senator Webster.


Members appointed by the House of Representatives:

*Liberal Party of Australia*—Mr Malcom Fraser (Leader of the Delegation), Mr Ellicott and Mr Wilson.

*National Country Party of Australia*—Mr Anthony and Mr Sinclair.

*Australian Labour Party*—Mr E. G. Whitlam (Deputy Leader of the Delegation), Mr Lionel Bowen, Mr Jacobi, Mr Scholes and Mr Antony Whitlam.
PARLIAMENTARY DEPARTMENTS

SENATE

Clerk—J. R. Odgers, C.B.E.
Deputy Clerk—R. E. Bullock, O.B.E.
First Clerk-Assistant—K. O. Bradshaw
Clerk-Assistant—A. R. Cumming Thor
Principal Parliamentary Officer—H. C. Nichols
Usher of the Black Rod—H. G. Smith

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Clerk of the House—N. J. Parkes, O.B.E.
Deputy Clerk of the House—J. A. Pettifer
First Clerk-Assistant—D. M. Blake, V.R.D.
Clerk-Assistant—A. R. Browning
Senior Parliamentary Officers:
  Table Office—L. M. Barlin
  Bills and Papers Office—I. C. Cochran
  Serjeant-at-Arms Office—D. M. Piper
  Committee Office—J. K. Porter

PARLIAMENTARY REPORTING STAFF

Principal Parliamentary Reporter—K. R. Ingram
Assistant Principal Parliamentary Reporter—G. R. Fraser
Leader of Staff (House of Representatives)—J. F. Kerr
Leader of Staff (Senate)—A. J. G. Simpson

LIBRARY

Parliamentary Librarian—A. L. Moore, O.B.E.

JOINT HOUSE

Secretary—R. W. Hillyer
THE ACTS OF THE SESSION

(FIRST SESSION: SECOND PERIOD)

Aboriginal Councils and Associations Act 1976 (Act No. 186 of 1976)—
An Act to provide for the Constitution of Aboriginal Councils and the Incorporation of Associations of Aboriginals and for matters connected therewith.

Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976 (Act No. 191 of 1976)—
An Act providing for the granting of Traditional Aboriginal Land in the Northern Territory for the benefit of Aboriginals, and for other purposes.

Acts Interpretation Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 144 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Acts Interpretation Act 1901, and for other purposes.

An Act to amend certain Acts in consequence of certain Administrative Changes, and to provide for related matters.

Advisory Council for Inter-government Relations Act 1976 (Act No. 106 of 1976)—
An Act to establish an Advisory Council for Inter-government Relations.


Air Force Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 138 of 1976)—
An Act relating to the establishment of an Air Training Corps.

Aged Persons Hostels Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 92 of 1976)—

An Act to amend the Air Navigation (Charges) Act 1952.

Airline Equipment (Loan Guarantee) Act 1976 (Act No. 140 of 1976)—
An Act relating to the Provision of certain Equipment for a Domestic Airline.

Airports (Surface Traffic) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 125 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Airports (Surface Traffic) Act 1960.

Apple and Pear Export Charge Collection Act 1976 (Act No. 198 of 1976)—
An Act relating to the Collection of the Charge imposed by the Apple and Pear Export Charge Act 1976.

Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1976–77 (Act No. 115 of 1976)—
An Act to appropriate certain sums out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the service of the year ending on 30 June 1977.

Appropriation Act (No. 2) 1976–77 (Act No. 116 of 1976)—
An Act to appropriate a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for certain expenditure in respect of the year ending on 30 June 1977.

Apple and Pear Export Charge Act 1976 (Act No. 197 of 1976)—
An Act to impose a Charge on the Export of Apples and Pears.

Apple and Pear Levy Act 1976 (Act No. 195 of 1976)—
An Act to impose a Levy on the Production of certain Apples and Pears.

An Act to appropriate Moneys out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of Urban Public Transport.

Asian Development Bank (Special Funds Contributions) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 147 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Asian Development Bank (Special Funds Contributions) Act 1970.

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

Australian Capital Territory Supreme Court Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 158 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Australian Capital Territory Supreme Court Act 1933.

Australian Council Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 113 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Australia Council Act 1975.

Australian Apple and Pear Corporation Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 199 of 1976)—

Australian Film Commission Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 107 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Australian Film Commission Act 1975.

Australian Film and Television School Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 110 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Film and Television School Act 1973.
The Acts of the Session—continued

Australian Heritage Commission Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 135 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Australian Heritage Commission Act 1975.

Bankruptcy Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 161 of 1976)—
An Act to make Provision for the Transfer of Jurisdiction from the Federal Court of Bankruptcy to the Federal Court of Australia and for the Abolition of the first-mentioned Court.

Broadcasting and Television Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 89 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Broadcasting and Television Act 1942–1975 and for related purposes.

Broadcasting and Television Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 187 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Broadcasting and Television Act 1942.

Broadcasting Stations Licence Fees Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 188 of 1976)—
An Act to amend Section 6 of the Broadcasting Stations Licence Fees Act 1964.

Christmas Island Agreement Act 1976 (Act No. 118 of 1976)—

Civil Aviation (Carriers’ Liability) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 126 of 1976)—

Conciliation and Arbitration Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 117 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904.

Conciliation and Arbitration Amendment Act (No. 3) 1976 (Act No. 160 of 1976)—
An Act to make Provision for the Transfer of Jurisdiction under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act 1904 from the Australian Industrial Court to the Federal Court of Australia and for the Abolition of the first-mentioned Court.

Compensation (Commonwealth Government Employees) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 166 of 1976)—
An Act to increase certain Amounts of Compensation payable to and in respect of Commonwealth Government Employees and certain other Persons, and for other purposes.

Customs Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 174 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Customs Act 1901.

Customs Tariff Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 203 of 1976)—
An Act relating to Duties of Customs.

Customs Tariff (Coal Export Duty) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 145 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Customs Tariff (Coal Export Duty) Act 1975.

Customs Tariff Validation Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 204 of 1976)—
An Act to provide for the Validation of certain Collections of Duties of Customs.

Dairying Industry Research and Promotion Levy Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 200 of 1976)—

Defence Forces Retirement Benefits Fund (Distribution of Surplus to Pensioners) Act 1976 (Act No. 128 of 1976)—
An Act to provide for the Distribution amongst certain Defence Force Pensioners of certain of the moneys paid out of the Defence Forces Retirement Benefits Fund into the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Defence Service Homes Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 185 of 1976)—
An Act to make provision for a Defence Service Homes Corporation, and for related purposes.

Estate Duty Assessment Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 169 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Estate Duty Assessment Act 1914.

Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 102 of 1976)—

Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 148 of 1976)—

Family Law Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 95 of 1976)—

Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 (Act No. 156 of 1976)—
An Act to create a Federal Court of Australia and to make provision with respect to the Jurisdiction of that Court.

An Act to amend certain Acts so as to make Provision for the Transfer of Jurisdiction of the Australian Industrial Court to the Federal Court of Australia.

Foreign Proceedings (Prohibition of Certain Evidence) Act 1976 (Act No. 121 of 1976)—
An Act to make provision for Preventing the Production of Certain Documents, and the giving of Certain Evidence, for the purposes of Proceedings in Foreign Courts.


ix
THE ACTS OF THE SESSION—continued


Health Insurance Levy Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 97 of 1976)— An Act to impose a Health Insurance Levy upon certain Incomes.


Homes Savings Grant Act 1976 (Act No. 183 of 1976)— An Act to Assist Persons to Purchase or Build their Own Homes.


Income Tax (Companies and Superannuation Funds) Act 1976 (Act No. 208 of 1976)— An Act to impose a Tax upon Incomes of Companies and Superannuation Funds.


Loan Act (No. 3) 1976 (Act No. 90 of 1976)— An Act to Authorize the Borrowing and Expenditure of Moneys for Defence Purposes.


National Health Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 99 of 1976)— An Act to amend the National Health Act 1953, and for related purposes.

National Health Amendment Act (No. 3) 1976 (Act No. 108 of 1976)— An Act to amend the National Health Act 1953, and for related purposes.

National Health Amendment Act (No. 4) 1976 (Act No. 177 of 1976)— An Act to amend the National Health Act 1953.

Nauru (High Court Appeals) Act 1976 (Act No. 151 of 1976)— An Act relating to Appeals to the High Court from the Supreme Court of Nauru.
New South Wales Grant (Namoi River Wiers) Act 1976 (Act No. 137 of 1976)—
An Act to grant Financial Assistance to New South Wales in connexion with the Construction of Weirs and certain Associated Works on the Namoi River near Wee Waa in that State.

Nitrogenous Fertilizers Subsidy Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 152 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Nitrogenous Fertilizers Subsidy Act 1966.

Northern Territory Supreme Court Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 159 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Northern Territory Supreme Court Act 1961.

Ombudsman Act 1976 (Act No. 181 of 1976)—
An Act to provide for the Appointment of a Commonwealth Ombudsman, and to Define his Functions and Powers.

An Act relating to the Agreement establishing a Financial Support Fund of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Patents Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 162 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Patents Act 1952 and for related purposes.

Pay-roll Tax (Territories) Assessment Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 172 of 1976)—

Prices Justification Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 182 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Prices Justification Act 1973 and for related purposes.

Psychotropic Substances Act 1976 (Act No. 87 of 1976)—
An Act to Approve Ratification of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances and to give effect to that Convention with respect to certain Psychotropic Substances and Psychotropic Preparations that enter Australia in the course of Consignment from one place outside Australia to another place outside Australia.

Public Service Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 193 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Public Service Act 1922.

Public Service Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 194 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Public Service Act 1922, and for related purposes.

Qantas Airways Limited (Loan Guarantee) Act 1976 (Act No. 139 of 1976)—
An Act relating to the Provision of certain Equipment for Qantas Airways Limited.

Queensland Grant (Proserpine Flood Mitigation) Act 1976 (Act No. 136 of 1976)—
An Act to grant Financial Assistance to Queensland for the purpose of Flood Mitigation Works in relation to the Proserpine River.

Queensland Grant (Special Assistance) Act 1976 (Act No. 153 of 1976)—
An Act to grant Financial Assistance to Queensland.

Remuneration and Allowances Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 170 of 1976)—
An Act relating to the Remuneration and Allowances payable to Justices of the High Court, Judges of the Courts created by the Parliament and the holders of certain other Offices, and for purposes connected therewith.

Repatriation Acts Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 112 of 1976)—
An Act relating to Repatriation and related Matters.

Roads Acts Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 173 of 1976)—

Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 175 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Sales Tax (Exemptions and Classifications) Act 1935.

Seamen’s Compensation Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 168 of 1976)—
An Act to increase certain Amounts of Compensation payable to and in respect of Seamen, and for other purposes.

Social Services Amendment Act (No. 3) 1976 (Act No. 111 of 1976)—
An Act relating to Social Services.


Softwood Forestry Agreements Act 1976 (Act No. 155 of 1976)—
An Act relating to Agreements between the Commonwealth and the States in connexion with Softwood Forestry.

States Grants (Aboriginal Assistance) Act 1977 (Act No. 1 of 1977)—
An Act to provide for Financial Assistance to the States in relation to Aboriginals.
States Grants (Advanced Education) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 120 of 1976)—

States Grants (Advanced Education Assistance) Act 1976 (Act No. 130 of 1976)—
An Act to make Provision for the Grant of Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with Colleges of Advanced Education.

States Grants (Beef Industry) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 150 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the States Grants (Beef Industry) Act 1975.

States Grants (Capital Assistance) Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 104 of 1976)—
An Act to grant Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with Expenditure of a Capital Nature and to authorize the Borrowing of Certain Moneys by the Commonwealth.

States Grants (Fruit-growing Reconstruction) Act 1976 (Act No. 149 of 1976)—
An Act relating to an Agreement between the Commonwealth and the States with respect to the Provision of Assistance to Persons engaged in Fruit-growing.

States Grants (Housing Assistance) Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 141 of 1976)—
An Act to Authorize Advances to the States of Financial Assistance in connexion with Housing and to Authorize the Borrowing of Certain Moneys by the Commonwealth.


States Grants (Rural Adjustment) Act 1976 (Act No. 201 of 1976)—
An Act relating to an Agreement between the Commonwealth and one or more of the States in respect of a Scheme to provide Assistance to Persons engaged in Rural Industries.

States Grants (Schools) Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 134 of 1976)—

States Grants (Schools Assistance) Act 1976 (Act No. 133 of 1976)—
An Act to provide Financial Assistance to the States for and in relation to Schools, and for related purposes.

States Grants (Technical and Further Education) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 132 of 1976)—

An Act relating to the Grant of Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with Technical and Further Education.

States Grants (Universities) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 119 of 1976)—

States Grants (Universities Assistance) Act 1976 (Act No. 129 of 1976)—
An Act to make Provision for the Grant of Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with Universities.

An Act to grant Financial Assistance to the States in connexion with the Assessment of their Water Resources.

An Act to Entitle the States to Share in the Personal Income Tax Collections of the Commonwealth.

Stevedoring Industry Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 178 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Stevedoring Industry Act 1956.

Stevedoring Industry Charge Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 180 of 1976)—
An Act to extend the operation of the Stevedoring Industry Charge Amendment Act 1975.

Stevedoring Industry (Temporary Provisions) Amendment Act (No. 2) 1976 (Act No. 179 of 1976)—

Telecommunications Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 94 of 1976)—
An Act to amend the Telecommunications Act 1975.

Television Stations Licence Fees Amendment Act 1976 (Act No. 103 of 1976)—
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PETITIONS

Medibank

Senator MELZER—I present the following petition from 140 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. We, the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth of Australia by this our humble petition respectfully sheweth:

That Medibank has proved to be the cheapest and most efficient means of bringing health care to Australian citizens and that the citizens of Australia have received Medibank as a great and valued social reform.

That Medibank has proved itself to be a far superior system of health care than was offered by the private funds prior to July 1975.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Government will observe the promise made by the Prime Minister in his policy speech that 'We will maintain Medibank and ensure the standard of health care does not decline'.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Nursing Homes Subsidies

Senator MESSNER—I present the following petition from 161 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

'The purpose of this petition is to bring to your notice the mounting financial burden being thrust upon patients and or relatives of Nursing Home Patients.'

'Fee levels are controlled by the Government but increases in Government subsidies have not been sufficient to cover the spiralling fees in Nursing Homes'.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament Assembled should, 'take immediate steps to apply a major increase in patient subsidies' and your Petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Australian Assistance Plan

Senator BUTTON—I present the following petition from 204 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That since the Australian Assistance Plan is making it possible for citizens to help themselves, thereby ensuring best possible use of limited Government resources, as shown by the fact that over 200 community projects have been initiated or funded through the AAP in the Outer Eastern Region.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament will take immediate steps to continue the Australian Assistance Plan as recommended in the Report tabled by the Honourable the Minister for Social Security, Senator Margaret Guilfoyle in Parliament on the 4 March, 1976 and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Aboriginal Land Rights

Senator KEEFFE—I present the following petition from 60 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble Petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That Parliament ensure that appropriate action in accordance with relevant legislation of the Australian Parliament and the Australian Government's policy in relation to Land Rights, be implemented as soon as possible in order to ensure that—

a. Aboriginals and Islanders resident in Queensland have their land restored to them

b. That the Aborigines Act 1971 and the Torres Strait Islanders Act 1971 be abolished or nullified forthwith

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Social Security Payments

Senator SIBRAA—I present the following petition from 34 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate, in Parliament assembled, the Petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth—

That distress is being caused to social security recipients by the delay in adjusting pensions to the Consumer Prices Index months after prices of goods and services have risen, and that medications which were formerly pharmaceutical benefits must now be paid for. Additionally, that State housing authorities' waiting lists for low rental dwellings for pensioners grow ever longer, and the cost of funerals increase ever greater.

Your petitioners call on the Australian Government as a matter of urgency to—

Adjust social security payments instantly and automatically when the quarterly Consumer Prices Index is announced.

Restore pharmaceutical benefits deleted from the free list.

Update the State Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act of 1974, eroded by inflation, to increase grants to overcome the backlog.

Update Funeral Benefit to 60 per cent of reasonable cost of funeral. (This benefit was 200 shillings, 20 dollars, when introduced in 1943. It was seven times the 1943 pension of 27 shillings a week).

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received.

Home Finance Trustee

Senator KILGARIFF—I present the following petition from 699 citizens of Darwin:

To the Honourable the President and members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned residents of Darwin respectfully sheweth:

Whereas residents of Darwin whose homes were destroyed or damaged in the cyclone of December 1974 desire
to rebuild their homes and the Government has promised to assist these endeavours by making available low-interest finance through the Home Finance Trustee.

And whereas the Minister for the Northern Territory has now announced limitations on the amount of funds to be made available for the purpose this financial year which will unduly prolong the rebuilding of Darwin with consequent prolongation of the already lengthy period of living under deplorable conditions endured by many.

Your petitioners therefore pray that the Senate will urge the Government to continue funding all applications for loans from the Home Finance Trustee as and when received to allow the rebuilding of homes to proceed without interruption during this year and successive financial years until the residents who suffered loss of accommodation in the cyclone are adequately housed.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received.

Home Finance Trustee

Senator ROBERTSON—I present the following petition from 673 citizens of Darwin:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned residents of Darwin respectfully showeth:

Whereas residents of Darwin whose homes were destroyed or damaged in the cyclone of December 1974 desire to rebuild their homes and the Government has promised to assist these endeavours by making available low-interest finance through the Home Finance Trustee,

And whereas the Minister for the Northern Territory has now announced limitations on the amount of funds to be made available for the purpose this financial year which will unduly prolong the rebuilding of Darwin with consequent prolongation of the already lengthy period of living under deplorable conditions endured by many.

Your petitioners therefore pray that the Senate will urge the Government to continue funding all applications for loans from the Home Finance Trustee as and when received to allow the rebuilding of homes to proceed without interruption during this year and successive financial years until the residents who suffered loss of accommodation in the cyclone are adequately housed.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received.

Institutions for the Aged

Senator COLSTON—I present the following petition from 88 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully showeth:

1. That there is a great concern and alarm of the removal of some Government support for St Luke's Hospital, Garden Settlement and for other institutions providing care for the aged within Queensland.

2. That the removal of grants is causing unnecessary hardship to those aged citizens of Australia who are dependent upon continued care and accommodation.

3. That the removal of grants has caused unnecessary unemployment and hardship for those who were previously employed in duties caring for the aged in those centres where reduction in grants have been made.

4. That the aged, and others within Australian Society who are least able to defend themselves against the arbitrary acts of Governments should be spared from these unnecessary cuts.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray:

That the government should reconsider its decision to cut the budgets of these institutions and immediately restore the grants to enable these institutions to continue their high standard of dedicated and unselfish care for the aged and infirm in the community.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Social Security Payments

Senator GEORGES—I present the following petition from 98 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled the petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully showeth:

That distress is being caused to social security recipients by the delay in adjusting pensions to the Consumer Price Index months after goods and services have risen, and that many medicators, formerly a pharmaceutical benefit, must now be paid for.

In addition, State Housing Authority waiting lists for low rental dwellings for pensioners become never less, and funeral costs increase ever greater.

Your petitioners call on the Australian Government as a matter of urgency to:

Adjust social security payments instantly and automatically on announcement of increases in the quarterly Consumer Price Index.

Restore pharmaceutical benefits deleted from the free list.

The States Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act 1974, eroded by inflation, be updated and increased to overcome the back-log.

The funeral benefit be updated to 60 per cent of a reasonable funeral cost. This benefit, when introduced in 1943 at 200 shillings ($20.00), was seven times the pension at that time of 27 shillings ($2.70) per week, or more than twice the basic wage of 97 shillings ($9.70).

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Taxation

Senator GIEZELT—I present the following petition from 22 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully showeth:

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

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

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

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

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

Petition received and read.

Medibank

Senator GEORGES—I present the following petition from 62 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned electors of the State of Queensland respectfully sheweth:

That Medibank was established to bring to every Australian the opportunity to attend the doctor of his or her own choice and to provide hospital insurance to all Australians irrespective of their means;

That Medibank provides substantial financial assistance to the free hospital system in Queensland which has never been given under any previous government.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate, in Parliament assembled, should ensure that the agreements entered into between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland should be maintained and that Medibank should not be altered either in cost or complexity so that it may no longer be available to all people of Australia as a universal health insurance scheme.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Medibank

Senator WALSH—I present the following petition from 19 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

(1) That we deplore the confusion generated by the Government's proposals to radically modify the system of health insurance in Australia;

(2) That we believe the changes will destroy the concept of universality previously incorporated in Medibank;

(3) That the Government's actions will lead to a two-class system of health care and thereby creating a division in Australian society;

(4) That the unnecessary duplication of health insurance funds created by Medibank and private organisations both operating will lead to gross administrative inefficiency, waste and increased costs.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Government retain at least the original Medibank Scheme.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Australian Broadcasting Commission

Senator MELZER—I present two petitions, similar in wording, from 51 and 2 citizens of Australia respectively, as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petitions received, and first petition read.

Prisoners in the Soviet Union

Senator BAUME—I present the following petition from 281 citizens of the Commonwealth:

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth respectfully sheweth:

Having learned of the unjust and harsh incarceration in Vladimir prison by the Soviet Authorities of a prisoner of conscience of Latvian nationality Gunars Rode, we the undersigned Australian citizens respectfully petition the Australian Senate and through it the Australian Government to use all its diplomatic resources and influence to secure the release of the said prisoner of conscience in order that he may enjoy the human rights as set out in the United Nations Charter, and as agreed to by all signatories of the European Security and Co-operation Conference in Helsinki.

This petition is submitted because great anxiety is felt for Gunars Rode, as it is known that to obtain the very minimum of the abovementioned human rights, in March of this year he commenced a hunger strike and his fate since then is unknown.

We further feel great concern for the numerous prisoners of conscience of many nationalities kept in Soviet prisons, labour camps and so-called mental institutions and pray for their well being and release.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.

Children's Commission

Senator CAVANAGH—I present the following petition from 337 citizens of Australia:

To the Honourable the President, and the Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. We the undersigned citizens of the Commonwealth of Australia do humbly submit:

1. That pre-school education is the right of every child, irrespective of financial circumstances;

2. That any cuts in money available for children's services will deny this right to many children in need of them;

We therefore urge that the cuts already made in the budget of the Children's Commission be restored and no further cuts be made in children's services, i.e. full day care, occasional day care, sessional pre-schools, family day care, residential care, play groups, parent education programs, holiday programs, toy libraries, mobile pre-school units and any other areas concerned with the total development of the child.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petition received and read.
The Clerk—The following petitions have been lodged for presentation:

**Medibank**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That Medibank was established to bring to every Australian the opportunity to attend the doctor of his or her own choice and to provide hospital insurance to all Australians irrespective of their means;

That Medibank provides substantial financial assistance to the free hospital system in Queensland which has never been given under any previous Government;

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament assembled, should ensure that the agreements entered into between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland should be maintained and that Medibank should not be so altered either in cost or complexity so that it may no longer be available to all people of Australia as a universal health insurance scheme.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Senator James McClelland.

Petition received.

**Medibank**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

(1) That we deplore the confusion generated by the Government’s proposals to radically modify the system of health insurance in Australia;

(2) That we believe the changes will destroy the concept of universality previously incorporated in Medibank;

(3) That the Government’s actions will lead to a two-class system of health care and thereby creating a division in Australian society;

(4) That the unnecessary duplication of health insurance funds created by Medibank and private organisations both operating will lead to gross administrative inefficiency, waste and increased costs.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that the Government retain at least the original Medibank Scheme.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Senator Thomas.

Petition received.

**Family Planning**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully sheweth:

That the Family Planning Association and similar organisations throughout Australia contribute to the welfare and well-being of a great proportion of the Australian people both in family planning and in an advisory capacity on the prevention and control of social diseases.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that urgent consideration be given to a favourable decision on the continuation of Federal Government finance to enable the activities of the Family Planning Associations and like organisations to proceed unimpaired throughout Australia.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Senator Guilfoyle.

Petition received.

**Medibank and Health Matters**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The petition of the undersigned electors of the State of Queensland respectfully sheweth:

That Medibank was established to bring to every Australian the opportunity to attend the doctor of his or her own choice and to provide hospital insurance to all Australians irrespective of their means;

That Medibank provides substantial financial assistance to the free hospital system in Queensland which has never been given under any previous Government;

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament assembled, should ensure that the agreements entered into between the Commonwealth and the State of Queensland should be maintained and that Medibank should not be so altered either in cost or complexity so that it may no longer be available to all people of Australia as a universal health insurance scheme.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Petitions

**Social Security Matters**

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 sheweth:

That distress is being caused to social security recipients by the delay in adjusting pensions to the Consumer Prices Index months after prices of goods and services have risen, and that medications which were formerly pharmaceutical benefits must now be paid for.

Additionally, that State housing authorities’ waiting lists for low rental dwellings for pensioners grow ever longer, and the cost of funerals increase ever greater.

Your Petitioners call on the Australian Government as a matter of urgency to—

Adjust social security payments instantly and automatically when the quarterly Consumer Prices Index is announced.

Restore pharmaceutical benefits deleted from the free list.

Update the State Grants (Dwellings for Pensioners) Act of 1974, eroded by inflation, to increase grants to overcome the backlog.

Update Funeral Benefit to 60 per cent of reasonable cost of funeral. (This benefit was 200 shillings, 20 dollars, when introduced in 1943. It was seven times the 1943 pension of 27 shillings a week).

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Senator Baume and Senator Guilfoyle.

Petitions received.

**Nursing Home Subsidies**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The Petition of the undersigned respectfully sheweth:

The purpose of this petition is to bring to your notice the mounting financial burden being thrust upon patients and or relatives of Nursing Home Patients.

Fee levels are controlled by the Government but increases in Government subsidies have not been sufficient to cover the spiralling fees in Nursing Homes.

Your Petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament assembled should, take immediate steps to apply a major increase in patient subsidies.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.
by Senator Webster and Senator Sir Magnus Cormack (3 petitions).

Petitions received.

**Australian Assistance Plan**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned citizens of Australia respectfully showeth:

That since the Australian Assistance Plan is making it possible for citizens to help themselves, thereby ensuring best possible use of limited Government resources, as shown by the fact that over 200 community projects have been initiated or funded through the AAP in the Outer Eastern Region.

Your petitioners most humbly pray that the Senate in Parliament will take immediate steps to continue the Australian Assistance Plan as recommended in the Report tabled by the Honourable the Minister for Social Security, Senator Margaret Givfcx by in Parliament on 4 March, 1976 and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

by Senator Sir Magnus Cormack and Senator Webster.

Petitions received.

**Australian Heritage Commission**

To the Honourable the President and Members of the Senate in Parliament assembled. The humble petition of the undersigned members of community organisations respectfully showeth:

There is a growing interest and concern in all sections of Australian society for the conservation of the environment, natural and man-made.

That there are also rapidly growing pressures by powerful forces tending towards the destruction of the Australian heritage.

That it is therefore urgent to appoint the Australian Heritage Commission, which was approved by both sides of this Parliament and to give the Commission sufficient independent staff, resources and funds.

That Technical Assistance Grants and Administrative Support Grants to community organisations are needed to partially redress the gross imbalance in technical expertise and resources suffered by community groups in pressing the community's case against the exploiter.

That a proper balance between the Government program of public austerity and the need for action in conservation would be a modest increase in the budget allocations in these areas over that of 1975-76.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

by Senator Webster, Senator Sir Magnus Cormack and Senator Button.

Petitions received.

**NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Seamen's Compensation**

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria) (Minister for Social Security)—I give notice that, on the next day of sitting, I will move:

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to increase certain amounts of compensation payable to and in respect of seamen, and for other purposes.

Commonwealth Government Employees Compensation

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria) (Minister for Social Security)—I give notice that, on the next day of sitting, I will move:

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to increase certain amounts of compensation payable to and in respect of Commonwealth Government employees and certain other persons, and for other purposes.

**United States Naval Communication Station (Civilian Employees) ACT**

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria) (Minister for Social Security)—I give notice that, on the next day of sitting, I will move:

That leave be given to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the United States Naval Communication Station (Civilian Employees) Act 1971.

**SPEECH TIMING CLOCKS**

The PRESIDENT—I draw the attention of honourable senators to the installation in the chamber of speech timing clocks. The clocks will come into operation this day.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**INCREASE IN MONEY SUPPLY**

Senator WRIEDT—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Will the Minister give an assurance that the rate of increase in the money supply in the current financial year will be no less than the average increase that obtained during the last financial year?

Senator COTTON—Certainly not. I commend to the honourable senator a reading of the Budget Speech delivered last night.

**EAST TIMOR**

Senator BONNER—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs. I seek your indulgence, Mr President, because the question is in 4 parts. First, what will be the view of the Australian Government in the General Assembly later this year when the report of the United Nations envoy, Mr Guicciardi, is presented? Secondly, will Australia maintain a positive role in the United Nations in support of the self determination of the East Timorese people? Thirdly, what steps are being taken to ensure that Australia will not grant de jure or de facto recognition of the integration of East Timor into Indonesia? Fourthly, is the Australian Government fully aware of the messages that are being transmitted from East Timor each week indicating the hold
the East Timorese people still have on their territory?

Senator WITHERS—I think the only one of those 4 questions I can answer positively is the second one, and the answer to that would be yes. As to the other 3 questions, I will seek information from my colleague in the other place.

ABORIGINAL LAND AT BORROLOOLA

Senator KEEFFE—I direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Is Mount Isa Mines Holdings Ltd to be allocated land at Borroloola which is at present part of the land claimed on the basis of tradition by the Aborigines living at Borroloola? If so, will the company acquire this land before the Aboriginal Land Rights Bill 1976 is considered in the Parliament?

Senator GUILFOYLE—I am unable to give the honourable senator a detailed answer about land at Mt Isa. I will refer the question to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and seek information from him.

MAIL DELIVERIES

Senator DRAKE-BROCKMAN—I direct a question to the Minister representing the Minister for Post and Telecommunications. Do people living in areas serviced by a contract mail service have their mail delivered without charge? Is it a fact that people living in city and country areas with a house to house mail delivery up to 5 times a week do not pay for such services? Are people who live in neither of these areas compulsorily required to rent a post office mail box from their nearest post office? Can the Minister explain this anomaly and indicate what steps are being taken to amend the irregularity?

Senator CARRICK—Yes, the contract mail service and the home delivery service are free of charge. The honourable senator asked what charges are made and whether they are made compulsorily in areas where it is not possible to give such services. There is no compulsory requirement. People may elect to collect their mail at the post office counter at no cost to themselves. I realise that the honourable senator is talking about country areas and that considerable distances may be involved. The Australian Postal Commission has recently reduced the charges for private mail boxes in areas where a box holder is not served by a postman or mailman. The charges are now $20 for a large private mail box, $12 for a medium size box and $6 for a small box. The charges were previously $42, $24 and $8 respectively.

SICKNESS AND UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Senator GRIMES—My question, which is directed to the Minister for Social Security, refers to the estimated expenditure for 1976-77 in the Budget released last night which shows that there is an estimated reduction in the expenditure of $33.6m for sickness and unemployment benefits. As both these benefits have been increased under the indexation arrangements and as the Treasurer himself and every other political commentator in this country expects that unemployment will not decrease and many expect it to rise, will the Minister inform us how this estimate has been reached? Does she expect a reduction in expenditure on unemployment benefits? Will the reduction result from a more strict work test on applicants for unemployment benefit or does she expect an epidemic of good health to overtake the country and the reduction to occur in sickness benefits?

Senator GUILFOYLE—It should be understood by the honourable senator that the amounts that have been appropriated from the National Welfare Fund for all of the pensions and benefits paid by my Department are based on an estimate. In the case of unemployment benefits, this would necessarily be an estimate. Equally, this would be the case with amounts relating to sickness benefits. The basis upon which these amounts have been calculated is consistent with the way in which they have always been calculated. There is some information in the Senate Estimates Committee briefing material that I could have extracted and given to the honourable senator at this stage. I think I should also refer to the fact that the numbers of pay periods have some significance if the amounts are compared year by year. I will have the information extracted and given to the honourable senator.

RAID ON ENTEBBE AIRPORT

Senator BAUME—I refer the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the gallant and effective rescue from Entebbe Airport in Uganda on 4 July of 100 hostages held after a hijack by Palestinian terrorists. The Minister undoubtedly is aware that many countries, including our close neighbour New Zealand, offered statements of congratulations to Israel for the courageous and effective way in which that nation ensured the rescue and safety of the hostages. Is the Minister able to assure the Senate that there are no reservations in this country as to
the appropriateness, the gallantry or the necessity for the rescue by Israel of these innocent victims of international hijack?

Senator WITHERS—I am sorry if the question offends some honourable senators opposite, but I think it is a very proper question to be asked by an honourable senator. Those who like to support the Palestine Liberation Organisation no doubt will sneer at the honourable senator who asked the question. The Australian Government consistently has affirmed its unequivocal condemnation of terrorism and its desire to see effective measures taken against acts of terrorism and force, particularly when these involve innocent civilians. The Government therefore deprecates the hijacking of the Air France aircraft, which led to the situation at Entebbe in July, and regrets that this situation deteriorated to such an extent that it caused the Israeli Government to conclude that it had to intervene militarily. The failure of multilateral efforts in the United Nations and elsewhere to get effective international action against terrorism clearly leaves in certain circumstances little alternative to unilateral action, and that was the situation faced by the Israeli Government. Australia is very ready at all times to help seek international agreement on effective means to counter terrorist activities.

URANIUM

Senator BUTTON—My question is directed to the Leader of the Government in the Senate as Minister representing the Prime Minister, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Deputy Prime Minister. I hope that the Minister's cold will not prevent him from answering this question. In asking it I refer to 3 facts. The first is that the report of the Ranger Uranium Environmental Inquiry by Mr Justice Fox has not yet been completed. The second is the statement by the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Anthony, that he would be happy to sell uranium to the Soviet Union and would accept guarantees by the Soviet Union that it would not be used for nuclear weapons. The third is the frequent statements by the Prime Minister that the Soviet Union constitutes a threat to the security of Australia and the peace of this region. I ask the Minister: Has not the Deputy Prime Minister's statement pre-empted the Government's acting objectively on the basis of the report of the Ranger inquiry? Which does the Government regard as more important—the interests of the Australian uranium mining industry as expressed by Mr Anthony or the alleged threat to Australian security as a whole as expressed by the Prime Minister?

Senator WITHERS—After that lengthy, confused and involved question by the honourable senator, let me say that the answer to the first part of the question is no. As to the second part, I suggest that the honourable senator start to compare like with like and not try to draw red herrings out of his own imagination.

DROUGHT CONDITIONS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Senator YOUNG—I direct my question to the Minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry. In view of the continued worsening drought conditions in many areas of South Australia, has the Government been approached by the South Australian Government to give Federal assistance towards drought relief in South Australia? If it has, will the Federal Government be prepared to give such assistance as has been the case with some of the other States suffering from drought?

Senator COTTON—I have not been approached directly and I do not know whether the Minister for Primary Industry in another place has been approached. Occasionally I have been in touch with Mr Dunstan on other matters but he has not said anything about this matter. It is perfectly correct that States that have had solid drought problems have been able to come to us for relief and they should continue to be able to do so. I imagine that if the case exists as the honourable senator says it does—I have no reason to doubt that it does fully exist—urgent action is necessary for the State Government to be in touch with the Federal Government, as the honourable senator suggests.

ELECTORAL REDISTRIBUTION

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND—My question is directed to the Minister for Administrative Services. In view of the fact that the Government now has been in office since December 1975 and in view of the fact that the Australian High Court handed down judgments in December 1975 concerning the Commonwealth Electoral Act and the Representation Act, has the Government yet made any timetabling arrangements for the appointment of distribution commissioners for House of Representatives electorates in the various States? If so, what are those arrangements?

Senator WITHERS—It is quite obvious that the honourable senator does not understand what the High Court ruled last December and I suggest that he read again the judgments and decisions in that litigation. I also suggest to the honourable senator that the writ issued last week
by the Attorney-General of New South Wales concerning the relationship of an elector has not exactly helped bring this matter to solution. The whole matter has now been put back to the High Court for a determination of section 10 of the Representation Act. I imagine that until that matter is totally determined it will be difficult to bring about any redistribution for the House of Representatives.

POSTAL SERVICES

Senator COLLARD—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Post and Telecommunications. In view of the serious cutbacks, and in some cases complete abolition, of mail services in country areas can the Minister ascertain what criteria is used by the Australian Postal Commission to decide on the future of any mail service? Can the Commission advise the Government what would be the extra cost of providing everybody with at least one mail service a week?

Senator CARRICK—I will seek the information and have it conveyed to the honourable senator.

VISAS

Senator MULVIIHILL—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs. Since Australia maintains a fairly flexible policy as regards work visas for United States boxers, wrestlers and entertainers generally, does the Minister feel that the apparent United States restrictions applied to Australian boxers Lionel Rose and Paul Ferreri justify this easy visa system or that we should review it unless the United States reciprocates in the spirit that we manifest to her nationals?

Senator GUILFOYLE—I can understand the honourable senator's interest in the eligibility of sportsmen coming into this country. The Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs has made statements about this matter. I will refer the specific inquiry the honourable senator has made to him to see whether he has some further comments he wishes to make.

ABORIGINAL LEGAL AID SERVICES

Senator CAVANAGH—I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs whether the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs authorised a circular, which was sent by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to the Aboriginal Legal Aid Services, containing this statement:

The previous Government's commitment to pay the cost of representation for all Aboriginals in all courts is no longer operative.

Is this the present Government's policy and is it in conflict with a telegram sent by the then shadow Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to Aboriginal organisations on 26 November last which stated that with the return of a Liberal government funds would continue to be made available for Aboriginal legal aid and that such a government would support Aboriginal organisations, such as medical and legal services? Was it this circular, which was sent to legal services, that prompted the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to state to a meeting in Victoria, as reported in the Melbourne Age on 7 August 1976: 'We broke promise to blacks'. Or was the Minister's statement prompted by the knowledge that despite the promise to continue Aboriginal legal aid, made by the shadow Minister with pre-knowledge of the statement contained in the Budget Speech by the Treasurer last evening, the Attorney-General, who was the shadow Minister who made the statement, was negotiating with the States with the object of bringing all forms of legal aid under the control of statutory legal aid commissions?

Senator GUILFOYLE—I do not know that the question has been properly directed to me as the Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs as I believe some of the matters referred to would be dealt with by the Attorney-General. I will refer to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and the Attorney-General the matters which have been raised and obtain a considered answer for the honourable senator.

THIRD WORLD CONFERENCE IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Senator SIM—Is the Minister for Education aware that the School of Social Sciences at the Western Australian Institute of Technology recently jointly sponsored a Third World Conference at the Institute? Were any federal education funds supplied to the Institute used to pay any of the costs of the solidarity week conference? If educational funds were used, in what manner were they used and who authorised their use? Were any of the facilities of the Institute used and who authorised their use? Finally, were any administrative staff used to assist in organising the conference and, if so, who authorised their employment for this purpose?

Senator CARRICK—I have a copy of the program of the Third World Conference which was held at the Western Australian Institute of Technology on, I think, 3 August and 4 August, so I am aware that such a conference was planned. I am aware of the subjects discussed and the nature of the people who spoke. I should explain
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first of all to the honourable senator the relationship of the Federal Government with such an institute. The Federal Government funds approved courses at the Institute but the Institute constitutionally derives its existence from the Western Australian State Government which provides the legislation for its existence. Under the State Government’s legislation the Institute is given autonomy to conduct its affairs within the Institute, and so I specifically relate to one aspect at the moment and that is the approved courses. This conference would not be regarded as an approved course for funding by the Federal Government and I presume, although I cannot answer specifically, that therefore Federal funds were not made available. It may be possible to find other information on this through the State Government. In fact it is possible for the Institute to permit, under its autonomous functions, such conferences.

I merely want to say that I have looked at the program, and it would be beneficial to Australia and Australians to have good and balanced discussions on the developing nations, the nations of the so-called Third World, but I do not think it is helpful if discussions appear to be unbalanced. On a superficial view—and this is purely a personal comment on my part—these appear to have been unbalanced. Whilst institutes, colleges and universities have autonomy in order to preserve academic freedom and the right of freedom of speech they have a basic responsibility to see that balanced views are put forward, and I hope they take note of that point.

INDUSTRIAL AFFAIRS: COLLEGIATE VOTING

Senator HARRADINE—My question is directed to the Minister for Repatriation in his capacity as Minister representing the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations. As this is the first question directed to the Minister, I trust it is in order for me to congratulate Senator Durack on his appointment to the Ministry.

Honourable senators—Hear, hear!

Senator McLaren—What are you after?

Senator HARRADINE—I am being courteous. Does the Minister recall that, in answer to a question in the last session of this Parliament, I was promised information concerning the number of unions which had altered their rules in order to comply with the provisions of section 133A and section 140 (1) (d) of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, as required by the 1974 amendments to that Act introduced on the recommendation of Mr Justice Sweeney by the then Minister for Labor and Immigration, the Hon. Clyde Cameron? Is the Minister aware that his colleague, whom he represents in this place, informed me by letter on 11 August 1976 that of the 228 organisations registered under the Conciliation and Arbitration Act only three have made the alterations and ten have sought exemptions. Granted there might be a remote possibility that some organisations were unaffected by the amendments to the Act and consequently were not required to make alterations to their rules, does the Minister agree that there must be something radically wrong with those sections of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act in view of the fact that probably more than 90 per cent of registered organisations have found it impossible to comply with them? Does the Minister agree that the information provided by his colleague constitutes a most damning indictment of those amendments to sections 133 and 140 of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act, for which the Hon. Clyde Cameron was responsible and reveals how far removed they are from the industrial realities experienced by trade unions and other registered organisations?

Senator DURACK—I am very glad to have the opportunity of giving my maiden answer, if that is a permissible phrase, on such an important subject as the one raised by Senator Harradine. I have read the question which Senator Harradine addressed to my colleague in another place, the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, on 18 May last concerning the sections which were introduced into the Conciliation and Arbitration Act by the Hon. Clyde Cameron. The answer given by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Mr Street, also provides the information on the number of organisations that have complied with the provisions of that Act, as detailed by Senator Harradine. It is certainly a matter of considerable interest that, as Senator Harradine has said, only three out of 228 organisations have been able at this stage to comply with the provisions of the sections introduced by the former Labor Government. I think that circumstance probably speaks for itself and that all of us can draw our own conclusions with regard to that matter.

As far as the attitude of the Government is concerned, I remind Senator Harradine and the Senate of the views expressed by my colleague in regard to this question of collegiate voting and the provisions in organisations’ rules providing for collegiate voting. The Minister said in May last—this is still the position—that the Government accepts in principle some form of collegiate
voting, but the system adopted must be consistent with the Government’s policy of fullest participation by members. This matter is a very complex one and the Government considers that further detailed consideration is necessary so that it can properly examine the large number of representations it has received. I understand that it certainly has received a number of such representations over this period of time. The matter is a complex one. The Government is still giving consideration to the action it should take in relation to the matter.

Senator HARRADINE—Mr President, I wish to ask a supplementary question, which I think is important to clarify the matter. In its considerations will the Government review the situation confronting unions by virtue of the amendments in section 133A, the section which provides for certain funds, and section 140 (1) (d), of the Conciliation and Arbitration Act?

Senator DURACK—I certainly will draw Mr Street’s attention to that.

PUBLIC TELEPHONES

Senator TOWNLEY—I ask a question of the Minister representing the Minister for Post and Telecommunications. It has been prompted by a statement in an advertisement which I saw yesterday and in which Telecom Australia says that it has launched a multi-million dollar project to modernise the public telephone system. The advertisement goes on to say that new types of telephones and telephone booths will be offered to the public to give a more reliable service, and that further STD calling facilities will be made available. I ask: Does Telecom Australia intend to increase dramatically the number of public telephones available, which would seem to me to be much more important than to upgrade the types of telephones that are available? What are the criteria upon which Telecom Australia decides whether to install a public telephone in any area?

Senator CARRICK—I do not have the information that Senator Townley has sought immediately available to me. I will ask my colleague in another place to supply it and let Senator Townley have it.

PRIMARY PRODUCERS

Senator GIETZELT—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Primary Industry. I refer to the Budget proposals outlined by the Minister in the Senate last night, particularly that section detailed ‘Income Equalisation Deposits’. Is the Minister aware that the Prime Minister said in a speech that he made in Tasmania in July that about 40 per cent of the farmers in many sectors of agriculture are earning less than $5,000 per annum? In the light of that statement and the fact that the new scheme outlined in the Budget will cost the revenue only $2m in the 1976-77 financial year, does this not mean that small farmers will get little or no benefit from this Budget? Is the Government therefore contemplating taking any other initiatives to assist small farmers in their current financial difficulties?

Senator COTTON—The farmers have a great problem. They have suffered and are still suffering the effects of 3 years of Labor government and the disasters that were thrust upon them. Most of them therefore are operating in a loss phase in their businesses. The Fraser Government has in the past planned an economic recovery that in due course will bring them back to a position of profitability in which they will be able to pay some tax. That will be of some help to them.

EDUCATION OF ISOLATED CHILDREN

Senator DAVIDSON—My question is addressed to the Minister for Education. Has he received a copy of the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts relating in particular to the education of isolated children? Has he read the report and arranged for a departmental study of its contents, particularly its recommendations? If so, does he have any information to give way of a response or public statement? When can such a response be expected?

Senator CARRICK—Yes, I have received the report and I have read it. The honourable senator will be aware that I was a member of the Committee for most of the period of the investigation on the isolated children reference. I have therefore read the report with more than usual interest. I have referred it to my Department for study. Indeed, as honourable senators will know from the Budget Speech last night, an inter-departmental committee is studying allowances, including allowances for isolated children. I am making sure that that committee studies the matter. It would not be proper for me to reflect any viewpoint because the matter ultimately must be studied by the Government and must be one for decision by the Government. I commend the Committee on its diligence and application in preparing the report. The Government is greatly appreciative of the problems of isolated families with children, particularly families as those of cattle producers who are suffering doubly because of the dreadful fall in beef prices. The Government is mindful of this situation. It will
take into account what can be done in relation to the erosion of inflation when it considers the report of the interdepartmental committee in the weeks immediately ahead.

MEDIBANK

Senator O'BYRNE—I ask the Minister representing the Minister for Health whether she is in a position to confirm or deny, or whether she can prevail upon her colleague in another place to confirm or deny, a report which was made to me by a member of the medical profession that the Medibank private health insurance scheme provides for 32 days accommodation in a private ward of a hospital as compared with 300 days accommodation in a private ward under the private hospital benefit funds. If this difference exists and thus places the Medibank private scheme at a great disadvantage will the Minister inform the Senate why there is such a disparity between the 2 schemes? Will she cause a review of Medibank to be undertaken to correct this anomaly before 1 October when the new scheme comes into effect?

Senator GUILFOYLE—I leave it for my colleague, the Minister for Health, to answer the specific matters which have been raised. The desire of the Government is that Medibank private insurance be competitive with private health funds. I feel sure that the disparities which have been mentioned by the honourable senator have an explanation other than the one he has suggested.

FAMILY COURT

Senator MISSEN—My question is addressed to the Minister representing the Attorney-General. I refer to the Budget proposal to impose a fee of $60 on the issue of applications for divorce and certain other remedies under the Family Law Act. I do not now canvass the advisability of this impost or the purpose of its application which, I trust, may be for better facilities and services for the Family Court. I ask the Minister whether the Government has considered methods of avoiding the setting up of bookkeeping, accountancy and auditing services in the family courts required to handle this single impost. Has the Government considered the provision of stamps purchased at post offices, so as to avoid unnecessary administrative expense?

Senator DURACK—The imposition of the fee on an application for divorce is, of course, part of the proposals contained in the Budget in relation to legal aid. The fee for the application for divorce is also part of an increase in fees in Federal courts and in the Family Court so the imposition has to be looked at in relation to an increase in fees in other Federal courts as well. The Budget proposes a very significant increase in legal aid. Expenditure on legal aid will increase from $16m, which was provided by the previous Government in the Budget last year, to $20m in the current year. That is a significant increase in the provision of legal aid for the community by the Commonwealth Government. That figure includes an amount of, I think, $3.5m to $4m for Aboriginal legal aid which, no doubt, will interest Senator Cavanagh and many other honourable senators on the other side of the Senate. The suggestion made by Senator Missen as to an alternative method of raising funds as some offset to the high and growing cost of legal aid is one in which I am sure the Attorney-General will be interested. I am sure that other methods of avoiding an increase in court fees have been considered by the Government. I shall certainly pass on to my colleague the Attorney-General the suggestion made by Senator Missen.

AUSTRALIAN FACILITIES ON COCOS ISLANDS

Senator SIBRAA—Will the Minister representing the Minister for Foreign Affairs either confirm or deny reports that United States Military aircraft have been and are continuing to use Australian facilities on Cocos Islands on stopovers while en route from Clark Air Base in the Philippines to Diego Garcia?

Senator WITHERS—I have no personal knowledge one way or the other on this issue. I shall seek the information from the Minister for Defence.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

Senator KILGARIFF—I direct a question to Senator Guilfoyle in her capacity as Minister representing the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. It was announced in the Budget that the Aboriginal Affairs vote is some $33m less than the 1975-76 allocation and that part of this cut is in the Aboriginal Housing Association area. The Budget further stated that the Hay report, which reviews the operation of housing associations, will be used to assess future needs for funds for Aboriginal housing. In the light of this review and of the fact that additional funds will be provided by government, will the Government table the Hay report or indicate whether the review of the Hay report has been completed? If the report has not been completed, will the Government indicate when it is anticipated that the report will be completed? Will the Government indicate whether action is to be taken in this financial year
in the light of the report to reinstate a housing program and to finance it? If it is indicated in the Hay report that particular housing associations have operated satisfactorily, will these associations be encouraged to recommence operations forthwith? In the circumstances of the so-called 'fringe dwellers' in and around towns of Australia, and in particular in the Northern Territory, will priority be given to providing housing and camping facilities to alleviate the plight of these Aboriginal people who at present lack basic living requirements such as showers, toilets, laundries and shelter from the extremes of the Northern Territory climate?

Senator GUILFOYLE—With regard to the matters that have been raised by the honourable senator I am able to advise that the Government is committed to funding Aboriginal housing associations as an integral part of its policy of Aboriginal self-sufficiency. The funds that were allocated previously for this purpose have been under review. It has come to the Government's attention from various sources that some funds have not been used as effectively as we should all want to see them used. During this financial year a major review of the scheme is being undertaken in conjunction with the Department of Construction. As was suggested in the question, funds will be lower while this review continues. The limited funds will go to the more successful housing associations. The Aboriginal Lands Commission has $10m this year for housing and personal loans.

With regard to the Hay inquiry, Mr Hay's final report has been received by the Department. The report will not be published. The Government is currently considering the recommendations in conjunction with the report of the Administrative Review Committee. It is hoped that full consideration of these reports will soon be finished. I am able to say with regard to funds for Aboriginal Affairs that despite what was appropriated in the Budget last night, it is the Government's intention that when the reports have been examined and the areas which are able to use funds effectively have been determined further funds will be made available. In other words, I am saying that what has been shown in the Budget this year for Aboriginal Affairs expenditure is the minimum amount. It will be added to as we have these inquiries completed and are able to determine the most effective way to attend to many of the matters that were raised by Senator Kilgariff.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Senator BISHOP—My question, which is directed to the Minister for Industry and Commerce, refers to the very grave situation which has resulted from the Minister's announcement on 13 August about shipbuilding policy which has been variously described by industry, unions and community leaders as being disastrous to shipbuilding and, it is claimed, will destroy the continuity of the shipyards. I ask the Minister: Does he agree that such continuity is imperilled by his decision or has he some projects which, in an interim way, will keep the shipyards active? Is he aware of a claim that one-third of the workforce in Whyalla will be made redundant over many months? Will he consider again the representations made to him by the Whyalla community group and the proposals by the Australian Council of Trade Unions building group?

Senator COTTON—The honourable senator—indeed the whole Senate—would know quite well that this matter has been under very earnest and serious consideration for quite some time. Talks have been held with the people from Whyalla, the unions, the ACTU, the ship builders, the ship owners and the ship repairers. There have been both joint and several discussions. Whichever way one considered this industry, it looked like a lot of trouble. Let me give the facts of the industry. In total, it employs approximately 4000 people and it is costing of the order of $45m a year in subsidy to employ them. On the best evidence available, and that is now being checked, a subsidy to enable the building of ships in Australia to continue would cost about $13,000 per person employed. That amount makes no provision at all for trying to improve the performance of the ship yards. Discussions about productivity improvements and freedom from disputes have indicated that the actual gain from eliminating industrial trouble would not be as great as one might think. Equally it is apparent that, on Australian costs, wages could be excluded from the cost of building ships in Australia and we would still not be able to compete.

In considering the whole situation, I wish to make a couple of observations. I personally am very upset at the position into which the industry has got itself, but that has been going on for quite some time. I would refer anybody who has an interest in this matter to a speech on the same subject made in Newcastle by the previous Minister for Transport in which the same sort of facts came out. I have tried to get some reality into this situation—to get the matter under careful study and determination. At the moment, having
regard to cost levels as they affect shipbuilding, and to the Australian cost structure generally, it is not possible to do other than order overseas Australian National Line ships for transporting our goods around the coast and overseas. The whole matter of ship repair has been referred to the Industries Assistance Commission for urgent examination. For some time it has seemed to me that this is an area on which we could concentrate a great deal more in an endeavour to improve the industry and to make something out of it. That is what I am doing. I welcome contributions. I have appreciated the problem and it has been distressing to me. However, I should observe that no government can walk away from its problems.

Senator BISHOP—I wish to ask a supplementary question. The Minister will recall that I referred to the possible redundancies, which seem to be of the order of some thousands of people. In Whyalla one third of the work force in the town would be involved. I ask the Minister what consideration has been given to those developments and what remedies might be available?

Senator COTTON—Earnest study is taking place at the moment of the general question of the redundancies and alternative opportunities available, as well as the need for relief and assistance. I cannot take the matter any further than that because it is not really in the area for which I have full responsibility, although I have been trying to push it along as fast as possible. There are some areas of difficulty in determining the real facts, but the matter is under careful consideration, and I mean that.

CONTAINER SHIPPING COSTS

Senator TEHAN—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Minister for Transport. Is the Minister aware that the port of Melbourne is the most costly container port in the world and that it costs almost 3 times as much to unload, process and deliver light container-load containers at Melbourne than it does at London, Rotterdam or New York? The respective costs are $A66 at Rotterdam, $A65 at London and New York and $A158 at Melbourne. No doubt the Minister will appreciate that this enormous cost is creating great hardship for Melbourne importers as well as adversely affecting the Government’s program to cut inflation. Will the Minister arrange for an urgent report to consider what action is available to the Government to correct the situation?

Senator CARRICK—I have not seen the most recent figures, but my understanding is that the facts stated by Senator Tehan are correct. In the previous session of Parliament this information was provided. It is my understanding that it costs approximately 3 times as much to handle a container at the port of Melbourne as it does in more efficient ports overseas. It is my understanding also that there are considerable delays and that these not only add to the difficulties of importers but add greatly to the cost of the goods when they are sold from the shelves in the shops to Australians. Yes, it is true that these actions are adding to the inflationary pressures in Australia. Because they are doing that, people are being put out of work and they are being kept out of work. I will refer to the Minister for Transport the request of the honourable senator that there should be an urgent review of this matter. I know that he is very concerned about it. I am sure that he will act upon the honourable senator’s question.

KINDERGARTEN TEACHERS

Senator PRIMMER—I direct a question to the Minister for Education. Is it a fact that the Government intends to cut its present payment of 75 per cent of the salary of kindergarten teachers as from 1 January next year?

Senator CARRICK—The responsibility for this matter does not come within my portfolio. Mr President, perhaps I could with a smile ask you to direct it to my colleague, the Minister for Social Security.

Senator GUILFOYLE—Negotiations are taking place with the States at the present time with regard to future funding for pre-school education. It will be understood that the proposed children’s commission of the former Government has now become the office of child care within the Department of Social Security. It is necessary to discuss with the States their programs for pre-school education and the manner in which the Commonwealth Government may participate with them in the future. Those negotiations are taking place at the present time. There are 2 ways in which funds have been dealt with through the office of child care—firstly, through the Child Care Act of 1972, and secondly, by means of the arrangement that was made by the Whitlam Government with respect to a 75 per cent level of funding for pre-school salaries provided those pre-schools developed other services which were appropriate to the needs of the communities in which they were operating. As I have said, those negotiations are taking place at the present time. I hope to be able in the very near future to announce what the programs will be within the office of child care to use
the $74m that has been appropriated under the Budget this year for those purposes.

**SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY**

Senator JESSOP—I direct a question to the Minister for Industry and Commerce which refers also to the decision by the Government to continue the policy established by the former Labor Administration of providing a 35 per cent subsidy to the shipbuilding industry in Australia. Does the Government consider it strategically important to retain a shipbuilding facility in Australia? Also, in reference to the Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into commercial shipbuilding repairs in Australia—hopefully this may provide some additional work—has the Government set a target date for the tabling of that report in the Parliament?

Senator COTTON—Yes, the Government does regard the industry as important. Also, as I have said for a long time now, it regards the industry as being in an almost impossible position for a variety of reasons. It is correct that the Government’s policy is to continue for the time being the policy laid down by the Whitlam Government. That policy was based upon a Tariff Board report, and it began in the days of the McMahon Government. It is felt by the Government that there would be value in updating the figures contained in that report. The specific matter referred to the Industries Assistance Commission for critical review is the ship repair industry. It does not relate to shipbuilding as such but to the repair facet of the industry.

I think honourable senators should bear in mind that shipbuilding is very much a matter of welding steel plates together. A great part of shipbuilding in this country has consisted of bringing in from outside Australia much of the equipment to go inside the welded hull. We have comparative figures on the relative output per man employed in our shipyards as against overseas shipyards. The comparison is quite odious, to say the least. It is equally true that the record of the industry in industrial matters over the years has been perfectly horrible. One hears that all this will improve a great deal. But I submit that this is a little like a death bed repentance. The problem is with us now. We are trying to get the data on repair out of the IAC as fast as we can. We should get the data on updated costs out much more quickly. The data on repair may take longer because it is in that area particularly that one sees more opportunity for continuity, redevelopment and improving the activities of all those engaged.

**COMMONWEALTH CAR POOL**

Senator McLAREN—The Leader of the Government in the Senate will recall my questioning during the autumn session on why the Government was using private taxis for Government work while Government cars were standing idle in the garage. The Leader will recall also that as a result of my questioning I was given an undertaking that a costing of the use of private taxis by the Government for the month of May would be carried out. When can I expect to be provided with details of this costing?

Senator WITHERS—I apologise for not carrying out my undertaking. I will chase the matter up for the honourable senator and see whether I can get the information for him this week.

**AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY SCHOOLS AUTHORITY ORDINANCE**

Senator KNIGHT—Can the Minister for Education indicate when consideration of the Australian Capital Territory Schools Authority Ordinance will be completed and when it might be introduced in the Australian Capital Territory?

Senator CARRICK—Senator Knight’s question gives me the opportunity to say that I regret the delay in the tabling of this Ordinance. I had foreshadowed that the Ordinance would be tabled by the end of the previous session or the beginning of this session. For a variety of reasons, particularly the huge volume of work that has been before the Cabinet until now, it has been delayed. I am hopeful that in the immediate weeks ahead the Ordinance will be available for tabling. I appreciate the desire of the Australian Capital Territory community for such an ordinance to be made in its final form, and I will endeavour to speed up the matter.

**TERTIARY STUDENT NUMBERS**

Senator COLSTON—Was the Minister for Education correctly reported in the University of Queensland publication *Varsity News* of 14 July 1976 as having said on the occasion of his July visit to the University of Queensland that ‘the 1976 calendar year has seen an absolute decline of 8300 students in the tertiary sector”? If the Minister was correctly reported, how was this figure of 8300 derived?

Senator CARRICK—Whilst I do not recall whether in fact in that speech I used such a reference, I have on occasions—and presumably then—made reference to the fact that in the costing of education in the 1976 calendar year, from evidence given to the Department of Education
through the various commissions by the institutions concerned, the effect would be that the number of first year enrolment places in both universities and colleges for the calendar year 1976 would be some 8300 fewer than in 1975. The reason for that, of course, was that in August last year the then Whitlam Government in its Budget set aside the triennial funding principle and triennial reports and set fixed guidelines. The effect of this was to cut back the program of the 4 education commissions for the calendar year 1976 by a total of $105m compared with 1975. The effect on the 2 tertiary commissions concerned was such that the institutions anticipated that the cutback would result in a reduction of that number of places. I do not have the figures immediately available at all, but those were the figures supplied to my Department from the institutions and the commissions concerned.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY

Senator MESSNER—My question, which is addressed to the Minister for Industry and Commerce, follows the questions asked by Senator Bishop and Senator Jessop regarding the shipbuilding industry. Has the Minister consulted with State governments, particularly the South Australian Government, in connection with rebates of payroll tax or other taxation incentives to shipbuilders? In view of the substantial subsidy of almost $1m to Whyalla that this would represent and the oft proclaimed rainy day Budget surplus of the South Australian Government, will the Minister take up this matter with the Dunstan Government and other Premiers and seek action?

Senator COTTON—Shortly after this announcement was made with great care, the comment of the Premier of New South Wales, Mr Wran, was that he was going to talk to Mr Dunstan I could not commend him more for doing that. Mr Dunstan knows something about it; Mr Wran knows nothing about it. I have talked to Mr Dunstan several times on this matter and have said quite clearly that contacts between governments take place between Premiers and the Prime Minister. However, I have always been open to talk with State governments about this matter and have done so. I am sure that if they want to talk to the Prime Minister or to me we will be more than happy to talk with them.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Senator RYAN—My question is directed to the Minister for Education. Can the Minister inform the Senate whether all the recommendations in the Schools Commission report of July 1976 will be implemented by the Government? If not, which recommendations will not be implemented?

Senator CARRICK—The honourable senator should know that this Government, in common with previous governments, will receive the reports of the commissions, including the Schools Commission, will discuss the reports on merit at Cabinet level and will make substantive decisions as to the nature of the reports, what shall be adopted and what, if anything, shall be amended or rejected. It is important to say that throughout the history of these commissions they have existed as very important bodies to investigate, to advise and to recommend. Their reports make recommendations but the responsibility for decisions lies with the Cabinet and the government of the day. That will continue to be so. Until the report has been considered I cannot make any statement on behalf of the Government. In the days when it is public property it is serving a very valuable purpose in that it is allowing public dialogue and I will be very interested to receive the viewpoints of various organisations on the matter.

BUDGET DEFICIT

Senator WALSH—My question is directed to the Minister representing the Treasurer. Is he aware that at 12.15 p.m. today on the Australian Broadcasting Commission radio program Country Hour, in reply to a farmer who was criticising the negative net payments to agriculture specified in the Budget, the Minister for Primary Industry said:

Total outlays on agriculture will be significantly greater than those which appear in the Budget.

By how much will this as yet unrevealed expenditure increase the deficit beyond the stated level of $2.6 billion? Has the Government—I ask the Minister to bear in mind Senator Guilfoyle’s 2 statements today pertaining to unemployment benefit payments and Aboriginal affairs that greater expenditure may yet be incurred—deliberately understated the true level of expenditure in the Budget figures in order to appease the Prime Minister’s somewhat outdated beliefs concerning deficits?

Senator COTTON—I used to listen to the Australian Broadcasting Commission’s Country Hour at one stage in my life but every time I heard beef prices quoted I used to burst into tears so I gave it up. Now I do not hear it so, unfortunately, I do not have the privilege of being up to date like the honourable senator. He has
drawn attention to some comment and suggestion that figures may not be accurate or that there may be some disguised money floating around. All I can say to him is that in my time I have not known a Budget to be so carefully constructed over such a long time. I doubt whether it is in error in its judgment, its fact or its accounting but the comments he has made will be checked and I will get a proper answer for him.

SCHOOL LEAVERS

Senator GEORGES—I ask the Minister for Social Security a brief question. Will school leavers who finish school in November and December of this year and who are unable to find suitable employment be paid the unemployment benefit on their application after the 7 days' waiting period? If not, what will be the period of delay and what will be the reason for the delay?

Senator GUILFOYLE—Earlier this year I made a statement with regard to school leavers and unemployment benefit provisions. I will have it restated for the honourable senator. However, I am able to say that with many school leavers their eligibility for unemployment benefit is not a matter for determination immediately the school year has concluded. People who intend to return to school or to some other form of education are not regarded as being unemployed. Statements were made and conditions set earlier this year with regard to school leavers and in order not to give an answer that may not be fully accurate I will have those statements restated in the answer for the honourable senator later.

RETIREMENT OF PRINCIPAL PARLIAMENTARY REPORTER

The PRESIDENT—I inform honourable senators of the retirement during the recess of the Principal Parliamentary Reporter, Mr W. J. Bridgman, who has given nearly 41 years of service to Hansard. By a remarkable coincidence, his father, Mr J. S. Bridgman, gave a similar period of service to the Hansard staff of the Western Australian Parliament. Our Principal Parliamentary Reporter was educated at Perth Modern School and the University of Western Australia. He began work in January 1928 as a journalist, attained the grading of senior reporter 7 years later and then joined the federal Hansard staff. His first assignment was to report the Senate. At that time Sir George Pearce was Leader of the Government in the Senate and Joseph Silver Collings was Leader of the Opposition. The Lyons Government had 33 supporters in the chamber and the Australian Labor Party only three.

Mr Bridgman was to see many, many changes here in the next 40 years. He is one of the few in this building who have seen three of the four double dissolutions in our political history and the only joint sitting of the 2 Houses. He assisted with making the arrangements to introduce the daily Hansard in 1955 and as Principal Parliamentary Reporter he set up, in 1970, the comprehensive recording system to produce from tapes the transcripts of evidence taken by the numerous parliamentary committees and the proceedings of conferences of Commonwealth and State Ministers. He has never been afraid to apply his great experience to experiment and to improve the system of reporting. One almost revolutionary change as it seemed at the time was the appointment in 1970 of the first of a succession of women to the staff. He holds the Diploma of Journalism conferred by the University of Western Australia in 1932. He is a fellow of the Incorporated Phonographic Society, London, and a member of the Council of the Commercial Education Society of Australia. He edited the third edition of the work Commonwealth Hansard—Its Establishment and Development which describes the history of the staff from 1901 and sets out the rules that govern the production of Hansard and the authorities for them. In awarding birthday honours in June Her Majesty the Queen was pleased to confer on him the Order of the British Empire. It was appropriate that on 4 June when Parliament rose for the winter recess he was working in the chamber in which his service with Hansard began, the Senate. He plans to remain in Canberra but will sun himself on the Barrier Reef when the frosts of June, July and August become severe. Consequent upon the retirement of Mr Bridgman, Mr K. R. Ingram has been appointed Acting Principal Parliamentary Reporter.

Senator WITHERS (Western Australia—Leader of the Government)—by leave—On behalf of Government Senators and perhaps with the fond but forlorn hope that the lad from Leederville still reads Hansard might I express to him our wish for a long and happy retirement. Bill Bridgman was a friend to everybody in the national Parliament, in either House and on either side. He was more than a friend in some ways. He had the capacity to make our speeches sound literate when read, and that is an ability for which I have admired him and his staff ever since I have been in this place. I remember that when I first came here he approached me and said: 'Are you any relation to Fred Withers who
used to be the member for Bunbury?' I replied: 'Yes, he is my father'. He said: 'Well, that is good; I used to report him in the Assembly in Perth and now I will have the pleasure of reporting you in the Senate.' From that time on we had what I always felt was a very good personal relationship. I think that all honourable senators always found him helpful. His advice was always sought and was willingly given. We wish him a long and happy retirement and we express our thanks for all the service that he has given to the Parliament.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—Mr President, on behalf of the Opposition, I wish to associate myself with your comments and those of Senator Withers in wishing Mr Bridgman a long and happy retirement. We also congratulate him on the wonderful job that he has done over the years for the Parliament and for parliamentarians. We know that Hansard is a consistently efficient organisation. Mr Bridgman is one who has contributed towards that efficiency. I am sure that the helpfulness and the efficiency which he has accorded to all of us over the years will be long remembered in this Parliament.

Senator WEBSTER (Victoria—Minister for Science)—by leave—I am pleased to join with the Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Withers) in this expression of goodwill towards Mr W. J. Bridgman. Mr Bridgman set standards and established records which few servants of the Parliament will achieve. His years in dealing with members of the Federal Parliament were never to dull his warm-heartedness and at all times he exuded friendship to staff and members. This is a record seldom followed, even by members of Parliament.

I am told that Mr Bridgman joined the Federal Hansard staff in 1935 and was well respected in his years of service. He was of considerable assistance to all members of the Federal Parliament, having an ability to put into a recognisable form of words those addresses which we as senators often heard at first hand and considered to be incomprehensible. His achievement of a diploma in journalism is notable, it being conferred upon him in 1932 by the University of Western Australia. He was awarded the Order of the British Empire in June of this year.

As has already been stated there is a remarkable 'like-father like-son' coincidence in the similarity of the terms of office of Bill Bridgman and his father. My National Country Party colleague, Senator Tom Drake-Brockman, advises me that Bill Bridgman's father served for a term of some 41 years in a similar role in Western Australia. It is a fine record of which to be proud. I am advised that Mr Bridgman is a very keen student of history, particularly the Napoleonic wars on which he is apparently an authority. It is paradoxical that his official capacity in Parliament found him dealing with political battles. It is uncommon that he should choose in his leisure time to delve into ancient battles. I have it on best authority that he does not always agree with the Oxford dictionary but apparently approves of the Oxford stand that the capital 'V' must be used for 'Wellington boots' and the small 'v' for 'blucher boots', for the reason that this practice recognises the one most victorious in battle. However, in all his dealings with members of the Senate he was completely impartial, supporting neither the victor nor the vanquished.

Mr W. J. Bridgman will be long remembered by those who served in this Parliament during his 40-year term. His competence will, I believe, be acknowledged for many years to come. My National Country Party colleagues join me in wishing him health and happiness in his well-deserved retirement.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND (New South Wales)—by leave—I wish briefly to join Senator Withers, Senator Wriedt and Senator Webster in their laudatory remarks concerning the former Principal Parliamentary Reporter, Mr Bill Bridgman. As honourable senators will be aware, I was a reporter for some years before I entered the Parliament and I know the very exacting and trying task confronting Hansard reporters. They do their jobs efficiently, effectively and thoroughly. I know that, in the 41 years of service that he has given to the Parliament, Bill Bridgman reached the epitome of efficiency and thoroughness in the performance of his work. To be a reporter on Hansard is regarded as reaching the heights of the profession. But to be the chief of Hansard—the Principal Parliamentary Reporter—is the greatest honour that one can achieve in that profession. Bill Bridgman did achieve that high honour. He is a great man who will be missed in these environs. He has given outstanding service to the Parliament. I know that all members of the Australian Journalists Association will wish him and his wife, Barbara, a very long, healthy and enjoyable retirement.

Senator HARRADINE (Tasmania)—by leave—Senator Withers, on behalf of the Government, Senator Wriedt, on behalf of the Opposition, and Senator Webster, on behalf of
the National Country Party, have paid tribute to Mr Bridgman. They have done so with more knowledge and greater eloquence than I am capable of. However, as the only independent senator in this place and also, if I may, on behalf of new senators I join them in this tribute. Before coming to this place I often went to meetings at night and read Press reports of those meetings next morning. Frankly, I often wondered whether I had been at the meeting that was reported in the Press. I have never experienced that in this place. One can read the Hansard report on the morning after a sitting day and find that it is a very accurate and true expression of what occurred during the previous day's proceedings. Much of this high standard is due to persons such as Mr Bridgman. I join other honourable senators in wishing him a long and fruitful retirement.

The PRESIDENT—I shall take great pleasure in conveying to Mr Bridgman the expressions of appreciation, goodwill and good wishes from honourable senators.

GOVERNMENT'S ECONOMIC POLICIES

Matter of Urgency

The PRESIDENT—I inform the Senate that I have received the following letter from Senator Wriedt.

18 August 1976

Dear Mr President,

In accordance with Standing Order 64, I give notice that on Wednesday, 18 August, I shall move:

'That in the opinion of the Senate, the following is a matter of urgency:
The Government's economic policies which are producing increased unemployment and undermining business confidence.'

Is the motion supported?

(More than the number of senators required by the Standing Orders having risen in their places)

Senator WRIEIT (Tasmania) (4.8)—I move:

That in the opinion of the Senate, the following is a matter of urgency:

The Government's economic policies which are producing increased unemployment and undermining business confidence.

Mr President, there would be a no more appropriate time for the Senate to be debating an urgency motion of this nature. Last night we witnessed the presentation to this Parliament by the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) of a document—the annual Budget—which set out clearly the intentions of the Government over the next 12 months. Although we are not debating the Budget this afternoon—we reserve that for next week—it is necessary that we consider the immediate problems which confront this country at the present time as a result of policies introduced over the past 8 months by the present Government, despite undertakings which were given last year before the election. These problems will now be exacerbated by the material that we find in the Budget document.

There are 3 bases for this motion, Mr President. Firstly, the Government's economic policy is not working and can now be seen not to be working. Secondly, the Government has demonstrated that it has a ruthless and, I believe I could say legitimately, a callous disregard for the problems of the evergrowing number of unemployed. Thirdly, the Government has been totally unsuccessful in restoring business confidence which, it claims, is the keystone of its economic policy. There are 3 reasons why the policy is failing. They also should be enumerated. Before going any further I should say this: I believe that it would have been legitimate up until the present time for the Government to say or claim that, because of the difficulties that it alleges it inherited from the previous Government, it should not be the subject of criticism. But let one thing be made clear: It is evident now, after 8 months, that it is the policies of this Government with which we are now living and it is the problems created by this Government with which we are now living. I will come back to that in a moment.

The Government's policy is based, firstly, on a notion that every wage and salary earner in Australia must suffer a reduction in real wages and also must suffer the threat of unemployment. Its policy springs from what can only be termed an ideological commitment to the proposition that public enterprise is bad and wasteful and that, for some reason or other, private enterprise is always productive and useful. The Government's policy is based on misconceptions of the needs of the economy, the nature of demand and the appropriateness of the remedies. July is a month in which there is normally a drop in the number of registered unemployed. By contrast we find that in July of this year the number of registered unemployed in seasonally adjusted terms has actually risen by more than 18,000. Thus unemployment has increased in each of the last 5 months. Mr President, I seek leave to have incorporated in Hansard the Commonwealth Employment Service statistics in seasonally adjusted terms of the unemployed in Australia between October 1975 and July 1976.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(The table read as follows)—
adjusted terms rose by 63,000. Thus in a mere 5 months the Government’s policies completely reversed the beneficial effects of the Hayden Budget. In other words, by February the number of unemployed had decreased by 60,000 after the Hayden Budget of last year. Then we saw a reversal as a result of the policies implemented by this Government. So I hope that during the course of this debate we will not have to listen to excuses being made by Government spokesmen on the basis that the unemployment situation now is the result of the policies of the previous Government. It is due directly to the deliberate policies of this Government, for which it must accept responsibility.

Only this morning on the radio program A.M. Mr George Polites was interviewed. I think he is the Executive Director of the Employers Federation in Victoria. He is certainly a senior spokesman for private industry in this country. He is a person who is probably more conversant with the general feelings of the business community than any other single person in Australia. He is more in contact with the complete range of the private sector. As is known, we as an Opposition and, in fact, as a Government have always maintained that there is a need to ensure that demand is maintained at the maximum level possible in the community in order to stimulate the economy and in particular the private sector. But we have always been told by our friends who are now in Government that this was an illusion and that what we had to do was bring in investment allowances and so on. What did Mr Polites say this morning on A.M. in answer to a question? He was asked:

Is it now up to businesses then to start investing, to start employing more people?

I hope that Mr Polites’ answer will be listened to carefully by members of the Government Parties. He said:

Well you can’t employ more people unless you get more demand for your goods and services. What people have got to do is spend more money to make a demand for goods and services; then industry will put people on to meet the demand, or to meet the demand that is created by those purchases.

Those were the words of Mr Polites. They are the words that we have been saying to this Government ever since it came to office. We have been saying that as soon as it interfered with the prospect of the community being able to increase consumption there was obviously no chance of reactivating the economy. That is precisely what has happened. It is very simple to talk in terms of reducing government expenditure and to say ‘We are going to get the deficit down by $1,000m’, without paying regard to the effect

### CES STATISTICS—SEASONALLY ADJUSTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Registered unemployed</th>
<th>Total excluding school leavers</th>
<th>Vacancies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>269,300</td>
<td>24,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>281,800</td>
<td>265,800</td>
<td>27,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>278,400</td>
<td>258,700</td>
<td>28,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>257,700</td>
<td>236,400</td>
<td>29,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>252,300</td>
<td>228,500</td>
<td>27,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>268,900</td>
<td>239,200</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>281,800</td>
<td>245,100</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>286,200</td>
<td>243,900</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>296,800</td>
<td>250,600</td>
<td>21,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>315,300</td>
<td>263,300</td>
<td>23,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator WRIEDT—In that table can be seen the effects of the Government’s rhetoric contrasted with the reality. In his response to the Budget Speech last year the present Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser), as the then Leader of the Opposition, said:

We are firm in the view that action must be taken now to revive production and investment. Without this there will be no genuine bases for expanding employment opportunities. Who could believe that in the post-war era there could be any government so unconcerned with employment as this Government is? Every act it takes makes it harder for jobs to be created.

I suggest that that statement by Mr Fraser last year would be more appropriate today in the light of his Government’s policies. Merely citing the current level of unemployment does not give a true picture of the situation. If we look at that table we find a number of features that are significant. At the end of October 1975 the number of registered unemployed in seasonally adjusted terms was 305,000. From that time until the end of February 1976 the number of unemployed fell by more than 53,000 in seasonally adjusted terms. That was during the time in which the full effects of the Hayden Budget—that is the last Budget under the previous Government—were being felt. It is as well to recall again the words of the present Prime Minister in responding to the Hayden Budget. He claimed that that Budget would do nothing to stimulate production and the expansion of job opportunities and that it would not solve but rather worsen the unemployment situation. Yet the figures show that that Budget had the effect of making substantial inroads into the level of unemployment.

The effects of that Budget can be contrasted with the effects of this Government’s economic policies. Between February and July of this year the number of unemployed in seasonally
that that has on the total community—not just the
business sector but the consuming public as well.

The round-up of economic statistics for August
1976 placed great reliance on increases in retail
sales, buoyant motor vehicle registrations and the
level of private investment to justify the
suggestion that the economy was picking up.
However, the facts do not justify that conclusion.
It is true that the number of motor vehicle regis-
trations was increasing towards the end of
1975-76. However, only last week the Australian
Automobile Dealers Association reported that
during July sales of motor vehicles dropped by
no less than 50 per cent on last July’s figures—a
50 per cent reduction. That is substantial evi-
dence that the increase in motor vehicle registra-
tions that occurred towards the end of the last
financial year took place because institutional
buyers were buying early to beat price increases.
The Government interpreted the increase in the
number of registrations as a sign that the econ-
omy was starting to pick up. Based on report
from sellers of motor vehicles, the Government
will be in great difficulty in explaining the results
for the September quarter.

The Government’s reliance on rises in retail
sales is surprising. Retail sales in seasonally
adjusted terms rose by 4 per cent in the June
quarter, compared with a rise of 4.2 per cent in
seasonally adjusted terms in the December
quarter. The figures indicate that retail sales at
best are sluggish and at worst are stagnant.
There are further doubts about the figures for the
June quarter in view of the persistent reports that
the sales figures have been inflated because
retailers have been unloading old stock at very
cheap prices. The number of private dwelling ap-
provals fell in every month of the last quarter of
the last financial year. In view of the cutback in
funds for capital works across the whole range of
government activities, there is no chance of any
pick-up in the near future in the building and
construction areas.

It is well to recall again the comments that the
Prime Minister made about the Hayden Budget.
In his response to it—this goes back to last
year—he said:

The Budget had a major task to revive business con-
fidence, increase investment, production and job opportuni-
ties. Confidence cannot be built on air, it must be based on
orders, demands, funds.

To date there have been no traditional orders
and demands. Job opportunities have decreased.
There has been no substantial revival of business
confidence and even with the investment allow-
ance little increased investment. The Budget will
make the situation worse. There is nothing in the
Budget which could lead to the conclusion that
there will be any increase in consumer spending.
Rather, the reverse is the case. The Budget relies
on an expectation of growth in gross non-farm
product of 4 per cent. Even though this is recog-
nised as being not a strong growth by standards
of previous recoveries, there must be consider-
able doubt as to whether that level of growth
could be achieved.

I ask: What are the reasons for the failure of
the Government? It has recognised that there
could be no economic recovery until there had
been an increase in consumer demand. That
point must be emphasised again and again. Yet
at the very time that it has tried to talk up con-
sumer demand it has attacked the real value of
wages in the hands of the consumer. Obviously
the Government has set out to destroy wage
indexation. At the same time it is pursuing a pol-
icy of creating a permanent pool of unemployed
at levels never before contemplated by any Aus-
tralian Government. Of course, we have experi-
enced unemployment at these levels many years
ago. The important point to remember here is
that this is a deliberate act of policy. This
Government is convinced that the only way to
control inflation is by creating a maximum pool
of unemployed. I believe that the great majority
of Australians reject that concept.

The federalism policy of this Government will
result in increased charges and taxes on the
States which will add to inflation and further
reduce the value of real wages. The same com-
ments apply to the Government’s special charge,
the Medibank levy, which will have similar
effects and which will cause a dramatic drop in
the purchasing power of consumers by 1
October. Thus the policies which are being purs-
ued will have 2 effects. Firstly, they will prevent
economic recovery in any substantial form. Sec-
donely, they ignore the enormous social problems
caused by higher unemployment. With unem-
ployment running at 5 per cent of the work force
there is an output loss to the community as a
whole resulting from the waste of resources. It is
estimated that unemployment at this level results
in a loss to the community of about $2 billion
worth of output annually. The pursuit of a policy
of maintaining a permanent pool of unemployed
results in the creation of an increasing group
included in the long term unemployed. Not only
does this group suffer deprivation but also the
people in the group lose confidence in them-
selves. They come to believe that they are
incapable of holding down a job.

Because of this situation equity demands that
the victims of this national policy—it must be
repeated that it is a national policy—be compensated for the losses inflicted upon them by forces outside their control. The Government's failure to restore confidence arose out of a mixture of misconceptions and commitments to policies to which it had already ascribed. The Government started from a premise that investment and saving were 2 prime virtues which had to be encouraged. Again I read the speech of the Prime Minister. He stated:

The Australian tax system in the past has encouraged and rewarded saving and investment. Instead, this Budget encourages living for today.

The Government proceeded to introduce an investment allowance even though it was clear to all businessmen that such an allowance was useless. Not only was there no demand for new investment but the existing slack in capacity enabled industry and commerce to satisfy growth in demand from existing resources. Belatedly the Government decided that saving and investment were no longer prime virtues. By March of this year the Government was encouraging consumers to spend. So great was that encouragement that the Government was exhorting consumers to give up saving and to spend on any goods in order to assist the Government politically. In other words, it was reaching the policy based on living for today which was the very thing it condemned last year.

The Government rests its hope for recovery on a further decline in the saving ratio. Without such a decline there cannot possibly be any increase in consumer spending. Yet there is a definite possibility that there has been a change in the structure of savings and that the decline in the savings ratio will not occur. The report by the Australian Bankers Association which was issued on Monday indicates that savings bank deposits grew strongly in June with a rise of $355m. If these figures are correct it indicates that the Government's policies are certainly misconceived.

Because of its hostility to public sector enterprise the Government slashed spending on all levels of Government public works. It did this by reducing its own expenditure on construction and, under the guise of the federalism policy, it cut State government Loan Council programs and grants for capital works. In doing this it failed to recognise that many sections of industry were dependent upon government activity in this area to take up the slack in the economy. Even at the time when it was encouraging consumer spending it acted to prevent that consumer spending by cutting the level of real wages, by imposing or by causing the States to impose increased levies, taxes or charges and by creating a very real threat of long term unemployment. The Government has pursued the policy without taking into account the true nature of demand for goods and services. There is increasing evidence that demand for goods and services which have been traditionally produced by the private sector will no longer continue to grow at the rate which has occurred since the Second World War. This is a very important point which all of us should realise.

I do not think there is any recognition at this stage by this Government even of the possibility of its existence. There are 2 factors which lead to this: Firstly, there is a change in consumer taste resulting in an increase in the number of people reaching satisfaction with the level of goods and services which they have acquired. Secondly, there is the slow down in the rate of growth of population which will lead to a slow down in the rate of growth for demand. There is substantial evidence that the real growth sector of the economy is in the area of goods and services traditionally produced by the Government and not by the private sector. But, by the actions of this Government, the growth rate of that public sector which could well be the major growth centre in the years ahead has been effectively stifled. It has not been that this Government sees any benefit at all in the advancement of the public sector. The Opposition most certainly does not take the view that only by increasing the public sector can we restimulate the economy. We have said consistently that the private sector also must be restimulated and we took steps to do that.

The present Government is acting on the basis that only by assistance to the private sector and by completely neglecting the public sector can we hope to reactivate the economy. That has proved to be a very false assumption. If we look at the future, particularly in the short term, we can expect unemployment to rise substantially. Unfilled vacancies in seasonally adjusted terms dropped dramatically between January and March this year. They have remained constant ever since. There is now no prospect that there will be any substantial increase in unfilled vacancies by the end of this year. At the end of last year many students preferred to continue their studies because they were fearful that if thrown onto the labour market they would not be able to get work or there was very little prospect of work. Consequently, they stayed an extra year at school. But that cannot go on indefinitely. Sooner or later these students must come on to the labour market. Even this year with that assumption we can look forward—that would be the
term that the Government would use, I think, but as far as the Opposition is concerned we can look forward with great regret—to the fact that we could have an unemployment pool of around the 400 000 mark. The chances of a consumer-led recovery are decreasing every day. The impact of the Medibank levy is likely to cause a further downturn in demand. This will be further exacerbated when the effects of increased taxes and charges included in State budgets are fully felt.

Looking at the longer term I believe the situation to be far more serious. The Borrie report indicated that there will be little growth in demand arising from increases in the population. However, the number of people coming into the labour force in the next decade is likely to rise substantially. Thus the problems flowing from unemployment are likely to get much worse in the longer term. We find the Government continuing with a policy of high protection for manufacturing industry. Of course, one should always approach this matter on a selective basis but it is alleged that this policy will continue to make locally produced goods uncompetitive on world markets. This inevitably will lead to pressure for devaluation. This situation could be contrasted with the possibility of booming exports in the mining industry which would lead to pressure for revaluation. These pressures will cause increasing conflict and uncertainty unless the Government adopted policies which enable the economy to develop in a way which will allow those pressures to be absorbed. We are, in fact, living in a period when we do not at all fully appreciate the significance of the technological changes taking place about us. Technological advances could be expected in the next decade to reach a capacity to satisfy the demand for goods and services by the community. If that situation arises the policy of reliance upon growth in the private sector of the economy alone is likely to cause substantial disruption.

There are a number of measures that the Government must adopt if it is to avoid the damaging consequences of the policies that it is pursuing. Firstly, it must reverse its policy of turning off the tap in relation to Government enterprise and, I would suggest, also in relation to private enterprise. Today I addressed a question to the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator Cotton, who is in charge of this debate for the Government, concerning the money supply over the next 12 months. I asked the question deliberately because, as he knows, the rate at which that money supply will increase in this forthcoming financial year is very important. Last year the average increase was 15 per cent.

Last night, I read the Budget Speech and listened to Senator Cotton reading it with great enjoyment. In that Speech, we heard the Treasurer predicting that the increase in money supply will be between 10 per cent and 12 per cent. That means, of course, that during the next 12 months we could see the money supply increase at a minimum rate of 10 per cent which would be a 5 per cent reduction on the rate for last year.

That factor will not escape the business community in this country and I do not think it will escape the community at large. Even at the present time the business sector of the community is experiencing liquidity problems in many parts of the economy in many part of Australia. This has been brought about by the reduction in the money supply rate over the last 8 months. Now, it is to be tightened more and more over the next 12 months. That may be considered an inducement to the business community to look forward with confidence, as the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) and the Minister for Industry and Commerce exhort the business community to do, but I cannot rationalise how that could be expected of the private sector of the economy. I invite the Minister to comment on that when he speaks.

The Government must reverse its policy of turning off the tap. Even if the Government remains determined to shift resources from the public to the private sector it must at least allow that process to occur gradually. Turning off the tap is causing disruption and a waste of resources because the private sector is incapable of picking up the slack in the short term. Secondly, the Government must initiate a thorough study of the nature of demand trends. It is no use relying on policies that were adopted in 1951 and expecting them to apply in 1976. We must know more about the needs and demands of modern society if we are going to regulate it to ensure that both the private and public sectors can work together and act together in the best interests of the economy.

I suggest that we are facing a 12 month period when unemployment in this country will be far and away the worst that we have seen since 1931. I understand that projections are made by the Government each year for the ensuing 12 months; and that much of the material which was used during the course of the Budget Speech last night is based on those assumptions. It would be interesting to know what those assumptions are. I would assume that by the end of this year we shall see a figure of 400 000 people out of work. What are the assumptions of the Government up to June of next year? Is it to be 500 000
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or 600,000? None of us knows. But I suggest that the unemployment figure is going to get worse and that it is going to get worse because we have a government which is deliberately intent upon ensuring that the unemployment figure does get worse, with all the consequences that flow from that—the wasting of resources and the social and economic misery it creates for so many people. The Opposition condemns the Government for the attitudes it has taken. The Government may be assured that at every opportunity we shall continue to condemn and attack these policies whilst they are part of Government strategy.

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (4.36)—That was an interesting address which was given by the Leader of the Opposition (Senator Wriedt). During it Senator Wriedt undoubtedly canvassed what can be called 'alternative strategies' for the Australian economy. I think that he ought to know that a great number, if not all, of those strategies as I understood them, had been carefully considered and canvassed and gone through very thoroughly by the Government. No new measures have been proposed by the Opposition this afternoon. These sorts of alternative strategies are always available and they have been taken into account. They have been discarded as not being appropriate, to some extent out of date and to quite an extent relying upon old economic mythology which is no longer current. The honourable senator devoted some part of his time to the need for the Government to update its thinking and its attitudes towards future years. I am diverting slightly but I say yes; that is true; that is what the Government is about in issuing a White Paper for industry to try to see the general picture that lies ahead. It certainly will not represent a classic model for 1965 and no one should think it will. It represents an attempt to see what is going to happen and how best one can adjust one's general forecasting and programming in government developments towards that end.

Senator Wriedt devoted some little time also to the money supply. I think I ought to refer him briefly to page 37 of the Budget Speech made by the Treasurer (Mr Lynch), which, as the honourable senator said, deals quite exhaustively with that matter. One or two things might usefully be said about this. First of all, the money supply has a distinct relationship in its quantum to the size of the deficit. If the deficit can be brought down there is not the same need to expand the money supply unnecessarily. Of itself, expanding the money supply leads to inflation. This Government has directed its mind to reducing inflation.

If we do intend to take this debate seriously we should look at the Budget Speech. At first when I read the motion I wondered whether this was a serious attempt to do something about the present situation or whether it was just a light-hearted piece of Wednesday afternoon frivolity. Honourable senators could well direct their attention to the money supply situation about which the Treasurer is quite definite. The Budget Speech states:

. . . a Budget outcome of the kind foreshadowed here, along with other factors affecting the financial system, could be consistent with growth in the broadly defined volume of money (M3) in the 10-12 per cent range during 1976-77.

That range, which is subject to the usual hazards of forecasting, will no doubt change over time as circumstances unfold.

Depending upon those circumstances it could also be necessary and appropriate for policy to be adjusted in the light of events as they develop.

With a sensible deficit, the need for the Government to go into the market to try to get money for its own purposes is reduced. With an inflation rate coming down to much lower figures, money supply needs reduce accordingly. It is very likely that with an inflation rate running at about 17 per cent or 18 per cent, as it was, with deficits moving towards $5,000m, we would have money supply expansion problems of great magnitude.

Once things come back into balance, inflation starts to fall, deficits come down and the money supply can be brought to much more sensible terms. It is the general view that what is needed is a money supply position moving slightly above what can be regarded as the inflation rate. If that position can be reached then the whole thing will run reasonable well. If that position is not reached, if governments go mad and spend much more than their resources, then the printing presses go to work and the country is flooded with money. That is part of the overall problem, and if the Opposition is serious in its concern then by all means let us have some serious discussions about it from time to time.

The motion contains some comments about business confidence and unemployment. One asks: What are we really talking about? What is all this supposed to mean? Let us take business confidence. We have heard this afternoon predictions from Senator Wriedt, as one voice crying in the wilderness, but last night and this morning we had the benefit of comments from practically every economic soothsayer and teller of entrails around Australia. The general view which has come out this morning has been almost universal. This is a good Budget, a sensible Budget, a Budget designed to restore business confidence.
Let us consider what appeared in this morning’s Press. The *Financial Review* is a journal not noted for commending any government. It takes the view that it is the logical alternative Treasury and alternative economic adviser to whatever government might be in office. In its editorial today the *Financial Review* covers all the criticisms of the Budget that are likely to be raised and it adds:

These criticisms are offered because they tend to detract from the overall strategy outlined by Mr Lynch, a strategy which is the best one for Australia at the moment and if persevered with in an intelligent and non-dogmatic fashion will see Australia on the mend.

The Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia stated that it is a bold, counter-inflationary Budget. The Stock Exchanges in Melbourne and Sydney report very buoyant trading on mining and industrial stocks. It is a reasonable judgment that the business community, the media and the *Financial Review* are better judges of the Budget’s capacity to improve business and employment than Senator Georges and his colleagues. It is likely that that is the case.

I thought that after about an hour and 35 minutes last night the Opposition would have had enough of me, and I was therefore stunned to learn at about midday today that the exercise was to run on again. I said to myself when I saw this urgency motion: ‘It is not my job to run the Opposition, but what a way to go on!’ The Budget came down last night. It is a huge document and has an enormous amount of data attached to it. There is a massive amount of work involved, and yet the Opposition has launched an attack without reflection and without study. It has jumped straight into the water and started to drown. Why would it do that? Would not the Opposition normally put out the Budget for study and give a lot of intelligent thought to it? The normal process would be to come back in a week’s time and give a reasoned answer. It seems to me that that would have been a much more constructive contribution to debate in this area. The Government has said many times, both publicly and in this place, that one cannot knock something down in 3 years and then get it back into shape in about the same period of time. The public voted for this Government to take action to try to tidy up the mess, and this Government has been about that business as a matter of general policy. The first job is to tidy things up; the second is to create some stability; the third is to get some expansion, growth and development following the tidying up and stability phases. As the Government has always said, it will take some time to do that and there is a lot involved. Nobody is ever reluctant to listen to other viewpoints, whether in the Parliament or outside. If one is wrong one wants to know where one is wrong, but one is not necessarily wrong when somebody in the Parliament says so.

The Budget needs to go out for study, it needs to go out for checking. As a group, members of the Government have spent 8 months in this exercise of Budget framework. Honourable senators on both sides of this chamber have been engaged in Budget framing in earlier years and they know the sequence of timing. The work was done very quickly and close to the time of the Budget. The Government began this exercise last January, scrutinising expenditure, identifying systems, looking at administration, making every attempt possible to get the previous Government’s over-exertions in the community back into balance. I have never before in government been involved in such a long job, constructing such a solid and sensible position for a country. Those of us on the Government side who have been involved are extremely proud of the hard work, the consultation, the thorough development and the intelligent approach to all the examinations that have taken place. Every possible proposition was looked at and put under study. Nobody came in and said: ‘That is what you have to do and you have to take my word for it’. Any Government department involved had its views checked and by no means won everything for which it asked. Nobody did. This was a considered job and a solid job and it was done thoroughly. That is the situation.

Some general comments have been made about unemployment. Mr Hawke made some statements to which I will refer a little later. One thing to which I should like to refer now is the joint Press statement issued on 12 June 1976 at the time of the Government-union talks. I will not read the whole of the statement but only enough of it to be helpful. It states:

Representatives of the Government and the ACTU and other peak national Trade Union Councils met in Canberra over the last 2 days.

The meetings were chaired throughout by the Prime Minister.

The Trade Union representatives were led by the President of the ACTU, Mr Hawke.

A full list of those attending is attached.

The discussions were wide-ranging, frank and cordial.

As I was involved, I can confirm that. They were most constructive. It is a pity that that did not last. When it came to consideration of the economy the joint communiqué—issued by everybody, not just by one person—stated:
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The discussions traversed the present state of the economy, the Government's overall strategies and its assessment of the future.

There was common concern about the present problems of the economy and agreement on the fundamental objectives to be sought. These included the reduction of inflation, the resumption of economic growth and a return to full employment.

Both sides recognised that under the present extraordinary economic conditions, there is an inter-relationship between inflation and the level of unemployment.

Most people who study this matter and are concerned about it have come to understand that if one wishes to fix a country which is in the mess Australia is in, a prime target has to be selected. On anybody's test, the prime target here would have to be inflation, and that must be the principal aim of the Government. If that can be fixed then unemployment can be fixed, but unemployment will not be fixed by the Government attempting to spend its way out. The inflationary spiral would be resumed once again and that would put the country into worse trouble. Hard as it is, those are the economic facts of life, which I think the communique illustrates.

Last night a very detailed Budget Speech was presented. There will be plenty of opportunity, both in the community and in this Parliament, to debate quite thoroughly the issues involved in that Budget Speech, and without any doubt the strategies set out have been adopted after consultation and discussion. If they should be proved to need adjustment as time goes on, any sensible government would make such adjustments as the facts disclose to be necessary. What cannot be done with a sick country, any more than with a sick person, is to say every day: 'They tell me you are dying, dear' or 'Do you feel well? You look much sicker than I thought you were'. A country is fixed up by recognising that it is sick and adopting methods to bring it into a state of health. That is done by constructive work. It is not done by screaming calamity and panic every 3 minutes of the day.

I listened last night with some fascination to the comments on unemployment made by the reportedly aspiring Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and I will take this opportunity to correct some of those misstatements of fact. Mr Hawke made some statements which are to be deplored for their inaccuracy. Mr Whitlam in his comments has joined in that level of inaccuracy. Either Mr Hawke has deliberately distorted the projections for the labour market as contained in Budget Statement No. 2 or he has made the kind of basic error that shows nothing other than gross incompetence.

Let me state here and now that there is nothing in the Budget figures that can lead one to the conclusion that the unemployment rate at the end of the financial year will be higher than it is now. As Budget Statement No. 2 indicates, the average level of employment during 1976-77 as a whole is expected to be 1 to 2 per cent greater than the average level of employment in 1975-76. But the number of people employed will be more than 2 per cent greater in June 1977 than it was in June 1976. During the same period—that is, between June 1976 and June 1977—the labour force is projected to grow by about 2 per cent. In brief, employment will grow by more than 2 per cent over the financial year while the labour force will not grow by more than 2 per cent over the same period. That means there will be a gradual reduction in the rate of unemployment although little of this reduction will appear during the calendar year 1976.

I listened to what Mr Hawke said last night. That is why I have asked this material to be prepared for me by Treasury officers. Either Mr Hawke has deliberately or because of incompetence compared 2 different concepts. He has compared the average level of employment during the year with the movement over a 12-month period. A precise reading of Budget Statement No. 2 makes nonsense of the claims that Mr Hawke and the Opposition in the Senate have made that the Budget is based on an increasing level of unemployment over the course of the financial year.

Let me give some more detail in relation to unemployment because this is the matter brought forward in this fairly specious motion. The first point to bear in mind is this: Every Budget strategy has to suffer from overrun of previous events. This cannot be avoided. It is true in our case as the present Government, it was true in the case of the Opposition when it was in government and it would be true in relation to any other government. It is the previous Labor Government and not the present Government that stands indicted for the destruction of full employment in Australia. What are the figures? The average rate of unemployment in Australia between 1963 and 1972 was 1.3 per cent of the workforce. In December 1972 when the Whitlam Government came to office, the level of unemployment was 1.8 per cent of the workforce. In December 1975, after 3 years of the Whitlam policies, the level of unemployment had reached 5.6 per cent of the workforce. The Government has said repeatedly that the answer to the problem of unemployment lies in the control of inflation. This year's Budget forms one part—a central part—in a coherent set
of policies designed to bring down inflation to a single digit rate by the end of this financial year.

This Budget provides for an increase in the level of employment greater than the prospective rise in the size of the workforce, as I explained in trying to point out to Mr Hawke that some of his figures were wrong. Employment can be expected to increase over the course of the financial year by some 2 per cent compared with a decline of one-half of 1 per cent last financial year. New employment opportunities are being created. I think that gives honourable senators the general picture. Also, some comment was made by Senator Wriedt which I have endeavoured to remember about economic growth rates. The Budget presumes that the expansion rate in non-farm product will be of the order of 4 per cent. Of course, that percentage is yet to be realised. But let us bear in mind one thing: The actual performance during 1975, the last calendar year of the Whitlam Government, brought about a net decline in the non-farm product. If we can bring about a situation of decreasing inflation, an improvement in people's expectations, and an improving employment situation, there is a really good prospect that the 4 per cent growth rate can be realised. Indeed, the position could be much better if there was a unified effort within the country rather than these rows which are presently occurring all the time. That of itself would lead to a great improvement in the employment capacities of Australia and a return to sense and development in this country which has been absent from our affairs for some 4 years now.

Business investment was also mentioned in this motion moved by the Opposition. When the Government came to office it was faced with the results of the most serious downturn in private investment that had occurred since the Second World War. As the record shows, new investment in plant and equipment had fallen in real terms in two out of the three years of the Whitlam Government. In fact, real business fixed investment was at its lowest level for almost 3 years in the December quarter of last year. As a result of our policies, total business fixed capital expenditure rose by 7 per cent in seasonally adjusted terms during the June quarter of this year following a small increase in the March quarter. There is now a strong recovery in new investment in plant and equipment.

I can itemise some examples from the work in which I have been involved. I ask honourable senators to look at the investment programs announced for the motor vehicle industry. The people who make these decisions have alternatives all around the world. However, some people are showing great confidence in Australia. Some real money is being laid out on plant and expansion developments in the motor vehicle industry and in the chemical industry in Geelong. There are many cases I could cite. There are quite a lot of others that I do not talk about because they are confidential between me and the people concerned. I talk about such projects only when they become realities. But honourable senators have heard some realities announced recently. Economic recovery is beginning throughout the Australian scene. It is beginning as would be expected, that is, in an uneven form. Nonetheless, it is on the way. Investment in new plant and equipment increased by 12 per cent in the June quarter following a rise of 8 per cent during the March quarter. So there is this general upturn in capital investment. Whether the Opposition likes it or not, what we need to get this country going again is a mixture of capital investment and a return to the situation of people buying things because they are no longer frightened of inflation. This is all part of the scene. But we will not see that position develop if people believe that inflation will get worse and not better. They expect governments to manage things, to take the tough decisions and to do the job properly. The first thing they expect is for governments to be responsible in their own expenditures. That is what they have expected of us and it is what we have set out to do. So I say to Opposition members: Do not condemn us for something which is a necessary essential for any form of recovery in this country. Without any doubt at all, this country went on a mad spending spree when we had no capacity to finance that spree. We are still living with some of the overrun of that situation.

What are the facts about this motion? Honourable senators can read it if they want to. I read it once and it did not do anything for me. The Budget was presented last night. Honourable senators have the data before them. It is an immense construction. It is the most thorough and detailed Budget that I can recall. Let us look at some of the highlights of that Budget. Family allowances have been increased. There will be full personal income tax indexation. There will be the removal of the property means test for pensioners. Pension rates will be adjusted automatically for movements in the consumer price index. There will be the first stage of company tax indexation. There will be a relaxation of distribution requirements for private companies to help the small business area which employs
many people and which has been involved in a series of very great problems. The Budget introduces taxation concessions for mining and petroleum exploration companies to get them moving again. It includes the abolition of the $2 per barrel levy on crude oil from new discoveries. There will be the first stage of the abolition of the nonsensical coal export duty. The exemption level for estate duties will be lifted very substantially where the estate passes to the surviving spouse. Rural industries have been helped. There are new schemes of income equalisation for farmers. The Budget includes assistance to the beef and dairy industries, an increase in the minimum reserve price for wool and expenditure on rural reconstruction. There is to be a housing voucher experiment and a 3-year program of assistance for aged persons homes and hostels. The Budget also includes a 3-year program of assistance to handicapped people and an increase in payments to the States and to local government authorities. There will be restraint in the Commonwealth's own area of employment and expenditure.

What the Commonwealth has set out to do is to restrain its activities in the public sector in order to be competent and responsible in its own house and to make available those resources for use, spending and development in the community by people who can do things for themselves, not by people told what to do by some all-powerful, all-wise government located at a great distance from them. I suggest to honourable senators that this strategy is the right strategy. I suggest that it is the one which ought to be supported. If we do that, the economic position in the country will come back into balance and common sense. Living standards will improve. The employment position will improve very greatly. Inflation will be reduced substantially and we will return to a common sense position. We will get back to a better deal for all Australians. This Government is dedicated—it has stated this quite clearly—to a proper social attitude towards all the Australian people and to the restoration of the confidence of all Australian people in their country and in its future.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND (New South Wales) (5.0)—The Senate is debating the following motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, Senator Wriedt:

That in the opinion of the Senate the following is a matter of urgency:

The Government's economic policies which are producing increased unemployment and undermining business confidence.

I gathered from Senator Cotton's remarks, in speaking on behalf of the Government and in his capacity as Minister representing the Treasurer in this place, that so far as he is concerned unemployment—and growing unemployment—is not a serious matter for Australians. The simple fact is that, whilst Ministers can come in here, briefed by Treasury officers, and rattle off statistics, recite percentages and talk in economic jargon, unemployment is a very serious matter for hundreds of thousands of Australian people who previously were in the work force.

Senator Jessop—Put out of work when your Party was in Government.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND—Senator Jessop says that these people were put out of work by our Government. The simple fact is that the seasonally adjusted unemployment figures for July—last month—are the highest since the Depression. The present Government has had some 9 months now in which to correct that deficiency; but, rather than correct it, unemployment is growing. For 8 months in this Parliament honourable senators opposite have blamed the Whitlam Labor Government. For a long time they have got stuck into the trade union movement. Since 1 May, when the Wran Labor Government was elected to office in New South Wales, they have found another excuse. The simple fact of the matter is that members of the Government Parties have been in charge of this nation's affairs and destiny since 13 December 1975 and all that they have done, irrespective of their policies, is continue inflation and create more unemployment.

I am not standing here, for the time being, to debate the Government's economic strategy; that debate will come next week. I am here to relate my remarks to the terms of the motion concerning increased unemployment. We all remember that during the course of the last Federal election one of the cries of the Liberal and National Country Parties—to their eternal shame—was to get the dole bludgers back to work. In exacerbation of that offensive and insulting phrase members of the Government Parties added that if people really wanted to work in this country they could find work. In other words, clearly members of the Government Parties implied that they knew the answers to inflation and unemployment. Now that they are in office they find, as they must find, that the overwhelming majority of people who are out of work are out of work because they cannot in fact get work. The reason that they cannot get work is the economic policies that have been practised to date by the Fraser Government.
Let me refer to the statement brought down by the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) on 20 May relating to fiscal policy decisions. That statement said that there were sufficient signs then for believing that economic recovery was underway. Three months later, with unemployment rising and the consumer price index rising, we still hear statements made in much the same sort of parrot fashion, such as the statement made last night that recovery is now getting underway, that the private sector is growing again and that confidence is gradually returning. I would have thought that if confidence were gradually returning and if the private sector were growing again job opportunities would be available. In the last parliamentary recess I travelled extensively, practically all over New South Wales, the State that I represent in this Parliament and the State that Senator Cotton also represents. If he had gone round New South Wales as I have and had been to places such as Newcastle, Wollongong, Lithgow and the other industrialised cities, he would know that unemployment is in a very critical and crisis situation. The percentage of unemployment in the great industrial city of Newcastle is of the order of 12 per cent. People who are registering for employment on the North Coast of New South Wales are being asked to go to Whyalla in South Australia in order to get jobs. When they go to Whyalla they find that jobs are not available. The Government has exacerbated that problem in the last week by making the decision that it has made on the shipbuilding industry.

Far from turning the lights on as members of the Government Parties undertook to do, they have dimmed the horizons of many hundreds of thousands of young men and women in this community. As I have said, I represent New South Wales. I have already said that members of the Government Parties are finding other people to blame. A headline in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of last Saturday stated: 'PM blames Wran for Australian rise in jobless'. The article stated:

The Prime Minister claims that employment prospects in New South Wales are being hindered by the Premier, Mr Wran. Mr Fraser said today that Mr Wran would do well to remember that every wage increase granted today meant that the chance of creating a new job tomorrow was diminished. He called on the Premier to be more consistent, noting that Mr Wran 'argues for maximum increases in wages on the one hand and for more jobs on the other...'.

Ironically, on the same page is an article concerning the New South Wales Minister for Industrial Relations. The headline reads: 'Hills backs pay decision'. The article states:

The New South Wales Minister for Industrial Relations, Mr Hills, said yesterday he supported the Arbitration Commission's decision in the national wage case on Thursday. In contrast to the strong reaction against the Commission by many union leaders, Mr Hills said the decision 'may have avoided the destruction of wage indexation'.

On that very page the Prime Minister of this country is shown to be at fault in blaming the New South Wales Government. What are some of the figures for New South Wales? The unemployment figure throughout Australia is now about 4.4 per cent; but in New South Wales, because it is a heavy industrial State and has relied extensively for employment on capital works programs financed by the Commonwealth Government—which, as we all know, as a result of this Government's policies have been cut—the unemployment rate is running at 5.1 per cent. On a seasonally adjusted basis the unemployment figure throughout Australia is 6.2 per cent, whereas in New South Wales it is 8.1 per cent. New South Wales—that great industrial State, the most populous State of Australia—now accounts for 42 per cent of all unemployment in Australia. From June 1976 to July 1976 the number of unemployed in my State increased by 4870, making the total number of people unemployed in New South Wales as at the end of July 115997; that is after the Treasurer's fiscal statement of 20 May, which was said to have been introduced in order to bring confidence in the community, to reduce inflation and to create more job opportunities.

Clearly the Government's economic strategy, as it has been practised to date, is completely at fault. We are also told that great confidence is coming back into industry. A tremendous number of people are out of work in the building industry in New South Wales, and that is one of the best barometers of the economy generally. I am told by the Building Workers Industrial Union in New South Wales that it has on its books 600 apprentices and 8000 adult building workers out of work. In Queensland, the State which Senator McAuliffe represents, I am told by the Building Workers Industrial Union that in the last 12 months some 2500 building workers have been put off work on Queensland public works construction activities. Whilst I am concerned particularly with unemployment in my State, it surely is clearly the result of the economic policies pursued by this Government that there is this deleterious and critical employment situation existing throughout the whole of Australia.

I have quoted some figures relating to the building industry but if there is any confidence returning to the community I would have
thought it would be showing up in the retail industry, particularly after the ministerial statement on 20 May indicated that everything was supposed to be coming rosy again. If there is any guide to consumer demand increasing I would say unhesitatingly that it would be in the retail trade. The Shop Distributors Association in the New South Wales Branch of the Australian Workers Union tells me that in the retail industry in my State between 17 June and 13 August 2500 people were retrenched. We all know that even the staff of David Jones Pty Ltd in Canberra is talking of holding a stop work meeting because of retrenchments that are to occur. The many retail traders to whom I have spoken throughout an extensive part of New South Wales have clearly indicated to me that in terms of the spending power of people there are no signs of any consumer confidence returning. Let me now refer to something the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser) said on the program A Current Affair on 9 August 1976 when he was interviewed by Mr Michael Schildberger. If anyone thinks that Mr Michael Schildberger has any affiliation with the Australian Labor Party I suggest that they look at the program from time to time. Mr Schildberger, on the Current Affair program 8 days ago on 9 August 1976, asked Mr Fraser:

Are you concerned about the fact that your economic measures mightn’t be working quite the way you’d hoped that they should?

Mr Fraser replied:

I believe they are working. Overtime being worked has been rising slowly but steadily. Retail sales, especially sales of the motor industry, are going forward strongly, strongly for the motor industry. Steady improvement in retail sales, but not spectacular.

Let me repeat this. Mr Fraser said:

Retail sales, especially sales of the motor industry, are going forward strongly, strongly for the motor industry.

Last Sunday the Sydney Sun-Herald on page 3 had an article headed ‘Alarm at “Serious” Slump in Car Sales’. The article stated:

New and used car sales in Australia have slumped by a disastrous 30 to 50 per cent, according to an official survey.

The survey confirms fears that Australia is not emerging as quickly as hoped from the worst economic downturn since the Depression.

Economists regard motor industry consumer spending as a key pointer in gauging economic recovery.

I suggest that the Ministers in this Government and those who advise them economically, the officers of the Treasury, should be talking to people in the retail industry to see whether in fact consumer confidence is returning, because it is not, and quite clearly because of the Government’s economic failures, unemployment is increasing in this country.

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria—Minister for Social Security) (5.15)—We are discussing the matters of increased unemployment and business confidence which have been brought before the Senate by the Opposition today. As was said by Senator Cotton, it is extraordinary that on the day after the introduction of the Budget we should be discussing in these terms most vital aspects of the economic policy that was placed before the people of Australia last night by the Treasurer (Mr Lynch). The Budget is a Budget for confidence and a Budget for reform. It should be said at the start that when this Government came into office Australia was still locked in its most serious post-war recession. That quite unnecessary calamity was the product of 3 years of Labor Government. The economy had been shaken to its foundations. During the past 8 months the Government has been giving all its attention to an economic strategy that will provide the basis for confidence, for reform and for recovery. So to bring to our attention today the matters of unemployment and business confidence provides a very timely opportunity for the Government to discuss these matters. I would have expected such a debate to originate in the Budget debate itself when the opportunity could be taken to pursue matters of expenditure, the strategy of the Budget, and to examine closely the related Budget papers.

It should be said that unemployment is a matter of serious consequence to the Government. To have under employed in our community the opportunities that can be taken by people who can give their work and their skill is something that must diminish what we are able to do as a nation. Regard for what personally is hardship to the numbers of people who are unemployed we believe is a basic responsibility of government. All our efforts in the past 8 months have been directed towards the document that was introduced last night by the Treasurer and some of the things in it should be stressed again and again in the coming weeks. However, today I think it is important to look at some of the statements that have been made by honourable senators opposite, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr E. G. Whitlam) and the leader of the trade union movement and ask ourselves whether they have addressed themselves seriously to the matter of unemployment and whether they understand some of the basic economic truths which surround it.
One of the truths which they ignore is the fact that unemployment, inflation and wage restraint are absolutely interrelated. The level of unemployment and inflation which an economy has to accept depends ultimately upon the degree of wage restraint that can be imposed upon and practised by trade unions and employers. The present level of unemployment and inflation arises from the wages explosion which was permitted, and perhaps encouraged, in the past 3 years and this is notable when we look at some figures which tell our own story. In the 2 years 1973 and 1974 earnings rose by almost 50 per cent compared with a productivity increase of less than 5 per cent in the same period. We can argue about levels of profits and wages and perhaps people in different situations have different views but when we look at figures which show that earnings rose by 50 per cent and productivity by less than 5 per cent, any fairminded person will see that that is something which has caused many of the problems we are discussing today.

Whenever wage levels increase beyond the level of productivity labour must inevitably price itself out of the market. It prices itself out of jobs and services and prices itself out of being able to compete in any way with our overseas competitors for the purchasing power even of our own consumers. This is what has happened and I think it was acknowledged by Senator Douglas McClelland when he talked about the consumer resistance that there has been and the lack of consumer recovery which the retail trade is experiencing. When employers are driven to reduce their demand for labour in an effort to reduce spiralling costs you have a diminished number of jobs available.

The impact of excessive wage costs on job opportunities is most clearly seen in the area of overseas trade, and currently the labour costs, and therefore the price of finished products in Australia, have risen much more rapidly than has been the case with most of our overseas competitors. We therefore have competition for our consumers coming from those overseas competitors and we also are unable to export our products and find that overseas market that can add considerably to what we should be able to achieve.

There has also been a new phenomenon and one that has to be seriously considered. Not only have we reduced job opportunities in this country; we are also seeing a growing tendency by those who are prepared and have the capacity to invest and to manufacture to export that capacity to an overseas situation. Literally, instead of exporting products we have exported jobs and this is the real problem that faces the people of Australia. Any country which wishes to see a growth in its economy would be talking about exporting its products. What has happened in this country is that we have exported our jobs. People who are prepared to take mass manufacturing opportunities are finding that wage levels in other countries are more likely to give a profitable return and also give a better chance to compete.

We do see as the greatest obstacle to a lasting reduction in unemployment the behaviour of our labour force itself, very often misled by militant trade union officials who seem unable or unwilling to accept that demands for increases which it is beyond the capacity of industry to pay have a detrimental effect on job opportunities. This is the very serious matter that has had the attention of the Government when setting its economic strategy. As mentioned by Senator Cotton, some of the statements made last night by, for instance, the leader of the trade union movement, Mr Hawke, and others, are to be deplored in the strongest terms. What we want to see is cooperation between the worker who is offering his services and the employer who is offering the job opportunity. Until we can find some reconciliation of interest between those 2 forces we are not going to find the increases in numbers of jobs that we all want to see.

Statement No. 2, The Budget and the Economy, which accompanied the Budget Speech last night, did indicate the expected average level of employment during 1976 as showing an increase of 1 per cent or 2 per cent over the average level of employment last year. It is important that we look at that statement because some misunderstanding or misinterpretation of it has been expressed in the past few hours. On page 25 of that statement there is specific reference to the labour market. Whilst Senator Douglas McClelland might have said that we used the figures, the advice and the expertise of our Treasury officials, it should be said that all the work surrounding the preparation of this Budget has involved the skills of those people with the facts and statistics at their disposal. It also involved the expertise of people out in the manufacturing and industrial sectors. It involved the capacity of those who deal directly with consumers in order that the Government could put together a strategy which will overcome the difficulties we are experiencing. Statement No. 2 specifically contains these words:

Product growth of the order projected above would probably be accompanied by growth in productivity of more than
half of that amount. Employment growth then appears likely to be of the order of 1-2 per cent for the year as a whole although a faster rate of growth, more than 2 per cent, over the year is implied.

That is a very important statement when looking at the employment opportunities for this coming year. The concluding paragraph in Statement No. 2 is:

Needless to say, the picture in all respects would be better, the more rapidly the present inflation rate were wound down. The chief determinant of this during 1976-77 will be the extent to which the increase in money wages can be held below the inherited increase in prices. A more favourable outcome in this respect than that which has been taken for the purposes of the assumptions set out earlier would result, in time, in a sharper recovery in activity, a greater growth in employment and a more substantial inroad into present levels of unemployment.

That is one economic statement which is of great significance and which should have our attention as we proceed through the Budget debate. This means that there will be a gradual reduction in the rate of unemployment if we achieve the 1 per cent or 2 per cent growth rate that has been predicted. What Mr Hawke and others have done, either deliberately or through their own incompetence, is to compare 2 different things, as was said by Senator Cotton—the average level of employment during the year with the movement over a 12 months’ period.

I think I said at the beginning of my speech that we stress that this is a Budget to provide the opportunity for business confidence. Naturally we were pleased today when organisations such as the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia and the Metal Trades Industry Association told us that the Budget provided a strategy on which they could work for some improvement. They believe it is a Budget that tackles the real problem of inflation which faces Australia. It is fair to say that the Associated Chambers of Manufactures of Australia said it believed that the assistance that had been given to industry was rather modest. I think that what ought to be said is that our strategy is that there should be a gradual and steady recovery. That is the way in which we hope these things will take effect. In this connection I think it is significant to repeat the words of the Treasurer when he highlighted some of the conclusions of the Ministerial meeting of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. That meeting said:

... because of inadequate investment in past years in some countries and in certain basic industries, there is a risk of supply bottlenecks at a comparatively early stage of the recovery. In most countries, policies should be directed more towards promoting investment rather than consumption. In many cases, this will require an appropriate recovery of profits from the depressed levels of recent years.

On that basis we have taken action which we considered was required both to stimulate investment and to restrain the rise in public expenditure. These are things which can be ventilated during the coming weeks in speeches which will obviously have our attention in this House. I think at this stage it is rather too early for many honourable senators to be coming to the sorts of conclusions implied in the motion before the Senate.

I want to say something about our strategy on wages because I believe it is of great importance. It will be recalled that in February we put forward a view to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission that full indexation would not be the best way in which we could see economic recovery in this country. At that time our strategy was not understood or not accepted by a vast majority of the Australian people, notably the members of the trade union movement. It is fair to say that in our more recent submission to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission it was more widely understood that full indexation was not the way in which we would have the most immediate recovery or the most sustained recovery. Many of the things we said in our latest submission are important when read in conjunction with the strategy of our Budget which was presented last night. The Government is concerned about the growing incidence of claims in the non-wage area. I refer to the current claims for a 35-hour week and improved long service leave entitlements. All these things that are requested on behalf of trade union members are difficulties which need to be faced when placed beside the increases in costs of production that can be consequential upon them. The Government has taken many initiatives to steer the economy on the path of firmly based recovery, and basic to such recovery is the need to curb inflation. We believe that we should be stressing our efforts to wind down further the rate of inflation as quickly as possible, to ensure that the process of economic recovery which is beginning is in no way thwarted and to reverse the more recent tendency for labour costs in the Australian economy to increase more quickly than those of its major trading partners.

Senator KEEFFE (Queensland) (5.30)—I rise in this debate to support the motion which has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Wriedt). I do not propose to
comment on the remarks of earlier speakers but I want to make some comments on the statements made by the Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle). I am amazed that she can treat this subject lightly, as one which is rather humourous to her and one on which she can score political points. The Minister is probably one of the wealthiest persons in this Parliament, certainly in this chamber. She has never known hunger. She has never known what it is to go without. She has never seen kids dying in slums and places like that where they are not able to get a reasonable meal.

Senator Teyhan—Is that the best you can do?

Senator KEEFFE—I know this is a big joke to some honourable senators opposite but it is no joke to senators on this side of the chamber. The Minister is the lady who coined the term 'dole bludger' because apparently that is the sort of description honourable senators opposite like to apply. She set a work test that cannot be complied with. So, if a breadwinner is not able to get a day's work, his kids are not able to get a meal. Yet the Minister can lightly make remarks of the kind that we have just heard.

Senator Chaney—What about Senator Guilfoyle's family allowance?

Senator KEEFFE—If the honourable senator wants to interject we will deal with him in a moment. Senator Guilfoyle this week refused to see a delegation of women because no good purpose would be served; that is what one of her staff said to the delegation. They wanted to talk to her about being hungry and not having homes. She refused to see them. That was not the only delegation she refused to meet this week.

Senator Guilfoyle—I rise to take a point of order, Madam Acting Deputy President. I have no knowledge of the matter concerning my refusal to see a delegation of women, to which the honourable senator is referring. If statements of that nature are to be made, I think there should be some other statement that would support what the honourable senator is saying. Parliament has been in session for one day. I have no knowledge of any delegation of women which has asked to see me today which has not been seen. I think the honourable senator should give further facts if he is to continue to make statements of that nature.

Senator KEEFFE—I would be absolutely delighted to do so. One group to which I refer is a delegation of Aboriginal women which wanted to see you yesterday and which you refused to see. If you want written statements on the matter, I will get them.

Senator Guilfoyle—A delegation of Aboriginal women came to see me today. If that is the matter to which the honourable senator is referring—

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT (Senator Coleman)—Order! The Minister is making a personal explanation. That can be made at the end of this speech.

Senator KEEFFE—I think those points ought to be made known. This situation is not only happening with the Minister for Social Security; it is happening with six or seven other Ministers. They refuse to see people unless they are the types of people whom they personally want to see.

In addition I believe there is a responsibility, following the type of speech that the Minister made, to point out that what she obviously wants is a freezing of wages but not a freezing of profits. If that is part of the continuing saga of the actions of these people on the other side who gained office by dubious methods, let me point out what was reported in the annual survey by W. D. Scott & Co. The survey reported that seven out of ten business executives do not believe there will be a business recovery this year. Not one in five companies will engage more employees before Christmas. This is illustrative of the so-called new confidence on the part of business about which the Minister and some previous speakers on the other side of the chamber have been speaking. One company in ten will increase overtime but three companies in ten will reduce overtime by the end of the year. If that is the sort of business confidence that the new Government is introducing I think it is a pretty disgraceful state of affairs. The Government should stop hoodwinking Australia and itself.

During the election campaign in 1975 from 11 November to 13 December, the caretaker Prime Minister, Mr Malcolm Fraser, said that the economy would be maintained by spending on social security and that social security services, in particular, would be maintained. Yet the Minister for Social Security was the first to try to take the $40 funeral benefit from the relatives of deceased pensioners. It was only as a result of Government senators crossing the floor that the benefit provided by these lousy few dollars has been retained. The caretaker Prime Minister said that inflation would be reduced. Of course, inflation has not been reduced. In fact, there has been an effective increase of about 2 per cent since the Government took office.

Senator Messner—Oh, rubbish.
Senator KEEFFE—You do not read your tables properly. The Government certainly has not reduced the rate of inflation. The drastic reduction in the deficit that was to take place within the first 3 months has not occurred. The Government was going to reduce unemployment, but this has not happened. In fact, the level of unemployment has increased steadily since the Government took office. Increased unemployment results in tremendous pressure on those still employed not to demand wage increases. This is Liberal-National Country Party policy used to dominate and control the Australian worker. The extent to which conservatives will go to create increased unemployment is given witness by their decision to bring in an increasing number of migrants when there are no houses, no medical facilities, no schools and, worst of all, no jobs for those persons. The philosophy behind this policy is frightening. By increasing the pool of unemployed direct pressure is brought to bear on those who are employed to do what they are told when they are told or face the consequences. Unemployment was falling when this Government came to office and it fell during the three or four months after October. Since then unemployment has been increasing. In a moment I will ask leave to incorporate some tables in Hansard to prove the facts about which I have been speaking.

During the 1975-76 Budget Speech debates, that is the Hayden Budget, when honourable senators opposite were so busy trying to wreck this country—I am speaking now not in political terms but in economic terms as that was part of their plan—they quoted inflation and unemployment as the prime problems facing this country. In the course of those debates, Senator Withers said:

The people want an end to inflation. They want an end to the horrors of unemployment.

Together with all other honourable senators opposite, including Senator Lajovic who is opening his mouth trying to interject, Senator Withers tried to create these conditions in which they are now revelling. It is about time they had a good look at themselves. At that time, Senator Webster, a representative of the National Country Party, stated:

I would say that the first thing that needs to be done in our community at the moment is to see that jobs are provided.

Senator Cotton said:

I find it hard, really, to contain my total hostility. When we left government unemployment was almost negligible.

Of course, when that Government left office on 2 December 1972 unemployment was in fact over 100 000. I have a table which sets out a number of details in relation to savings bank deposits and persons registered for unemployment and I seek leave to have this table and two other tables dealing with unemployment figures incorporated in Hansard.

The ACTING DEPUTY PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(The documents read as follows)—

SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS AND PERSONS REGISTERED FOR EMPLOYMENT 1966 TO 1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Savings bank deposits</th>
<th>Persons registered for employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>$5,114.7</td>
<td>67,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>5,165.4</td>
<td>57,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>5,351.8</td>
<td>54,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>5,464.7</td>
<td>61,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>5,535.8</td>
<td>76,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>5,648.5</td>
<td>66,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>5,887.7</td>
<td>59,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>6,017.7</td>
<td>65,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>6,061.6</td>
<td>81,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>6,158.9</td>
<td>66,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>6,338.0</td>
<td>54,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>6,461.1</td>
<td>63,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>6,522.9</td>
<td>74,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>6,609.1</td>
<td>56,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>6,846.9</td>
<td>45,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>6,965.7</td>
<td>57,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>6,946.2</td>
<td>64,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>7,013.3</td>
<td>49,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>7,206.5</td>
<td>48,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>7,358.0</td>
<td>62,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>7,401.5</td>
<td>76,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>7,530.7</td>
<td>64,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>7,807.2</td>
<td>63,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>7,991.6</td>
<td>89,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>8,045.2</td>
<td>114,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>8,234.8</td>
<td>96,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>8,713.8</td>
<td>94,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>9,172.5</td>
<td>109,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>9,562.1</td>
<td>108,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>9,969.9</td>
<td>80,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>10,636.2</td>
<td>68,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>10,836.9</td>
<td>78,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>10,963.7</td>
<td>100,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>11,077.6</td>
<td>77,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>11,196.4</td>
<td>107,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>11,733.7</td>
<td>202,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>12,137.9</td>
<td>293,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>12,485.2</td>
<td>233,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>13,195.3</td>
<td>248,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>13,851.3</td>
<td>280,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>14,156.8</td>
<td>308,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>14,527.9</td>
<td>264,053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Quarterly figures are calculated as the simple average of the monthly figures for the three months in each quarter.
UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES (unadjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>1974-75 figure</th>
<th>1974-75 percentage of workforce</th>
<th>1975-76 figure</th>
<th>1975-76 percentage of workforce</th>
<th>Percentage change of 1976 figure on 1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>266 998</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>328 705</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>+23.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>311 596</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>343 939</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>+10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>297 747</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>303 739</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>+2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>270 784</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>276 010</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>+2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>265 356</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>268 003</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>+1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>248 064</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>258 905</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>+4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>245 975</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>265 251</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>+7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>251 622</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>270 280</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>+7.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES—NORTHERN AUSTRALIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Northern Territory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment figures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1974 (Labor)</td>
<td>9 679</td>
<td>6 500</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1975 (Labor)</td>
<td>38 426</td>
<td>16 482</td>
<td>1 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1976 (LC-P)</td>
<td>39 404</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>1 834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Change for 1976 on 1975</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec. (1974 and 1975)</td>
<td>40 925</td>
<td>49 902</td>
<td>21 630</td>
<td>24 268</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>49 779</td>
<td>50 141</td>
<td>24 070</td>
<td>22 752</td>
<td>1 083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>45 483</td>
<td>46 234</td>
<td>20 933</td>
<td>20 601</td>
<td>1 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>43 167</td>
<td>43 064</td>
<td>19 425</td>
<td>20 046</td>
<td>1 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>38 426</td>
<td>39 404</td>
<td>16 482</td>
<td>20 000</td>
<td>1 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>31 491</td>
<td>38 586</td>
<td>17 003</td>
<td>21 103</td>
<td>1 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July (1975 and 1976)</td>
<td>38 497</td>
<td>38 346</td>
<td>17 046</td>
<td>21 419</td>
<td>1 692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for the 8 months</td>
<td>43 030</td>
<td>45 091</td>
<td>20 285</td>
<td>21 959</td>
<td>1 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>(+4.79%)</td>
<td>(+8.25%)</td>
<td>(+8.51%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator KEEFFE—I thank the Senate. Fluctuations in unemployment clearly show up in one of the tables I have incorporated and which honourable senators on the other side of the chamber can read at their leisure tomorrow. It shows that in the first few months of this year under the new brem wielded by the Liberal-National Country Party Government unemployment continued to increase. In the period January to January it increased by nearly 11 per cent. In the following month there was an increase of over 2 per cent. This increase applied to the month of March also. The increase of April was not too bad with an increase of 1 per cent in unemployment. The rate rose to 4 per cent in May and 7 per cent plus in both June and July.

The Government has to accept responsibility because the 8 months it has been in government covers most of that period. The position is even worse in many other areas and I want to make a point about the Northern Territory. In the city of Darwin the increase in unemployment has been 3.12 per cent. In the city of Alice Springs the figure is 5.32 per cent and in Katherine the figure has been 11.45 per cent. Yet this is the sort of situation that the Government is happy to describe as just a passing phase. Let us look at the total for northern Australia. It is northern Australia that is getting the worst end of the stick politically. There was an increase in the level of unemployment in Western Australia over this period of 8.25 per cent. In the Northern Territory there was an 85.1 per cent increase. In other words, the Government has almost doubled the unemployment situation there; yet it is still adopting a very complacent attitude.

Let us examine what has happened in the field of Aboriginal affairs. Savage cuts have been instituted, despite the famous Ellicott telegrams. I have no doubt that the Government makes him eat the words he used in those telegrams each morning with his Weet-Bix. In those telegrams Mr Ellicott promised that there would be no reductions across the whole range of Aboriginal affairs; but the Government has done the opposite. The report of the Australian Council of Social Service that was issued on 19 May—only a few weeks ago—reads:
The statistics for February reveal that there are now more than 10,000 unemployed Aborigines out of an Aboriginal work force of approximately 35,000 people.

But the situation is even worse than that, because the level of unemployment goes up to 100 per cent in some of the smaller communities in rural areas. In the Cape York area not less than 60 per cent of the Aboriginal work force is unemployed and in most parts of the Northern Territory the figure is not less than 50 per cent.

My time is running out and I do not have time to make all the points that I would like to have made in this debate. I conclude my remarks by referring to an article in today's Daily Mirror that was written by a journalist named Mike Power. I shall quote the first few paragraphs of it.

The article reads:

Unemployment is wrecking marriages and splitting families in the outer western suburbs, particularly Mt Druitt.

That is in New South Wales. The article continues:

Many people in the 80,000 community of Mt Druitt are out of work and many people's marriages are breaking up.

One-third of the problems handled by the district's legal aid officers concern matrimonial, maintenance and custody cases.

And the Law Society's legal aid manager, Mr. H. K. Kershaw, says in his annual report: 'A disturbing feature of the matrimonial problems is that they are directly linked with financial difficulties due to loss of employment'.

The report says that legal aid staff at Mt Druitt's Community Law Centre interviewed 5386 people between April last year and June 30 this year.

About 15 per cent of the problems dealt with their financial matters.

'The economic circumstances of families are just about inseparable from many of the marriage break-ups that are brought to us,' Mr Don Harley said today.

The indications from that report of today's date, after the bringing down of this so-called famous Budget of liquidity, are that unemployment is a continuing social problem and a heart-breaking problem. Those who are adopting double standards by looking after the wealthy and kicking the poor to death are succeeding very well. I hope that the motion will be carried.

Senator CARRICK (New South Wales—Minister for Education) (5.43)—It is well to remind the Senate that this debate today takes place against the background that virtually every newspaper and most of the other main media in Australia are carrying in their general and editorial comment today strong condemnation of the Budget introduced by the Government last night and the strategy therein. It is against that background that the Opposition, upon returning for this session, has initiated this pathetic whimper of a debate—a so-called urgency debate. The Opposition has come along here and emotionally stirred us to believe that it believes in help for the unemployed and the underprivileged.

Let me remind the Senate of what this Budget has done. For the first time it has done something that the Whitlam Government refused to do. The Fraser Government has brought in tax indexation for all people and put more money in their pockets. It has done something else that the Whitlam Government refused to do. It has brought in a revolutionary scheme of family allowances that was recommended by the Committee of Inquiry into Poverty—the Henderson Committee—which was set up not by the Whitlam Government but by the McMahon Government. The policies implemented by the Fraser Government for a transfer of wealth from the more affluent to the poor are policies that the Whitlam Government refused to implement.

Against the background of the Whitlam Government of the past being kicked out by an overwhelming vote of the people on 13 December because it created the greatest unemployment since the Depression and the greatest inflation since the Depression, the Opposition has had the gall to come before the Senate today and say 2 things, and I want to examine them. Firstly, the Opposition has said that the Fraser Government created the present unemployment situation. That is the proposition that it has put forward. Secondly, the Opposition says that the Government is wrong in its Budget strategy and that the right thing for us to do is to spend ourselves out of the recession. Let us call the bluff of the Australian Labor Party. Barely one year ago every member of the Labor Party in the Senate stood in this chamber and commended the speech of the then Labor Treasurer, Mr Hayden. Mr Hayden said in his Budget Speech then—in theory at least—precisely what the Labor Party is now attacking and inveighing against today. Mr Hayden said: 'You cannot spend your way out of unemployment. You will create inflation if you try to do so'. I will read his precise words in a moment. He said: 'You must cut down the public sector expenditure. You must cut down your Budget to about $2,600m. Otherwise you will create more unemployment; you will create disaster'. In fact what has happened is this: The Labor Party, which failed in Government and which is now failing in Opposition, is coming to us today and rejecting what it said, what its Treasurer said and what its Government said one year ago. How does the Labor Party now look at the statements contained in that Budget
Speech? I refer to Mr Hayden’s statements. In this respect we concur. He said:

We are no longer operating in that simple Keynesian world in which some reduction in unemployment could, apparently, always be purchased at the cost of some more inflation. Today, it is inflation itself which is the central policy problem. More inflation simply leads to more unemployment.

That was said by Mr Hayden. That thesis commends entirely the whole of last night’s Budget. I shall read some more of what he said. The Senate ought to recall that the 1974-75 financial year ended up with an actual deficit of $2,567m. The Whitlam Government budgeted last year for an actual deficit of $2,798m. Mr Hayden said that it would be absolutely wrong to go ahead and have a Budget deficit any larger. He said:

In the context of an economy beginning to pick up, a deficit of the order initially projected—

I interpolate to say that that was $5,000m—

would have been a prescription for accelerating inflation. Its acceptance would have been tantamount to abandoning concern with inflation, discarding our wages policies, condemning the corporate sector to an attack upon its profitability and threatening the future jobs of thousands of Australians—

Mr Hayden said last year that it would have been intolerable to have a Budget deficit of $5,000m and that the right thing to do was to abandon the Keynesian theory—one cannot spend oneself out of an unemployment situation—and to reduce the deficit to $2,798m. That was the target that he set. So as to help the Labor Opposition in its pathetic stance today I read further from the Budget Speech of last year. I repeat to the Senate that what the Labor Party is saying today is a rejection of the whole of its thesis last year. The Labor Party Treasurer said last year:

Meanwhile, unless appropriate economic measures are adopted now, the hopeful signs in the economy could prove illusory, and inflation could take off again from its already high level, to a thoroughly destructive effect. The private sector would find it increasingly difficult to function with increasing business failures, and unemployment could rise to dramatically higher levels.

The quotation continues:

That situation can be avoided and it was with this objective in mind that this Budget was designed. Some sacrifice and patient restraint is called for from all of us in our demands for more resources, whether it is additional public services that are wanted or higher personal income.

Last year every Labor Party senator and member stood up and said: ‘The way to overcome unemployment is to reduce inflation. The way to reduce inflation is to cut the deficit in half to about $2.7 billion and that will be the way to restore business confidence’. They went on and said that the way to do this was to cut back in the use of resources in the public sector.

Senator Bishop—Tell us about the Regional Employment Development scheme and how you put people out of work.

Senator CARRICK—I will tell the honourable senator about the Regional Employment Development scheme. I remind Senator Bishop that, in fact, it was his Government which abolished the RED scheme. I remind the honourable senator, since he wants to interject, that if we took the loading of the RED scheme and put the people in it into the unemployment figures then in October and November when the Labor Government went out of office the number of unemployed would be an all time record. It hurts now for the Labor Party to find that the only illusory argument it is putting today, it stood up and rejected in this Senate exactly 12 months ago. Its words are in the record. Let me remind the Labor Party of what happened. In 1972 the Labor Party came into office after 20 years during which time a Liberal Government had provided the highest sustained full employment ever in the history of this country, the lowest sustained unemployment and the highest home ownership.

Senator Bishop—Tell us about now.

Senator CARRICK—I will tell Senator Bishop about now because the people in the shipyards of South Australia over whom he is shedding crocodile tears have been costed out of jobs by the wrecking of the former Labor Government. Let us keep in mind what the honourable senator is doing. Today we have seen crocodile tears. It was a Labor government which, in fact, created this number of unemployed—the greatest since the Depression. It was a Labor government which created the highest inflation since the Depression. It was a Labor government which said, but which did not act upon the fact, that if we tried to spend our way in the public sector out of unemployment we would create disastrous inflation and higher unemployment. That is exactly what the Labor Party did. It moved to a kind of expenditure which would have ended up with a deficit of $3,000m. The Labor Party provided the speaker’s notes for its Budget, and for the total defeat of that miserable contribution which it has made today.

Let us have a simple look at the situation. Since we came into government we have put more real money back into the people’s pockets by tax indexation. This was rejected by the Whitlam Government. We have transferred to the poor, from the more affluent, family allowances of a major type. The Labor Party rejected that benefit. We have indexed the pensions to the
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consumer price index. That was not done by the Labor Party. We have brought in probate reforms. That was not done by the Labor Party. But members of the Labor Party get up and say: 'We are for the poor. The Liberals are for the rich'. In fact, if we pick off every single policy of great human reform which has been implemented in recent years we find that it came from this side of the Senate, not from the other side. The Labor Party can cry out but it fails to understand and to remind itself that the public by an overwhelming majority on 13 December said: 'We will have no more of you because of your miserable failure, your creation of depression-type unemployment and your creation of record inflation'. We have started to bring inflation down. It is moving steadily downwards. The thesis we put forward last night has been applauded by every major commentator and it was the thesis of the Budget of the Labor Party last year. That thesis is that we have to bring down inflation in order to get a resurgence of employment. We have to cut the public sector steadily in order to bring inflation down and to stop inflationary spending. Senator Douglas McClelland smiles. The simple fact is that I am repeating the words—

Senator Douglas McClelland—You got a double dissolution on it.

Senator CARRICK—No, the honourable senator is wrong. The words which I read from the Budget Speech are the words of the then Labor Party Treasurer, Mr Hayden. They were said in August 1975. On 13 December 1975 the Labor Party was swept out of office because of its failure to handle that thesis. I repeat what the Labor Party said then because it is worth reminding honourable senators opposite. It stated that the Keynesian thesis of spending one's way out of unemployment was disastrous, that it created more unemployment. Mr Hayden stated:

We are no longer operating in that simple Keynesian world in which some reduction in unemployment could, apparently, always be produced at the cost of some more inflation. Today, it is inflation itself which is the central policy problem. More inflation simply leads to more unemployment.

The Labor Party said last year that the task was to reduce inflation in order to increase employment. The whole thesis of last night's Budget is built upon that basis. Now, the Labor Party finds itself in a fascinating situation. In order to reject our thesis of last night which was commended by the public of Australia the Labor Party has to say that it rejects its whole thesis for its Budget of August last year. The Labor Party cannot have it both ways. The thesis of its Budget Speech of last year is, in fact, the same economic thesis which was put forward last night. The trouble is that the Labor Party did not carry out its thesis. It said that it would do that, that it would cut its deficit in half, that it would attempt to reduce inflation, that it would cut back the Public Service.

Lest the Labor Party should try to pin on us the cutback I remind it that the only government that has ever cut back education at the federal level was the Whitlam Government of last year. It cut back the education budget by $105m. Now the Labor Party is saying that we ought to spend more to create more jobs. I remind the Labor Party that its thesis in the whole of that argument was: 'We must cut back on capital works in education because if we put money into capital works in education that will create inflation and that will destroy the cost structure.'

Senator McLaren—We never said that.

Senator CARRICK—The honourable senator can look at the report of the debate in Hansard. The simple fact is that the Labor Party cannot take it. It has uttered this miserable whimper today but, by its own words, it has destroyed its argument. It knows that the public of Australia has commended us for our policies.

Sitting suspended from 5.58 to 8 p.m.

Senator BUTTON (Victoria) (8.0)—The Senate is debating an urgency motion moved by the Opposition relating to the Government's economic policies which are producing increased unemployment and are undermining business confidence. Anybody who was listening to the Minister for Education, Senator Carrick, the previous speaker in this debate, would have heard a fairly hysterical outburst which revealed his somewhat halucinatory vision of the policies of the Liberal-National Country Party Government. Listening to him, one would have thought that the Liberal Party was in fact the Robin Hood of modern politics, taking from the rich and giving to the poor. In fact, as Senator Carrick revealed in his speech, the situation was rather that he fulfils the role of Christopher Robin of modern politics, not Robin Hood. One was tempted to think: 'Hush, hush, whisper who dares, Senator Carrick is saying his prayers'. He was saying his prayers for the much vaunted recovery in unemployment that the Liberal Party has talked about since November last year and for a recovery in the economy which it has proclaimed and talked about since November last year.

Here in the Senate we are back at work and in that we are more fortunate than 5.4 per cent of the Australian people or a minimum of 315 000 Australians who have no work to go to. It is to
these matters that I want to address myself tonight, not only because of the 315,000 people who were shown in the July unemployment figures and the others who were not shown in those figures, but also because of the sort of figures that we predict will occur in the next few months, indeed, which every commentator on the Budget believes will occur and which the Treasurer (Mr Lynch) in making the Budget Speech last night implied will occur. I think that that situation was very well summarised by the Economics Editor of the Melbourne Age today when he said in relation to what the Budget produced:

The unemployed will have to wait another year. In fact, by the middle of next year there could be a lot more on the dole queue than there are now. Most of the additional unemployed will be school leavers. And they will face a reduction in their unemployment benefit in real terms as a result of the decision not to adjust the benefit in line with consumer price movements as was promised at the election.

I said that I wanted to confine myself to the matter of unemployment because in the course of this debate we have had a number of lectures from Government spokesmen about financial responsibility and so on. I particularly single out the Minister for Industry and Commerce, Senator Cotton, for his Sunday school approach in giving the Senate a tutorial about financial responsibility. He did that at some length. But Senator Cotton was not always so responsible. He did not always sound like a Sunday school teacher. In fact last year in the course of the general election campaign he sounded much more like a used car salesman. I quote some of the things he said on this matter of unemployment. First of all, I quote from the Melbourne Age of 29 November 1975, some 12 or 13 days before the general election, which reported him as follows:

A Liberal-National Country Party Government would slash unemployment and inflation by expanding and protecting industry and small businesses, the Minister for Manufacturing Industry, Senator Cotton, said yesterday.

He said a coalition Government would reduce unemployment to less than 1 per cent of the workforce by developing an efficient and diversified manufacturing industry.

That was what Senator Cotton told us in November and December last year. It was a different story in the Senate today. But Senator Cotton in telling us those things in November and December last year did not lack colleagues. I suppose there was some degree of safety in numbers because the then Prime Minister, Mr Malcolm Fraser, was reported in the Sydney Daily Telegraph of 8 December, under the heading '200,000 Cut in Jobless', as follows:

Australia's unemployment figures could be slashed by up to 200,000 under a Liberal-National Country Party Government, the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, said yesterday. He said that at the same time he would try to cut inflation by 11 per cent.

Again, on 27 November 1975 another statement of the Prime Minister was reported as follows:

Inflation and unemployment would drop under a Liberal-National Country Party Government, the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, said yesterday.

'The changes in the direction of policies would start to have an immediate impact,' he said.

At about the same time the Minister for Primary Industry, Mr Anthony, said:

We will put people back to work by encouraging a thriving and productive private sector. This will be the key factor in Australia's economic recovery.

How different this statement is from what was said today and from what was said last night in the course of the Budget Speech—how different in the space of 8 months. Mr Street, the Minister of Employment and Industrial Relations, who presides over the current level of unemployment in this country was reported as follows in the Australian of 5 December 1975:

The Liberal-National Country Party coalition last night offered a five-point plan to deal with Australia's record unemployment—including retention of Labor's controversial Regional Employment Development Scheme and special aid for mass unemployment centres.

Referring to Mr Street, the article stated:

He said that to combat the worst unemployment in Australia's history the coalition planned a series of special measures including:

- RETRAINING of workers whose skills were no longer needed.
- RETENTION of the RED scheme . .
- RELOCATING workers unable to find jobs to suit their skills, and financial aid to them at such a time.
- LOCAL government-run employment schemes in areas of high unemployment where no mass employment opportunities exist.
- BETTER access to job information.

That was the Liberal-National Country Party coalition plan for restoring employment in Australia as enunciated in December last year. The Minister was reported to have continued:

I am hopeful that job opportunities will start to increase early in the life of the new Government but it will probably take about six months for this to happen. Unemployment levels will only start to drop with increased business confidence and that could take some time to surface.

It is now some 8 months later and there are no signs of business confidence surfacing, particularly in relation to unemployment figures. I mention these matters because that is what the Liberal-Country Party coalition promised the people of Australia in December last year and that is why its members are now sitting on the
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Government benches. These are the promises which they, as a government, have broken. These are the excuses that they used to delay Supply in the Senate last year and to justify the standover course of conduct which they took in Opposition in delaying the Budget. These were the promises upon which they were elected. All these things took place on the assumption that members of the Liberal-Country Party coalition could behave like that in November and December last year and be returned as a government because they would be able to govern better than we could. Those are the assumptions upon which they sit on the Government benches. They have failed the people of Australia in not giving validity to those assumptions.

It is now 8 months later and, to put it at its highest, there is only a marginal improvement in business confidence. There is a low level of consumer spending. We have the highest July unemployment figures in the history of this country since 1931. The Treasurer last night introduced a one-point plan for continued unemployment. Compare the Treasurer’s one-point plan of last night with the five-point plan for curing unemployment which the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations put before the people of Australia in November and December last year. Let us look at the specific promises which were made—the 5 unfulfilled promises. The first concerns retraining. The NEAT scheme has been cut back from an allocation of $52m a year to $40m a year. That is the Government’s expanded view of retraining. As to the retention of the Regional Employment Development scheme, the present Government has no job creation programs at all, other than pathetic attempts to give mouth to mouth resuscitation to the private sector of the economy. There is nothing else at all. The RED scheme has not been maintained. Mr Street promised the relocation of workers. No such scheme has been introduced. There is no structural adjustment scheme and there are no schemes to help special industries in difficulty.

Mr Street promised local government employment schemes and suggested in that promise that particular attention would be given to particular industries and particular localities. Let us consider particular industries in particular localities today where unemployment clearly can be seen to be running at a very high level. Let us consider shipbuilding. What special attention has been given by this Government to Whyalla and Newcastle, where people have been put out of work as a result of decisions reached about the future of the shipbuilding industry? What special attention has been given to those localities? What special attention has been given to the construction industry, which is in a parlous state and has a very high level of unemployment? It has received no assistance whatsoever from this Government, except for significant cutbacks in payments made available by the Government. That is all in pursuit of the myth that somehow the private sector in all its manifestations will be encouraged by cutbacks in Government expenditure. The fifth promise made by Mr Street related to better access to job information. That promise might have been fulfilled because people now know that the jobs are not available. The simple answer on job information is that the jobs are not there, and that fact is pretty clear. That could be said to be a promise which has been fulfilled.

I have talked about unemployment as a general tragedy for this country, but I want to refer to one particular aspect of it. That aspect relates to some special figures contained within the overall unemployment figures. It relates to the question of school leavers, to the thousands upon thousands of kids who will be leaving school in this country in two or three months’ time. The last published figures indicate that 5.4 per cent of the work force in Australia is unemployed. But for young people the unemployment figure in this country as at July of this year stands at 15 per cent for girls and 12 per cent for boys. Those are the published statistics for July on unemployment amongst teenage people in this country. In that context, this Government offers no more assistance for apprenticeship training, only the promise that the question will be looked at and reviewed in the near future. That is all that is offered by the Government in answer to the question of teenage unemployment in Australia. I want to draw to the Senate’s attention the disastrous social consequences of that level of unemployment amongst young people. Those consequences are quite horrifying, particularly in the big cities of this country, in terms of the problems of delinquency, crime, alienation from the work force, and the lack of promise of a future which could give respect to each of the individuals concerned. That is a quite horrifying situation about which the Senate ought to be concerned in considering this urgency motion.

I do not expect the problems of teenage unemployed people to be understood fully by a government of wealthy graziers and dropouts from small business. I do not really expect the problems of teenage unemployed to be understood fully by those people; I do not expect their problems to be understood by a Prime Minister...
who has never in his life been employed in an ordinary job. I do not expect those things to be understood by this Government, but I do hope that there are honourable senators on the other side of the House who understand them. Those problems are of vital social and political importance to the future welfare of this country. I began by saying that when this Government came to office—and this is part of its current illegitimacy, if I may use that expression in the widest possible sense—it came to office on the basis of promises that it would do better than the Labor Government in respect of these things, and particularly in respect of unemployment. It has failed to do so, and accordingly I commend this motion most firmly to the Senate.

Senator WEBSTER (Victoria—Minister for Science) (8.14)—The Senate is debating an urgency motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, Senator Wriedt, which attempts to encourage the Senate to criticise this Government. The motion states that it is a matter of urgency that the Government’s economic policies are producing increased unemployment and undermining business confidence. I believe that at the present time there is very little reason to agree with the statement put down by the Leader of the Opposition. Certainly if one takes the points he made in their reverse order, in relation to the Government’s policies undermining business confidence, nothing could be further from the truth. That point must have been thrown in purely for the purpose of filling in words. One should know from the business community that after a disastrous 3 years of Labor reign in this country business confidence is returning.

There is a reference in the motion to increased unemployment. I am very unhappy to see that there is unemployment to any extent in Australia. Certainly there was no extensive unemployment before Labor came to power. Senator Button rose and heaped as much abuse as he could on the Liberal and National Country Parties, calling them Parties of wealthy graziers and drop-outs from small business. Senator Button may have his own views, but he should cast his eyes about on his own side of the chamber before he throws the first stone. The motion moved by Senator Wriedt comes from a Party which was in charge of this country for 3 years and which seeks on this occasion to get up and decry a Government which has been in power for 8 months. That does the Opposition no credit. As to the unemployment situation, is Labor proud of its record?

Senator Cavanagh—Very much so.

Senator WEBSTER—Senator Cavanagh says that Labor is proud of its record on unemployment, and I really believe that that is so. It was the first time in the history of Australia that a government had led the country into the sort of unemployment that we had under Labor. As a Minister, Senator Cavanagh knew the situation because he was one of the men directly responsible, and he knows that well. I believe, as does Senator Cavanagh, that he could not care less how many people are unemployed. Before Labor came to office, in December 1972, 1.8 per cent of the labour force was unemployed. I can remember Senator Cavanagh criticising the Government in those days, saying that the level of unemployment was too high. In March 1974, after Labor had been in office for some time, 1.4 per cent of the work force was unemployed. In March 1975 the figure was 4.5 per cent, in May 1975 it was 4.5 per cent, in July 1975 it was 4.8 per cent, and in December 1975 the number had reached 320,000, or 5.6 per cent of the work force.

Senator Cavanagh—What is it now?

Senator WEBSTER—The honourable senator is interrupting. The great wisdom which he showed in his very important administrative position encouraged the Labor Government to bring about that situation; yet he has the temerity, together with the Leader of the Opposition, to stand up today and suggest that he has such wisdom that he should criticise this side of the House.

Senator Cavanagh—You are just a ratbag. You will not listen.

Senator WEBSTER—Coming from a man who looks into a mirror, I do not doubt that those words would be well reflected.

Senator Cavanagh—You are just a ratbag. You will not listen to an argument.

The PRESIDENT—Order! Senator Cavanagh, those words are not parliamentary. Would you please retract them?

Senator Cavanagh—Do you say they are incorrect, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT—They are not parliamentary.

Senator Cavanagh—Oh, they are not parliamentary. For that reason I will withdraw them.

Senator WEBSTER—It is most uncommon for a debate of this type to take place on the Wednesday evening after the Budget has been brought down. One might question the reason why this action has been taken. After a Budget has been brought down it is usual for both
Government and Opposition senators to desist from speaking on any matter relating to the Budget until the Leader of the Opposition has had the opportunity on the following Tuesday night to make known the views of the Opposition.

What an uncommon situation we have this evening. Senator Wriedt, the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate, has attempted to pre-empt his parliamentary leader by moving a motion to discuss a matter of urgency which suggests that the Government's economic policies are leading to certain disasters in this country. He has made a definite attempt in the Senate, I take it supported by all the Australian Labor Party Opposition senators, to steal a march on Mr Whitlam, the Party's parliamentary leader. Next Tuesday Mr Whitlam will face a situation in which what he will have to say has been pre-empted by his leader in the Senate. I think this must have been a definite move by the Australian Labor Party to demonstrate again the lack of faith that its members have in their present parliamentary leader. Why else would the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate speak in such a way? He is being supported by Opposition senators. Mr President, perhaps that convention to which you and I have been accustomed for so many years is another convention that has been broken by the Labor Party. We have seen in the many things that the members of the Labor Party have done that they do not wish to hold to convention, even if their action is harmful to their own members.

Perhaps Senator Wriedt's actions in upstaging his own leader are not uncommon. Let us look at what has happened during the last few months. Senator Wriedt's leader, Mr Whitlam, has been overseas for a number of months. Undoubtedly, during that time Senator Wriedt had to take the main burden of the debate, along with Mr Hawke of course, in Australia relating to all matters that concerned the leader of the Labor Party. It is those men who are now attempting to say that this new Government is not performing correctly. How could the people make a judgment on the statements which come from such people? How can they judge those people who are now rising to condemn this Government? Who are these people? What is their record? Who is it who has respect for their economic competence? There is not one member of the Labor Party who would say there was one tittle of confidence or competence in any Treasurer that the Labor Party ever had. Opposition senators laugh and well they might. They know that they, along with their leader, Mr Whitlam, sacked every Treasurer in a Labor Government within a year of his taking office. Mr Crean, a former Labor Treasurer, went out the door. Dr Cairns, another former Labor Treasurer, went out the door. Tonight, honourable senators opposite do not even agree with one word contained in the Budget put down by Mr Hayden on behalf of the Labor Party under which we have struggled for the past 8 months.

Perhaps it is Mr Hawke with his competence who is capable of speaking on the matter. As I understand it, Mr Hawke is stating at the present time that there is no competence in the parliamentary Labor Party. He hopes to gain a parliamentary seat to assist the Labor Party and to lead it out of the morass it is in. Apparently, there is no man competent in the parliamentary Labor Party, no man who is better than Mr Hawke. He has been very vocal—indeed, more vocal than Mr Whitlam—in his criticism of the present Budget. He is an executive officer of the ALP. As a man in a particular situation he criticises the Coms, to whose policies some members of the parliamentary Labor Party adhere. When the Coms scrawl on his front fence, he criticises them and takes them to task. He is President of the Australian Labor Party. He is a director of Bourke's ACTU store in Melbourne. I acknowledge that it is a wonderful store. He is a director who demands that every company should disclose its balance sheet, but Mr Hawke does not do that in his affairs. He does not wish to have the balance sheets of organisations with which he is associated disclosed to the public. Of course, he is also a director of ACTU-Solo Enterprises Pty Ltd. The various deals and criticisms of that man are made quite clear in the report of an inquiry which was recently made into ACTU-Solo Enterprises Pty Ltd.

However, there are appeals made to the public for support for Mr Hawke. Undoubtedly, he will become the leader of the Labor Party in the House of Representatives. Is he to be acknowledged as an expert on budgetary matters? My understanding is that Mr Hawke was the main adviser outside Parliament to the former Government. Every time that Government got into trouble I used to see Mr Hawke advising its Ministers in Parliament House. He advised that Government into a situation in which the unemployment rate was higher than we had ever seen. Are members of the community to take notice of his ranting last night and judge him an expert who can speak on the Budget? I really do not believe that the members of the ALP acknowledge that he is competent in his field. I do not believe that they can acknowledge that there is financial competence anywhere within their Party. For instance, if honourable senators opposite say that
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Senator Cavanagh as a Minister was capable of speaking out for the Labor Government on financial matters, I ask: Where was Senator Cavanagh’s information wrong? Why did they not take notice of him? Was it because they thought so little of him when he spoke? The Labor Government brought disaster not only to the workers but also to the pensioners and, indeed, everybody who had saved for years in the hope that they would be safe in their old age and that their money would be worth something. The Labor Government also wrecked small business during its 3 years of inflationary rule. It did so intentionally for the implementation of its socialist theories. I say to Senator Cavanagh that he is one of the greatest socialist left wing men who ever sat in the Senate. Senator Cavanagh smiled and was pleased and delighted every time this happened.

The one Labor Party member who could have been accepted as competent in the financial field was Mr Hayden. It has been expressed previously tonight that Mr Hayden set down in his last Budget Speech what the problem was. He pointed out the problem, much to the distress of many Labor members. I can remember the Budget Speech last year when Mr Hayden stated that the demand for wages had been a little too high and that the inflation brought about by the Labor Government had been a bit too great. It certainly had wreaked havoc. But he was driven to making that statement. It was thrust upon him after 2½ years of Labor rule. What he proposed at that stage is exactly what this Government is doing currently. But what is happening? We find that Senator Wriedt and other Labor Party senators are decrying what this Government is attempting to do. There is no possibility of a quick economic recovery after the economic wreckage caused by the Labor Party.

Honourable senators opposite speak about business. There was no possibility of business making a quick recovery. We have a situation today brought about by the Labor Government in which because of the cost of labour we are unable to compete on internal or external markets. The Labor Government brought about a situation in which nearly every major employing industry from the boot trade or the rag trade through to the electronics industry was driven out of this country. They set up their operations in South East Asia. The Labor Party was proud to do this. It was proud to open the flood gates to imports and to see their own men put out of business. Members of the Labor Party ought to be ashamed of themselves and ought to be backing the Government at this time. I do not doubt that they are pleased this Government is in power. Senator Wriedt today showed the interest that he has in this matter. He moved the motion and we did not see him again in the Senate until this evening. There were only 3 Labor Party senators in the Senate chamber all afternoon. The people of Australia should know the great interest that the Labor Party shows in a motion such as this which is has now moved.

This type of motion is pure humbug. But there is a deeper point behind it. I believe that it is intended to show up the Labor Party’s leader, Mr Whitlam. I believe that there is a move against him at the present time. It is most uncommon and most unconventional to have a debate of this nature on a Wednesday following the presentation of the Budget. I say this to Labor Party senators: They should be convinced of the havoc they wrought during the last 3 years. They should let a Government of competence show them how to bring this country back to its feet.

Senator WALSH (Western Australia) (8.30)—In Perth on 25 September last year—a little less than 11 months ago—the Sir Robert Menzies Lecture was delivered by Malcolm Fraser, then Leader of the Opposition and now Prime Minister. On page 8 of the text of that lecture we find this passage:

Can one imagine how Mr Hawke’s redoubtable invective, once frequently vented on unfortunate journalists, would have been vented on a Liberal Government had it caused, through its actions, unemployment of 250 000 workers. Can one doubt that, had a Liberal Government been so uncaring of the interests of the worker and so callous about the human suffering and loss of dignity and self respect involved in unemployment as to allow such a situation to emerge because of its philosophical pretensions, that such invective would have been justified.

Those were the words of the present Prime Minister less than a year ago. Senator Cotton, who spoke in this debate this afternoon, castigated the Opposition for bringing forward this urgency motion based upon the simple fact that today the level of unemployment, the actual number of unemployed, is not the 250 000 which the present Prime Minister suggested less than a year ago was reprehensible but almost 300 000, and on a seasonally adjusted basis 315 000. As my colleague Senator Button pointed out in his excellent address, it is the highest July level of unemployment recorded since the Depression of the 1930s. It is totally understandable that Senator Cotton and all his colleagues who promised that unemployment would disappear if a Liberal-National Country Party Government was elected last year regret the fact that the Opposition has taken this opportunity to draw attention to their duplicity, their dishonesty and
their manifest failure to deliver what they promised the people after their reprehensible actions of October and November last year.

The simple fact about the movement in unemployment in Australia in the last 12 months is that in October last year the level of unemployment, seasonally adjusted, commenced to fall and it continued to fall until February. I observe in passing that Megles Murdoch's flagship, the *Australian*, in reporting the October unemployment statistics used the raw figure which showed that unemployment had increased. It referred to that as being the accurate figure. When the November figures were available, the same flagship of the Murdoch stable, the *Australian*, switched around and used the seasonally adjusted figure because that presented the sort of distortion, the sort of line, that Megles Murdoch wanted to press upon the Australian people and mislead the electorate in the way that Megles Murdoch wished to mislead the electorate. I just observe in passing that that was typical of the behaviour of that newspaper throughout that entire election campaign, throughout the 4 months that preceded it and indeed throughout the 8 months that have succeeded it. From October to February, megalomaniacs—whether they are incumbents at *Yarralumla* or Press barons—

The PRESIDENT—Order! Watch your language, Senator Walsh.

Senator WALSH—I apologise to you, Mr President. The simple facts regarding unemployment are that from October to February unemployment was falling consistently and that from February onwards unemployment has been increasing consistently. My colleagues, Senator Button, Senator Wriedt and Senator Keeffe, have already quantified this simple fact and have had tables incorporated in Hansard.

We were told by the present Government when it was in Opposition that the election of a Liberal government would ensure that the problem of unemployment would begin to be solved. I think my colleague, Senator Button, quoted the Prime Minister as having said that within 6 months the problem would be overcome; all that was needed was the election of a Liberal government. A Liberal government was elected and unemployment continued to rise. Then the Prime Minister and the Treasurer, Mr Lynch, propounded the absurd theory that the way to economic recovery was through an investment-led recovery. To his great credit Senator Cotton, who has a considerably higher level of literacy on these matters than his Prime Minister, his Treasurer or most of his colleagues, as early as 11 February publicly repudiated this investment-led recovery nonsense. I notice that even its architects and proselytisers—the Prime Minister and the Treasurer—have since dropped the investment-led recovery theory from their rhetoric. Now we are told that the Budget will cure unemployment and put Australia back on the road to recovery. What does this Budget offer us? It purports to show a deficit of $2.6 billion. I mention this not because I believe that the level of the deficit is particularly important but because it seems to be a recurring obsession of the Prime Minister and his Treasurer. That figure needs a substantial amount of adjustment. Firstly, if we want to arrive at a deficit which is comparable with deficits as they have been recorded in previous years, we must add on the $200 billion which this year the Australian Telecommunications Commission will be required to raise on the private capital market and we must add on the $209m prepayment to the States for hospital Medibank—the Commonwealth's share of hospital Medibank operating expenses from July to September inclusive this year which was paid by the Treasurer before the end of June for the expedient reason, politically expedient to him, of artificially inflating last financial year's deficit and artificially deflating this financial year's deficit. When we make those 2 adjustments we find that in fact the deficit is in excess of $3 billion. One more adjustment still needs to be made. It is forecast in the Treasurer's Budget Speech that the Australian Wool Corporation will be making net repayments of $245m to the revenue this year. That represents the liquidation of capital stock. When all the necessary adjustments have been made, the actual size of the deficit on the basis on which historically it has been determined is in fact $3.25 billion, which is almost indistinguishable from the level of the deficit last year.

This Budget tacitly acknowledges that inflation in the next 12 months will continue to run at 12 per cent, which is only 0.2 per cent or 0.3 per cent lower than the level recorded in the last 12 months. Of course, unquestionably unemployment will be pushed to even higher levels. This afternoon Senator Cotton quoted the Financial Review with great approval. In fact he seemed to suggest that the Financial Review was the final arbiter, the ultimate authority, in Australia on all matters pertaining to Budgets and economic policies generally. The editorial in today's Financial Review, to which Senator Cotton referred, stated:

Inevitably it—

that is the Budget—
will mean record unemployment in the 1977 new year when the school leavers come on to the market.

That was the editorial voice of the *Financial Review* which Senator Cotton quoted with unequivocal approval 4 hours ago. So, we have a deficit just as high, when properly assessed, as the deficit last year which, according to the honourable senators who now populate the Government benches, was utterly disastrous. It is forecast that inflation will continue at the same rate and that unemployment will be higher. For that dismal forecast of the level of economic activity in the next 12 months, the Liberal and National Country Parties had the audacity to break every convention which had governed the operation of the Australian Parliament. The poverty of this Government’s ideas is manifest in this Budget it has produced. There as articulated by its Treasurer, its excuse for its failure to deliver that which it promised—its scapegoat—is the claim that wages are increasing at too fast a rate and that this is all the fault of militant unionists. When there is no longer a Labor government to blame honourable senators opposite fall back on blaming the militant unionists. The *Financial Review* editorial of 9 August, the publication which Senator Cotton regards as being so august, said:

The fact that the unemployment situation worsened during July—by 6.2 per cent after seasonal adjustment—represents a setback to the Government’s economic strategy.

That, I imagine, would be a considerable understatement. The article went on to describe how the Treasurer, Mr P. Lynch, sheeted home the responsibility for the latest deterioration to the “continuing push for wage increases, particularly by the militant left-wing of the trade union leadership”. The article then said:

This charge can hardly be sustained.

It went on to say that with some minor exceptions all that the trade union movement had pressed for was wage indexation. Then the *Financial Review* observed:

This policy incidentally was one endorsed by Mr Malcolm Fraser in the last election campaign.

Let that not be forgotten. Neither Mr Fraser nor any other member of this Government is in any position to castigate any union for demanding full indexation of wages. When Mr Fraser was facing the electors in November and December last year he promised indexation of wages and he has attempted to repudiate, to welch, on that promise as he has welched on Medibank and as he has attempted to welch on the railways agreement with South Australia. The *Financial Review* summarised its assessment of the situation by saying:

In truth what we heard from the Treasurer on Friday was the sort of clichéd nonsense you hear from any politician when confronted with the unexpected—a diversionary attack on a traditional enemy.

That is the newspaper that Senator Cotton regards as being the most authoritative in the land. I might also add that the same *Financial Review* on 23 June in a comment on the economic comprehension or perspicacity of the present Prime Minister noted:

Even the most moderately literate person in economics would recognise—

That is, Mr Fraser’s—

economic pontifications as patent rubbish.

Indeed, even the most illiterate person in economics would recognise the present Prime Minister’s pontifications on economics as patent rubbish. I am sure that Senator Cotton, perhaps alone amongst his colleagues in this chamber, does recognise the Prime Minister’s pontifications as just that. Senator Cotton asserted that the Budget had been greeted with universal euphoria by the editors in the major newspapers. After he said that I read the editorials in the major newspapers and found that the *Sydney Morning Herald*, adopting an evenhanded approach, pointed out the fiscal jiggery pokery which had gone into the manipulations which the Treasurer had used to produce a false and artificial deficit. The *Australian* predictably said that it was a great Budget. The *Canberra Times* said that it had a sting in the tail, that sting being when State governments had to impose higher charges and higher indirect taxation following the miserly treatment they had received financially from the present Government under its new federalism policy. Obviously Senator Cotton did not read the Melbourne *Age* which from cover to cover condemned this Budget as being totally inappropriate. The claim that this Budget has been greeted with editorial euphoria is as shonky as Senator Carrick’s assurance to me on 30 April that payments to the States would increase in the next 3 years in real terms by more than the 58 per cent by which they had increased in the last 3 years. I trust that in the future Senator Carrick may have cause to issue a well considered and amplified statement on that issue.

Senator MESSNER (South Australia) (8.45)—I start by saying how upset I am at the lack of fire in this debate today. This is my first debate on a matter of public importance since becoming a member of the Senate and I am surprised that the sense of urgency from the Opposition benches is about the same as at a 19th century garden party. The attack against the Government in this attempt to bring home some
of the real issues of the day is almost pathetic. Honourable senators opposite talked about unemployment in terms of numbers but forgot about the people involved in it. They forget about the very real possibility that rising cost levels in this country will lead to greater unemployment unless cost increases are curbed and brought back to realistic levels. Until this country can again afford to export its goods and protect its industries against imports, which are challenging the very industrial base of the country and have done since Labor came to power in December 1972, we will not be able to resolve the unemployment problem. It is that which the Government is attacking. It is that which is the core of the Budget and it is something which the Opposition appears totally unable to comprehend.

It talks about a deficit as though it is some sort of major contribution to the welfare of the people. It has not yet realised that it has to be paid for. It has to be paid for by the people. It has to be paid for by you and me. This is not just idle talk because if we look at the comments of such organisations as the Chambers of Commerce we find that there is a direct relationship between the outlook of businessmen—we are talking about business confidence here tonight—and the way in which unemployment can be cured. I refer honourable senators to Canberra Comments which would have come to every senator in the last day or so. I was interested to read under the heading 'Statistical Results' that since June 1975, compared with the September quarter of 1976, the number of people who were saying that they expected costs to go higher had dropped from 88 to 73. The correlation is quite clear. On employment, 55 people regarded the employment situation in their businesses as being unchanged in the June quarter of 1975. However, by the September quarter of 1976 that number had risen to 74, clearly showing that businessmen had reached the position of understanding that costs are in direct relation to the job opportunities which they are able to provide. That is the core of the Government's problem and the core of Australia's problem and it is obviously something that the Opposition cannot realise and seems unable to grasp.

Some further evidence that has come to hand in the last hour I found as I was opening my mail in my office. It is a statement from the Australian Development Association pointing out that costs are the number one issue in economic recovery. Let us look at some other evidence. The Australia and New Zealand Banking Group Ltd produces a well respected journal.

Senator Brown—What is involved in costs?

Senator MESSNER—That journal has been presenting economic indicators for the last 25 years. If I can read some of it, senator, perhaps it might sink through. The ANZ Bank, in the last indicator in August 1976 said:

. . . given Australia's continuing high rate of inflation, there can be little doubt that a direct stimulus by way of increasing government spending, whether financed by borrowing from the public or the Reserve Bank, is an oversimplistic approach.

Senator Bishop—You have read only part of it. What about the demand?

Senator MESSNER—The bank continued and said:

Moreover, given the low level of real investment in maintaining productive capacity in recent years, such measures would prove self-defeating.

I hope Senator Bishop took note of that point because it answers very clearly his question concerning demand. The article continued:

Even assuming a revival of consumer confidence, they would, at best, add more to monetary demand than to real output, thereby aggravating inflation and compounding the difficulty of achieving sustained real growth in private capital formation.

That is the core of the problem. How we come to it is also pointed out in this article. No doubt Opposition members have not read it. The article points out that there should be tax cuts. It says that the Government should be expected to reduce the tax burden to achieve both reduction of costs, including moderation of wage demands via indexation. What has the Government done? It has introduced a valuation stock adjustment system which is aimed at the core of the problem of inflation and taxation of stocks. This will answer very clearly the problems that have been loaded onto retailers and wholesalers in the last 3 years. The investment allowance was brought in by this Government to achieve a similar result in respect of manufacturers. The ANZ Bank also pointed out that it would be common and, indeed, important that a domestic deficit should be around $2,500m. In fact the Government has budgeted for a $2,608m deficit which is in easy range of that figure. Let us also consider what the ANZ Bank said about cuts in spending. As Senator Bishop pointed out from the Opposition side, that is the key to the growth in demand which is going to get us out of the rut which we are in. The bank said:

Indeed, the optimum level of the deficit is closely related to the other fiscal measures in the Budget and also to the country's response to them. For example, the more success attends a policy of reducing taxes aimed to stimulate activity, the greater the deficit could be in 1976-77, without aggravating inflation.
The bank went on to say:

The single most important measure of economic success will be the trend of inflation.

That is the overriding consideration in this respect. So the matter of demand which Senator Bishop mentioned does not enter into the question. What has happened in the field of capital expenditure since this Government came to power? The fact is that in the March quarter, the first quarter under this Liberal Government, fixed capital expenditure was of the order of $1,187m. For the June quarter it was of the order of $1,524m, an increase of 28 per cent. The Senate will recall that the investment allowance was brought in on 1 January 1976. It is said that our policies are not working. Of course they are working and they are producing the result we want—the stimulation of job opportunities. On top of that, while there has been some apparent decline in public service jobs, and we hear this quite often from the Opposition, the fact is that private employment has increased by about 40,000 employees since this Government came to power. This again signifies that our policies are working.

I quickly remind the Senate that it is the cost pressures—not only as regards our exports but also the buying of imported goods rather than Australian-made goods, which creates jobs, which is leading to our downfall. I quote as an example a major company in Australia which has analysed a major investment in this country of the order of $200m to $300m and which has found that it is about 25 per cent cheaper to build a plant on the west coast of the United States of America. This is a positive example of the sorts of things we have been doing to our economy in the last 3 years.

The major question that has been raised is that of unemployment and the difficulties are well acknowledged. The answer is that we should try to stimulate investment as we have done since we came to power. We are continuing to do this through this Budget. Returning to Senator Bishop’s interjection, in a year in which the Labor Government was in power, 1973-74, we found that Government spending increased by 46 per cent while unemployment trebled. So where is his argument? How are we to solve the problem by spending more and creating a growing deficit?

The final point I want to make relates to what has occurred in the business community since the Budget. This clearly indicates the trend and the confidence which the Budget is developing in the community. I refer first of all to the result of trading on the stock exchange today. I think Senator Cotton referred earlier to the fact that the shares of Broken Hill Proprietary Company Ltd, the leading company in Australia, leapt considerably following heavy turnover today. Obviously this is the result of the impetus given to people to invest in Australia. People are investing in Australia’s leading companies. This was not an isolated example. The shares of companies such as the Australian Consolidated Industries Limited rose very much in today’s trading, and of course the mining companies also did well. To my mind this illustrates the confidence which Australians now seem to have. They are determined to press on and to ensure that the recovery we have all been looking for is going to develop. I move:

That the question be now put.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT—The question now is that the motion moved by Senator Wriedt be agreed to. Those in favour say ‘aye’; to the contrary ‘no’. I think the noes have it.

Senator Georges—Wait a minute. I think we will divide on this.

The PRESIDENT—A division is required. Ring the bells.

Senator Sir Magnus Cormack—I take a point of order. The honourable senator on the other side is challenging your decision. A decision was given and he challenged it.

Senator Georges—Speaking to the point of order, we were unexpectedly faced with the question that the motion be put. When the last speaker moved the gag he quite unexpectedly cut out one of our speakers. We were caught unaware and for that reason there was some hesitation in calling for the division. That is the reason for my hesitation, Mr President, and I apologise to you if I cut across your decision.

Senator Chaney—I rise to speak to the point of order. There have been a number of references of late to so-called arrangements. I made it quite clear to Senator Georges that the gag would be moved at the last opportunity so that this matter could be brought to a vote. If arrangements are to be discussed in this chamber in this way I must put my point.

Senator Bishop—I want to speak. I would like to speak.

The PRESIDENT—Order! I have ruled that a division be taken and the division shall proceed. Ring the bells.

(The bells having been rung)—
The PRESIDENT—Order! I will put the question again to clarify the situation in the minds of honourable senators. The question is: 'That the motion moved by Senator Wriedt be agreed to.' Those of that opinion say aye, those against say no. I have ordered that a division be held. The noes will pass to the left of the Chair and the ayes will pass to the right of the Chair.

The Senate divided.

(The President—Senator the Hon. Condor Laucke)

Ayes ........................................ 24
Noes .......................................... 33

Majority .................................... 9

AYES

Bishop, R. ................................ McClelland, Douglas
Brown, W. W. C. ............................... McIvor, G. D.
Button, J. N. ................................ McLaren, G. T.
Cameron, D. N. ................................. Melzer, J. I.
Cavanagh, J. L. ................................ Mulvihill, J. A.
Coleman, R. N. ................................ Primer, C. G.
Colston, M. A. ................................ Robertson, E. A.
Devitt, D. M. .................................. Ryan, S. M.
Gibbs, A. T. ................................... Silva, K. W.
Grimes, D. J. ................................... Walsh, P. A.
Harradine, B. ................................. Teller:
Keeffe, J. B. ................................... George, G.
McAuliffe, R. E. .............................. Teller:

NOES

Archer, B. R. ................................... Martin, K. J.
Baume, P. E. ................................... Mannell, C. R.
Bonner, N. T. ................................... Messner, A. J.
Carrick, J. L. ................................... Missen, A. J.
Collard, S. J. ................................... Rae, P. E.
Cormack, Sir Magnus ..................... Teller:
Cotton, R. C. ................................. Scott, D. B.
Davidson, G. S. ............................ Shell, G.
Drake-Brockman, T. C. .................. Sim, J. P.
Durack, P. D. .................................. Tchen, T. J.
Guilfoyle, M. G. C. ....................... Thomas, A. M.
Hall, R. Steele ............................... Townley, M.
Jessop, D. S. .................................. Walters, M. S.
Kilgour, B. F. ................................. Webster, J. J.
Knight, J. W. .................................. Wright, R. C.
Lajovic, M. E. ................................ Teller:
Laucke, C. L. ................................. Teller:

PAIRS

Wood, J. A. C. ................................ Wheelton, J. M.
Greenwood, I. J. .............................. McClelland, J.

Question so resolved in the negative.

Senator Bishop—At this stage, I wish to raise a point of order as to the procedure which might be adopted in future with respect to debates on urgency motions such as we have just completed. On the point of order may I indicate to you, Mr President, the understanding that I, my Whip, Senator Georges, and my Leader, Senator Wriedt, had with respect to the debate. It was my understanding that this debate on the urgency motion moved by Senator Wriedt on the question of unemployment would run for the full 3 hours allowed under the Standing Orders. The concluding speaker at the end of that 3-hour period would seek to move that the question be put.

You will recall, Mr President, that when the question was put 12 minutes debating time remained. I was the person listed to conclude the debate. At that point, Senator Messner, my colleague from South Australia, moved that the question be put. He had attacked some of my interjections in the course of his speech. His action meant that I had no opportunity to reply. I am raising this matter in a general sense. You may not wish to rule on it tonight. I suggest that you might have occasion to talk to the Leader of the Government (Senator Withers) and the Leader of the Opposition regarding the procedure to be followed in the future on such matters. I think that we in this Senate need to work to restore the prestige of this chamber in future similar debates. For that reason, and in a constructive vein, I ask you to consider what I have proposed. I do not ask you to rule on it tonight. Perhaps you might consider my representations later in the evening.

The PRESIDENT—Order! The matter which the honourable senator has referred to is a matter for determination by the Parties. When a motion is before me that the question be now put, that question must be put. In accordance with the procedures of this chamber, I have no authority other than to put that question.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Senator CHANEY (Western Australia)—Mr President, I ask for leave to make a personal explanation.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Senator CHANEY—There is a clear implication in what has been said by my colleague, Senator Georges, and by Senator Bishop that some breach of arrangements has occurred. My understanding was that arrangements between Whips or the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition were private matters not to be brought to the floor of the Senate. However, the matter having been raised on the floor of the Senate, it seems to me proper that I be given the chance simply to explain the position from my point of view.

All discussions of motions of urgency which have been dealt with in this Senate since I have been here have been concluded by being brought to a vote in the only way possible, that is, by moving that the question be put. In the other
event, the debate simply runs out its appointed
time. This afternoon in discussions with Senator
Georges we talked about this matter going for
the full 3 hours. It is certainly my understanding
of that conversation that I made it clear that the
Government would be seeking to bring the mat-
ter to a vote and that of course could be done
only by moving the gag. If there has been a mis-
understanding I regret it, but my understanding
of the position was that the debate would be
brought to a conclusion in the way in which all
such debates have been brought to a conclusion
since I became a member of the Senate; that is,
by a gag motion being moved.

Senator GEORGES (Queensland)—I apolo-
gise to Senator Chaney for the misunderstanding. If I placed him in an embarrassing position, it was without any deliberation on my part. My understanding of the position concerning de-
bates on urgency motions while I have been a member of the Senate is that they are not always
gagged or brought to, a decision. On many occasions in the past urgency motions have been
allowed to be talked out. That is really the point
of disagreement. We did not come to an exact ar-
rangement. For that reason I was caught unexpected-
ly when Senator Messner moved the gag. My understanding was that Senator Bishop
would have some time in which to speak. I gave
that indication to Senator Bishop. I am some-
what disturbed, however, that when the gag was
moved it was moved so unexpectedly that we did
not ask for a division on it. You, Mr President,
were caught in the very awkward situation of
there being indecision on our part as to whether
we wanted to divide.

I make it clear to the Senate that whenever the
gag is moved we will oppose it. The gag has been
used very seldom in this place, although since
this Government came to office with the numbers
in the Senate it has applied the gag on quite a
number of occasions. Our view of the matter is
that the gag must always be opposed. It is a
device that prevents people from speaking. On
this occasion it was a device that prevented Sen-
tator Bishop from speaking. It would have been far
more advantageous to the discussion if the de-
bate had been allowed to expire. That was my
understanding of the matter.

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—
Minister for Industry and Commerce)—I suggest
that, in the spirit of Senator Bishop's remarks, it
might be useful at a time later than this evening
to have this matter talked over between the
leaders of the various parties. My understanding
of the situation was quite clear. I asked the
Government Whip what would happen. He said
that the gag motion would be moved by Senator
Messner. That is what one would expect to be a
fact of life. If there are problems about this mat-
ter, I suggest that the general position be thought
about later by the Standing Orders Committee
or some such body. But there is little profit in con-
inuing to argue tonight about who was right and
who was wrong. I think that everybody is full of
good will. The original matter has been disposed
of. Let this matter be considered later.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the
Opposition)—I do not wish to prolong the mat-
ter. I believe that Senator Cotton has said the
right thing. We must not delay the matter. I have
risen to speak only because I was party to part of
the conversation between Senator Chaney and
Senator Georges. I think that there has been a
genuine misunderstanding. It is a borderline
case. My understanding was that the debate
would continue until 9.25 p.m.; but I have been
corrected by the Clerk, who has indicated to me
that the time for the expiration of the debate was
9.10 p.m. I think that that is where the confusion
arose. Perhaps in the future we ought to be a
little more precise in our communications with
each other. I do not think that there was any ill-
intention on the part of either of the Whips to
create the situation that arose.

POULTRY RESEARCH ADVISORY
COMMITTEE

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—
Minister for Industry and Commerce)—For the
information of honourable senators, I present the
third report of the Poultry Research Advisory
Committee for the year ended 30 June 1975.

FISHING INDUSTRY RESEARCH
COMMITTEE

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—
Minister for Industry and Commerce)—Pursuant
to section 19 of the Fishing Industry Research
Act 1969, I present the annual report of the Fish-
ing Industry Research Committee for the year
ended 30 June 1975.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION

Senator CARRICK (New South Wales—
Minister for Education)—Pursuant to section 14
of the Schools Commission Act 1973, I present
the Schools Commission report for the triennium
1977-1979. I seek leave to make a brief state-
ment relating to that report.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There
being no objection, leave is granted.
Senator CARRICK—The report contains the Commission's recommendations for the allocation of $508m—in December 1975 prices—for 1977 that I announced in the guidelines on 20 May. The report also contains provisional recommendations for the use of funds in 1978 and 1979. The main recommendations of the report are for the continuation of programs of general recurrent and capital grants for both government and non-government schools to be spent at the discretion of the recipients, the continuation of special purpose programs, a proposal for a special initiative to assist in overcoming the problems of educational disadvantage in country areas, a recommendation to provide $1m in 1977 to assist with the educational problems of children in government and non-government institutions, and encouragement of more openness and local participation in decision-making to encourage extended choice and variety in schooling. The Schools Commission's recommendations will be considered by the Government and decisions announced as soon as possible. By releasing the report as soon as it is available the Government is providing the opportunity for public consideration and comment.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to make my remarks at a later stage.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

TECHNICAL AND FURTHER EDUCATION COMMISSION


The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Senator CARRICK—The report contains detailed recommendations for Commonwealth financial assistance to the States for technical and further education in 1977 and options for alternative levels of support in 1978 and 1979. Under guidelines issued by the Government on 20 May an amount of $70m—in December 1975 prices—is to be available in 1977 for technical and further education purposes. By agreement between the Technical and Further Education Commission and the Commission on Advanced Education, $3m for 1977 has been transferred to TAFEC to cover the costs of those tertiary courses that are provided in technical and further education institutions. Consequently the recommendations of the Commission for 1977 cover the expenditure of $73m.

The Commission has recommended grants of $34.6m in 1977 for the construction and equipping of technical colleges. The balance is made up of recurrent grants—$25m to cover the costs to the States of abolishing tuition fees in technical colleges and $13.2m for a range of programs to improve the quality and effectiveness of technical and further education. In addition, $200,000 has been recommended to assist non-government agencies to mount programs designed to improve literacy and numeracy among adults and to provide preparatory courses, particularly those designed for people seeking training for re-entry to the labour force, and programs aimed at assisting the economically and socially deprived. The Commission's recommendations will be considered by the Government and decisions announced as soon as possible.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to make my remarks at a later stage.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION


The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Senator CARRICK—The Commission's report for the 1977-1979 triennium has been prepared in accordance with the guidelines for education commissions which I announced in the Senate on 20 May 1976. The Commission has made firm recommendation for the allocation of the funds available under the guidelines for 1977 and has made provisional recommendations relating to the minimum amounts under the guidelines for 1978 and 1979. It has also recommended new guidelines for the 1978-1980 triennium. The Commission's firm recommendations for the allocation of funds to universities for 1977 involve operating expenditure of $531.2m at December quarter 1975 cost levels, and building expenditure of $30m at December 1975 cost levels. Chapter I of the report provides a complete summary and sets out the Commission's recommendations. The Government will give
considerations to the Commission’s recommendations for 1977 and will announce its decisions as soon as possible.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SERVICE AND BUSINESS OUTLOOK FOR 1976-1977

Senator CARRICK (New South Wales—Minister for Education)—For the information of honourable senators I present 2 papers, one prepared by the Australian Postal Commission and the other by the Australian Telecommunications Commission, both entitled service and business outlook for 1976-1977.

REMUNERATION TRIBUNAL'S 1976 REVIEW

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce)—Pursuant to sub-sections 6 (5) and 7 (7) of the Remuneration Tribunals Act 1973 I present a copy of the Remuneration Tribunal’s 1976 review. This contains determinations or reports on the remuneration of Ministers of State, members of Parliament, judges, holders of offices in the First Division of the Australian Public Service, and holders of public offices. Pursuant to sub-section 7 (7) of the Remuneration Tribunals Act 1973 I also present determination number 1976/4, which preceded the 1976 review and relates to holders of certain public offices.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND (New South Wales)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the papers.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce)—For the information of honourable senators I present the report of the Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration together with 4 volumes of appendices. This report was publicly released on 1 August 1976.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND (New South Wales)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE TO ADVISE ON POLICIES FOR MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce)—For the information of honourable senators I present volume II of the Committee to Advise on Policies for Manufacturing Industry—the Jackson Committee. This volume was publicly released on 21 June 1976, during the parliamentary recess. All 4 volumes of the Committee’s report have now been released.

Senator DOUGLAS McCLELLAND (New South Wales)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

COMMITTEE ON OVERSEAS PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria—Minister for Social Security)—For the information of honourable senators I present the seventh report of the Committee on Overseas Professional Qualifications, dated December 1975.

Senator MULVIIHILL (New South Wales)—by leave—I move:
That the Senate take note of the paper.
I seek leave to continue my remarks.
Leave granted; debate adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY POLICE FORCE

Senator WEBSTER (Victoria—Minister for Science)—For the information of honourable senators I present the annual report of the Australian Capital Territory Police Force for the year ended 30 June 1975.

NATIONAL TRAINING COUNCIL

Senator DURACK (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation)—For the information of honourable senators I present the annual report of the National Training Council for the year ended 31 December 1975.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Senator DURACK (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation)—For the honourable senators I present reports by the Industries Assistance Commission on: Short term assistance to the commercial theatre, paints, varnishes and lacquers, railway and tramway locomotives, rolling stock, etc., and an interim report on:
Domestic refrigerating appliances, etc. (chest Freezers of up to 350 litres capacity).

**TEXTILES AUTHORITY**

Senator DURACK (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation)—For the information of honourable senators I present a report by the Textiles Authority on 'knitted and woven apparel.

**TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORITY**

Senator DURACK (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation)—For the information of honourable senators I present reports by the Temporary Assistance Authority on: Orange juice and sheets and plates of iron or steel.

Senator McLAREN (South Australia)—by leave—I move:

That the Senate take note of the paper in relation to the report by the Temporary Assistance Authority on orange juice.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

**ADMISSIBILITY AS EVIDENCE OF CONFESSIONS BY ABORIGINES AND ISLANDERS**

Motion (by Senator Bonner) agreed to:

That leave be given to bring in a Bill for an Act relating to the admissibility as evidence of confessions by Aborigines and Islanders and for purposes connected therewith.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Motion (by Senator Cotton) agreed to:

That intervening business be postponed until after consideration of General Business, Notice of Motion No. 2, standing in the name of Senator Davidson, that the Senate take note of the report of the Standing Committee on Education and the Arts on the education of isolated schoolchildren; and

That Government Business, Order of the Day No. 2, be postponed until the next day of sitting.

**SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON REGULATIONS AND ORDINANCES**

The PRESIDENT—I inform the Senate that I have received letters from the Leader of the Government in the Senate (Senator Withers) and the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Wriedt) informing me that Senators Durack, Devitt and Brown have requested that they be discharged from further attendance upon the Senate Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances and nominating Senators Missen, Cavanagh and Georges as members of the Committee in their places.

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce)—I ask for leave to propose a motion.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Motion (by Senator Cotton) agreed to:

That Senators Durack, Devitt and Brown be discharged from further attendance upon the Senate Standing Committee on Regulations and Ordinances, and that Senators Missen, Cavanagh and Georges, having been duly nominated in accordance with standing order 36a, be appointed to the Committee.

**STATES GRANTS (ABORIGINAL ASSISTANCE) BILL 1976**

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Guilfoyle) read a first time.

Second Reading

Senator GUILFOYLE (Victoria—Minister for Social Security) (9.30)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

This annual States Grants Bill will provide legislative authority for the payments of grants to the States, for Aboriginal assistance programs undertaken by the State governments during 1975-76. It follows the pattern of States grants legislation of previous years. I seek the agreement of the Senate to the incorporation in Hansard of several tables of expenditure. Table 1 sets out the estimated expenditure under State grants for various broad functions in 1975-76. I seek leave to have that table included in Hansard.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(The document read as follows)—

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>4,495,203</td>
<td>373,457</td>
<td>2,200,000</td>
<td>2,885,900</td>
<td>2,881,973</td>
<td>227,200</td>
<td>13,063,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,640,635</td>
<td>279,800</td>
<td>4,142,596</td>
<td>1,177,500</td>
<td>6,860,000</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>14,118,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,518,212</td>
<td>490,200</td>
<td>1,475,355</td>
<td>1,389,500</td>
<td>2,005,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>6,901,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>281,300</td>
<td>343,500</td>
<td>418,361</td>
<td></td>
<td>357,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,400,161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senator GUILFOYLE—Table 2 sets out actual expenditure for the 1974-75 financial year. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in Hansard.

(The document read as follows)—

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>112,700</td>
<td>93,800</td>
<td>143,400</td>
<td>220,100</td>
<td>710,000</td>
<td>17,600</td>
<td>1,297,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,236,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,344,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,166,050</td>
<td>1,580,757</td>
<td>9,645,957</td>
<td>5,673,000</td>
<td>12,813,973</td>
<td>286,000</td>
<td>38,165,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(The document read as follows)—

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
<th>S.A.</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,296,800</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>2,007,300</td>
<td>1,025,868</td>
<td>6,059,198</td>
<td>21,550</td>
<td>10,560,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>5,345,698</td>
<td>1,513,947</td>
<td>6,964,495</td>
<td>3,606,972</td>
<td>204,450</td>
<td>17,635,562</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>545,532</td>
<td>329,000</td>
<td>610,505</td>
<td>722,100</td>
<td>2,380,965</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,591,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>331,418</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>55,700</td>
<td>22,235</td>
<td>561,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,037,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>221,052</td>
<td>70,053</td>
<td></td>
<td>59,405</td>
<td>1,968,837</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>2,328,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community amenities</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>724,000</td>
<td>121,847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>895,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,790,500</td>
<td>2,130,000</td>
<td>10,362,000</td>
<td>5,558,427</td>
<td>10,970,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>37,048,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator GUILFOYLE—Table 3 shows the pattern of appropriations to the States for Aboriginal affairs programs from 1969-70 to 1974-75, including proposed allocations for 1975-76. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in Hansard also.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>1,179,000</td>
<td>1,701,000</td>
<td>2,400,000</td>
<td>4,750,000</td>
<td>5,402,000</td>
<td>7,790,500</td>
<td>8,254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>347,000</td>
<td>367,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>770,000</td>
<td>948,000</td>
<td>2,130,000</td>
<td>2,147,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>2,055,000</td>
<td>2,538,000</td>
<td>3,038,000</td>
<td>7,700,000</td>
<td>9,557,000</td>
<td>10,362,000</td>
<td>11,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,740,000</td>
<td>4,699,000</td>
<td>5,558,427</td>
<td>5,725,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>1,255,000</td>
<td>1,680,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td>6,886,000</td>
<td>11,090,000</td>
<td>10,970,000</td>
<td>13,307,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>154,000</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>286,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,410,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td>9,200,000</td>
<td>22,000,000</td>
<td>32,250,000</td>
<td>37,048,927</td>
<td>40,790,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator GUILFOYLE—These tables will show to Parliament the breadth and scope of the Commonwealth's activities to overcome Aboriginal disadvantage in co-operation with the States.

This financial year a total of $192.065m was appropriated for direct Commonwealth Government expenditure on Aboriginal affairs—an increase of 21.5 per cent over the $158m actually spent in 1974-75. Of this year's funds, $145.8m was to be spent through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs either directly in the Northern
Territory and by direct grants to Aboriginals or organisations; through grants to the States; or through related Government companies and statutory bodies. The balance was to be expended by other departments with which the Department of Aboriginal Affairs acts in close collaboration such as the Department of Health, the Department of Education for study grants, secondary grants and special programs in the Northern Territory, and the Department of Housing and Construction in the Northern Territory. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs was able to achieve savings of about $3m in the

States Grants program in support of the Government's action in restraining the growth of Government expenditure this financial year in order to control the size of the Budget deficit. As with other savings, our aim was to meet commitments made and avoid major disruption to programs, an objective I am satisfied has been achieved. I seek leave to incorporate in Hansard table 4 which is a statement showing how the $192.065m was allocated.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(1he document read as follows)—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>PROPOSED DIRECT AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE OF ABORIGINAL ADVANCEMENT BY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to the States</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Secondary Grants</td>
<td>3,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Study Grants</td>
<td>4,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Study Grants for Aboriginals</td>
<td>631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to voluntary organisations</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory education services</td>
<td>6,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to the States</td>
<td>2,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to voluntary organisations</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct expenditure in the Northern Territory</td>
<td>1,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security and Welfare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to the States</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to voluntary organisation and support of miscellaneous projects</td>
<td>4,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to municipal authorities and Aboriginal Councils for employment projects</td>
<td>2,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Aboriginal business enterprises</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal enterprises loans (payment to the Aboriginal Enterprises Fund)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government settlements in the Northern Territory</td>
<td>3,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missions in the Northern Territory</td>
<td>4,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aboriginal Consultative Committee</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative and other expenditure</td>
<td>6,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to the States</td>
<td>10,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants to Aboriginal housing associations</td>
<td>1,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal housing and personal loans (payments to Aboriginal Housing and Personal Loans Fund)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of hostel accommodation</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14,489</td>
<td>25,457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Senator GUILFOYLE—These 4 tables will provide honourable senators with information on the wide range of funding undertaken by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs through both grants to the States and direct administration of the Department. The mere words and figures do not of themselves reflect the diversity of programs and projects undertaken, nor the divergent problems of urban, fringe dwelling and remote communities of Aborigines with which the Government must cope.

This Bill is not the occasion to discuss all these matters in detail but for the moment I will shortly outline some of the actions and objectives of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs since assuming responsibility. Since coming into office the Government has embarked upon a review and re-assessment of programs aimed at eliminating waste and inefficiency, providing real value for money spent and establishing a firm foundation for future reforms and sound long term policies. The Government is expected to receive shortly the report of the inquiry conducted by Mr David Hay into services financed by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs.

In recognising the valuable contribution which is being made by the States in supporting the Commonwealth’s programs for Aboriginal affairs, the Government will be keen to explore ways in which its primary objective of developing Aboriginals self-management and Aboriginal self-sufficiency can be meshed in with the need to continue ongoing programs. The principles of Aboriginal self-management and self-sufficiency are not only major objectives of the Government’s policy but will, it is believed, have a cumulative effect in freeing Aboriginals from over-dependence on Government and removing all taint of past paternalism. Wherever possible through direct grants Aboriginal organisations are funded to carry out programs apart from those performed by Commonwealth and State government departments.

It is our aim to find ways in which Aboriginals can play a more significant role in their own affairs. This includes the setting of long term goals and objectives, establishing priorities for expenditure within overall Budget allocations and evaluating programs and formulating new ones. Some States already have machinery for involving Aboriginals in their programs and for consulting with them. Within the Government’s pursuit of a real policy of federalism it is hoped to promote in co-operation with the States, a higher degree of involvement of Aboriginals in State programs in line with our own policies for direct funding of Aboriginal organisations throughout Australia. This is not to be regarded as an excuse for delaying steps towards a greater degree of Aboriginal involvement. In saying this there needs to be recognised the problems which Aboriginal organisations face in accumulating managerial, administrative and other expertise as they move to more responsibility for their own affairs.

The Government will foster State participation in concert with its policies on federalism where it is seen that State agencies are the most appropriate avenue for assisting in Aboriginal affairs programs. However, I would remind
honourable senators that, with the co-operation of almost every State government, arrangements have been made for the Commonwealth through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to assume a major role in policy and administration in the States following the decision of the Australian community in the 1967 referendum. There is already a high level of co-operation with the States and we aim to build upon it. Since 1974-75 the Commonwealth has assumed responsibility for Aboriginal affairs in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania. In Western Australia responsibility is a joint Commonwealth-State one pursuant to an agreement between the State and the Commonwealth. The Department of Aboriginal Affairs presence in Queensland continued to increase in 1975-76 whilst at the same time expanding the provision of grants to the State Government.

There is foreshadowed in the coalition parties’ policy statement on Aboriginal affairs the establishment of new funding accounts. We are looking at these as a basis for future reform.

The Government has initiated certain measures aimed at improving the level of consultation with Aboriginal people. The appointment of a committee of inquiry to review the functions and role of the National Aboriginal Consultative Committee is the most important of these measures. Three of the 4 members are Aboriginals. As stated previously it is not the Government’s intention to abolish the NACC. Our objective is to determine the most appropriate role for it within a total framework of consultative arrangements which ensure that differences in the situations, culture and diversity of life styles of Aboriginals throughout Australia are recognised. The interests of the more traditional communities in remote parts of the country are not the same as urban Aboriginals. We have announced that a major legislative commitment in the early life of this Government will be a measure for the recognition and implementation of Aboriginal land rights in the Northern Territory which the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs expects to introduce today.

The Government is aware of the need to institute policies at the national level to improve the relationships between Aboriginals and police. I will not dwell again on the statement made concerning the Royal Commission’s report on the incidents at Laverton and Skull Creek in Western Australia other than to indicate that more needs to be done in achieving a greater level of understanding of the problems of Aboriginals by those who enforce the law. This circumstance has highlighted the good sense of the Government parties in identifying cross cultural understanding in their Aboriginal affairs policy as a matter of high priority. This is so because it is not until we as Australians come to accept the problems of minority groups living by different historic cultural values that better race relationships can be established. We would aim to promote Aboriginal history and culture programs through the primary schools and other measures designed to give effect to these goals. In many respects one of the most disturbing effects of contact with traditional Aboriginal communities is the destruction of their social and cultural organisation with the resultant inability of some groups to withstand the shock of the clash of cultures. Fortunately the destructive force of the forced abandonment or plain disdain of traditional Aboriginal social structures is now being recognised.

The problem of alcohol is a much discussed but less understood symptom of this situation. Aboriginal groups and communities have shown their desire to deal with the problem: more traditional communities by their own control of the availability of alcohol within the community and individuals in more urban situations by their wish to play an important part in treatment programs. What is being done here is a good example of Aboriginal involvement and the range of activities supported by the Government. Various Aboriginal-run pick-up services, night shelters and half-way houses are already operating very successfully. A recent national seminar funded by the Government on Aborigines and alcohol recommended the use of predominantly Aboriginal staff in treatment programs, that courts and ambulances refer Aboriginal alcoholics and problem drinkers to Aboriginal services and that Aboriginal police steering committees be set up in each State to co-operate on the legal aspects of drunkenness and arrest. To assist and develop these services $288,330 has been allocated in the current financial year to voluntary organisations working in the field. The House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs has before it a reference on alcoholism and Aboriginals.

Employment training and support programs are an important element in activities aimed at overcoming disadvantage. In conjunction with his colleagues the Minister for Education (Senator Carrick), the Minister for Health (Mr Hunt) and myself, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Mr Viner) is reviewing the relationship between widespread Aboriginal unemployment and the social consequences, in many cases disastrous for communities in remote areas, of the payment of
unemployment benefits. In conjunction with my colleagues the Minister for Education and the Minister for Health, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs is considering and reviewing the needs of Aboriginal people in those areas against the background of the coalition parties' policy statement. There have been significant developments in the field of education and the attention which has been given to programs in this area is beginning to show results.

An examination of the tables and some of the points that I have made indicate the wide range of our programs, the inter-relationship between the various areas of activity and the need to cross functional boundaries to achieve results. In much the same way as we must act at the Commonwealth level to co-ordinate programs with other departments we must necessarily do the same between the Commonwealth and the States.

What I have said also points to the particular responsibilities which the Government faces in developing national policies in Aboriginal affairs. I have not attempted to provide an extensive exposition of what is being done by and through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in the field of Aboriginal affairs. I have sought to give an outline of what lies behind the bare figures presented in the tables as indicative of the range of activities in which the Government is currently engaged in meeting the needs of Aboriginal people. I commend the Bill to the Senate.

Debate (on motion by Senator Keefe) adjourned.

EXPORT FINANCE AND INSURANCE CORPORATION AMENDMENT BILL 1976

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Cotton) read a first time.

Second Reading

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (9.44)—I move: That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the overseas investment insurance provisions of the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Act, 1974. The amendments proposed in the Bill do not involve any change in the Government's policy concerning the overseas investment insurance scheme operated by the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation—EFIC. The amendments are essentially of an administrative character and are intended to streamline the administration of the scheme for the benefit of Australian investors in overseas countries.

This scheme was introduced in 1965 to assist Australian manufacturers to establish manufacturing facilities overseas as a means of preserving their export markets. At that time Australia was one of the pioneers in this field, being only the fourth country to provide this facility for its overseas investors. There are about twenty such schemes operating around the world today. In 1974, the previous Government extended the scope of the scheme to encompass all new worthwhile direct investments which can assist in the social and economic development of an overseas country, and which are in Australia's national interest to insure. The new legislation also provided that the Corporation could participate in overseas investment insurance on its own commercial account instead of the Government assuming all liability, as was previously the case.

The overseas investment insurance scheme has been a useful means of implementing the policy of successive Australian Governments of encouraging direct Australian investment in developing countries, particularly those in our region. Insurance cover is offered against non-commercial risks such as expropriation, war damage and restrictions on the remittance of dividends and capital to Australia. At the present time, 60 overseas investments by Australian enterprises are insured under the scheme, involving a maximum contingent liability for the Government and the Corporation of $74m. The majority of investments insured under the scheme are in developing countries and in recent years the countries of the Association of South East Asian Nations group have been the most important locations for investments covered under the scheme. Twenty-six applications for investment insurance cover have been submitted in the last 12 months and this increasing usage of the scheme has demonstrated a need to streamline procedures for processing applications.

The present legislation requires that all applications for investment insurance be submitted to the Minister for Overseas Trade for approval. The principal amendments proposed would empower the Corporation to transact the more routine business on its commercial account in accordance with a policy approved by the Minister, without the need to refer individual applications to the Minister for decision. The policy approved by me for the operation of this element of the scheme will establish guidelines to be observed
by the Corporation on such aspects as the overseas countries which would be covered, the categories of investment eligible for insurance and the nature of the non-commercial risks against which investors overseas would be insured. Applications which fall outside the scope of the approved policy, or which the Corporation is unable to accommodate on its own commercial account, would continue to be referred to the Minister to consider whether the Government should accept the liability for insurance cover. These amendments would place the administration of the overseas investment insurance scheme on a similar basis to the administration of the other insurance facilities provided by EFIC, notably the export payments insurance and guarantees scheme.

The Bill proposes that the definition of an 'overseas investment transaction' which may be considered for insurance cover would be broadened to better reflect current commercial practice. In particular, it is proposed to include 2 additional categories of investment, namely guarantees of loans made to finance investment overseas, and investment transactions made through overseas affiliates in which the Australian investor has a substantial shareholding. The Bill also proposes amendments to rectify an anomaly whereby the transitional provisions of the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Act 1974 do not encompass applications which were received or approved under the repealed Export Payments Insurance Corporation Act 1956-73 and which had not been finalised to the contract stage by the time the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Act came into operation. The inadvertent effect of the transitional provisions of the Export Finance and Insurance Corporation Act has been to deny insurance to a number of transactions which would have been finalised if the Export Payments Insurance Corporation Act had continued in force. This amendment will enable these applications to be processed normally, as if they had been submitted under the existing legislation. The amendments proposed in this Bill are a step forward in the Government's program to develop practical measures which will assist Australian industry both in Australia and overseas. The proposals will also facilitate our commercial relations with developing countries, particularly those in our own region. I commend the Bill to honourable senators.

Debate (on motion by Senator Keeffe) adjourned.

HOMES SAVINGS GRANT AMENDMENT BILL 1976

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Carrick) read a first time.

Second Reading

Senator CARRICK (New South Wales—Minister for Education) (9.52)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Homes Savings Grant Act 1964-1975, to give effect to the proposals for changes in the existing home savings grant scheme which Senator Greenwood announced to the Senate on 31 March 1976. I intend, as soon as possible, to introduce legislation to establish the new home savings grant scheme, the details of which were also announced to the Senate on 31 March. The new scheme will apply to persons contracting to acquire their first home on or after 1 January 1977. In passing, might I again draw attention to a special provision of the new scheme whereby savings held in the approved forms as at 31 May 1976 will be deemed to have been held since 1 January 1976. I should like to advise everyone saving for their first home to ensure that their home savings are held in an acceptable form by 31 May 1976. The acceptable forms for the new scheme will be the same as for the present scheme—savings bank accounts; fixed deposits with banks; shares or deposits in registered building societies or credit unions; and payments on land on which the home is to be built, deposits paid for the acquisition of the home and payments for the construction of the home.

The amendments which I now introduce will apply to people who are otherwise eligible to receive a grant under the present scheme and who contract to buy or build their first home on or after 1 April 1976. Under the present scheme a person who builds a home on his parents' rural property is ineligible for a home savings grant unless he has title to the land. To become eligible for a grant, he has to acquire separate title, which can be expensive undertaking, or to become a joint owner, which is not always practicable. The amendments now proposed do away with this requirement. They provide that a person has an approved interest in land for the purposes of the Act if he has contracted to build a dwelling-house on a rural property, provided that he has the permission of the owner of that property to
occupy the dwelling-house on completion. Increasingly, people are buying factory-built houses which are transported to the site and placed on prepared foundations. This applies particularly to rural properties. The Bill provides that, for the purposes of the Act, this shall be regarded as the construction of the dwelling-house on the land, as shall be the purchase of a house built on land elsewhere and transported to the site.

In addition, the amendments will assist young married couples who are buying their first home from a State or Commonwealth housing authority. Previously, such couples have not been eligible for a grant because of the financial assistance provided by the Commonwealth in the construction and purchase of their home. This was an anomalous situation, because people acquiring privately-built homes with Commonwealth finance were not disqualified. The restriction will be removed in relation to people contracting to acquire homes from Commonwealth or State housing authorities on or after 1 April 1976. Under the conditions of the present legislation savings with a credit union are acceptable only if the credit union has been approved for the purposes of the Act. People contracting to buy or build their first home on or after 1 April 1976 will be able to claim savings held with any credit union within their 3 years savings period.

The Bill also provides that people who contract to buy or build their first home on or after 1 April 1976 may apply for a grant at any time. However, people who contracted to buy or build their home before 1 April 1976 must still apply for their grant within 12 months, unless an extension of time is granted. This Bill should be seen as the first step towards implementing our housing policy undertaking, to make it a major national objective to encourage all people who wish to do so to own their own home. I commend the Bill to honourable senators.

Debate (on motion by Senator O'Keeffe) adjourned.

DEFENCE FORCES RETIREMENT BENEFITS FUND (DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS TO PENSIONERS) BILL 1976

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Cotton) read a first time.

Defence Forces Retirement Benefits (Surplus) Bill

Second Reading

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (9.56)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On 28 April 1976 the report of the Defence Forces Retirement Benefits Board was tabled together with a report to the Board by the Australian Government Actuary on the assets and liabilities of the Defence Forces Retirement Benefits Fund as at 30 September 1972—the effective date of the transfer of the Fund to the Commonwealth. The investigation covered the period from 1 July 1964 to 30 September 1972. It revealed excess or surplus assets at book value of $6.337m which was attributable to those who were pensioners during that period. I emphasise that the investigation relating to former DFRB contributors who transferred to the DFRDB Scheme is not yet complete. The Minister for Defence (Mr Killen) is awaiting a further report from the Board. It was explained when the report was tabled that the surplus amount would be distributed in cash to the eligible persons concerned and that the amounts to be allocated would be accumulated from 1 October 1972 using a factor based on the earning rate of the DFRB Fund at 30 June 1972. The calculations will be equivalent to the accumulation of the surplus assets at compound interest and will produce a final return to pensioners of an amount approximating $8m. This Bill gives effect to those decisions.

It provides also for the development of a basis of allocation which ensures that each person concerned will receive a fair and reasonable share of the amount to be distributed. The allocation arrangements will be determined by the Minister for Defence after receiving advice from the Actuary. In conclusion I should mention that the Chairman of the DFRB Board had informed the Minister for Defence that every attempt will be made to have all the formalities completed in time for the payments to be made before the end of the year. I commend the Bill to the Senate.

Debate (on motion by Senator O'Keeffe) adjourned.

CRIMES (AIRCRAFT) AMENDMENT BILL 1976

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Durack) read a first time.
Second Reading

Senator DURACK (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation) (10.1)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Crimes (Aircraft) Act 1963-1973 so as to permit the summary prosecution of offences against section 18 of that Act. The Crimes (Aircraft) Act is the basic Commonwealth legislation concerning offences on or in relation to aircraft engaged in flights in and around Australia. It creates a number of offences of varying gravity but as it now stands, provides only one mode of trial for those offences—namely, trial on indictment. In the years since the first passage of this legislation by Parliament experience has shown that there are many cases arising under section 18 that do not warrant the lengthy processes involved in a trial before a judge and jury; nor are they within measurable distance of warranting the maximum penalty prescribed by section 18—namely, imprisonment for 7 years. As it now stands that section makes it an offence for a person, except in the circumstances specified in sub-section (2), to carry or place dangerous goods on an aircraft; deliver dangerous goods to a person for the purpose of their being placed on an aircraft; or be in possession of dangerous goods on an aircraft.

Honourable senators will see that basically these are very serious offences indeed. It will be equally obvious, however, that there can be circumstances which make it totally inappropriate for the offender to be tried before a judge and jury. For example, there have been several cases where undeclared ‘dangerous’ goods, usually firearms, have been found in passengers' hold luggage. If there is no intent to mis-use the goods on the aircraft the danger created by the presence of those firearms may not be of major significance. Accordingly summary prosecution of offenders falling within this class would provide the adequate deterrent effect and allow for the imposition of the appropriate penalty.

I need make only two more points: Firstly, the consent of the Attorney-General will still be required for any prosecution instituted for an offence against the Act. This will ensure that there is adequate control of proceedings arising out of any infringement of the provisions of the Act. Next, the essence of this amendment is that an offender may only have his case disposed of summarily if both the prosecutor and the defendant agree to that course being taken. It is of course the intention that serious cases be prosecuted on indictment. Additionally, however, this amendment ensures that an accused person will retain his right to insist on a trial by his peers for any offence against this Act. I commend the Bill to the Senate.

Debate (on motion by Senator Keeffe) adjourned.

AUSTRALIAN CAPITAL TERRITORY ELECTRICITY SUPPLY AMENDMENT BILL 1976

Bill received from the House of Representatives.

Ordered that the Bill may be taken through all its stages without delay.

Bill (on motion by Senator Webster) read a first time.

Second Reading

Senator WEBSTER (Victoria—Minister for Science) (10.6)—I move:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the Australian Capital Territory Electricity Supply Act 1962-1973 for the following purposes: Firstly, to replace the references to the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council with references to the Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly; secondly, to amend the provisions of the principal Act dealing with the remuneration and allowances of the members of the Australian Capital Territory Electricity Authority; and, thirdly, to bring the language of the principal Act into line with current drafting practices. In 1962 the Australian Capital Territory Electricity Authority was established by the principal Act. It consisted of a Chairman and two other members, one of whom was to be elected by the 'Advisory Council' of the Australian Capital Territory.

In 1974 amendments were made to the Advisory Council Ordinance which amongst other things effectually reconstituted the Australian Capital Territory Advisory Council as the Legislative Assembly. Legal doubts have been expressed that the amendments to the Ordinance could operate to amend the Australian Capital Territory Electricity Supply Act to correct the superseded references. The Bill, which in this respect is of a purely mechanical character, will bring about this result but it also validates acts or things done by the Electricity Authority and any election by the Legislative Assembly of a member of the Authority since the time the Advisory Council was superseded by the Legislative Assembly. With regard to the second of the purposes I have mentioned, the Bill makes the provisions of the principal Act dealing with the remuneration and allowances of members of the
Authority to take account of the changes in the manner in which their remuneration is now determined by virtue of the Remuneration Tribunals Act 1973-1975. The opportunity has been taken to include in the Bill some formal amendments of the principal Act to bring the language of the Act into line with current drafting practices. I commend the Bill to the Senate.

Debate (on motion by Senator Keeffe) adjourned.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE ARTS

Senator DAVIDSON (South Australia) (10.9)—I move:

That the Senate take note of the Report of the Standing Committee on Education and the Arts on the Education of Isolated School Children.

In moving the motion I want to acknowledge the decision of the Senate on 2 June 1976 which, as you will recall, Mr President, allowed for the presentation of the report to the President to enable it to become a public document. I want to acknowledge the action of the President which enabled this to be done and I further want to acknowledge the tabling of the report by the President last evening in fulfilment of the resolution of the Senate. All of this was of particular value to the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts which is one of a number of Senate committees involved in a wide range of activities and one which is devoting itself with some intensity to the references that are currently before it.

The resolution of the Senate in June enabled the presentation of the report and gave an opportunity for the organisation in Australia most interested in it and most affected by it to be part of the presentation. I refer to the Isolated Children’s Parents’ Association. This, as honourable senators may know, is a large and successful organisation which held its annual conference this year at Broken Hill on 21 and 22 July. Members of the Senate will greatly appreciate the value of this situation in that the presentation of the report immediately before the conference enabled a discussion on the report itself. It was my privilege to accept the Association’s invitation to open the annual conference of the Isolated Children’s Parents’ Association and I was able to speak in some dimension in relation to the report. I am very pleased to say that the report of the Senate Committee was very well received and in confirmation of that I would like to read to the Senate a letter which I have received in the last few days from the Federal President of the Isolated Children’s Parents’ Association, Mr E. C. Powne. Mr Powne said, and I quote the letter in full:

Dear Senator Davidson,

I wish to thank you on behalf of our members for coming to Broken Hill, and officially opening our annual Conference. At the same time I want to express our appreciation to you, the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts, and the staff of that committee, for the work that went into compiling the report on Isolated children. In particular for the effort in presenting a report, prior to the 1976 Budget.

Our Association at last has a document, prepared by an outside body, that can be referred to when making future submissions. I congratulate you on the fine summary of the report that you presented at our conference. In the minutes of Conference we are including a full copy of all addresses and comments made during the conference. When the minutes are completed we will be forwarding your copy.

In addition to that the release of the report of the Standing Committee on Education and the Arts at the time received a great deal of interest and favourable Press coverage for which, of course, members of the Committee are particularly appreciative.

In speaking at the Broken Hill meeting specifically about the report of the Senate Committee I not only referred to the details of the recommendations in the Senate Committee’s report but also had a few things to say in relation to the wide field of education. In this connection I made the point that the major purpose of education is to provide opportunity for self-fulfilment and personal development. I went on to say that this self-fulfilment is a heritage and it follows that access to this heritage is a basic human right which really should yield satisfaction throughout all of our lifetime. I also pointed out that for some considerable time it has been generally felt that free access to education was a powerful instrument of social mobility and for this reason governments everywhere had given a great deal of attention to the provision of free public education. These governments had tried to ensure that facilities at a given level of education were equal for all people. I made the additional point that education should really ensure that all children in their growth from a dependent to an independent status in our society should have the opportunity to find their own identity as social beings and that if all these arguments had any weight at all it surely followed that they must be applied to the situation of what we know as isolated school children. These arguments should be applied to them with increased emphasis, persistent attention and an extraordinary sympathetic understanding.

The Committee presents its report to the Senate in order to outline the main issues which have been brought to its attention during its inquiry.
As honourable senators will see, the report discusses possible courses of action which might be taken by education authorities at both Commonwealth level and State level so that there can be an alleviation of the educational disadvantage or hardship which is suffered by what we call isolated children. The report makes a large number of recommendations. Many of them relate to funding and to allocations of a financial nature. I would say that if these recommendations are implemented they will go a long way towards giving assistance to parents of isolated children, parents who are endeavouring to give their families the same educational opportunities as other children. I commend the report to the Senate and I invite members of the Senate to examine the recommendations which the report contains. As everybody will appreciate, it is not appropriate now to discuss the recommendations and details of the report and I hope that arrangements can be made before too long for a sensible debate in depth on the report.

I have pointed out that the people affected by the deliberations of the Committee and the people affected by the recommendations contained in the report come from all States of Australia. Indeed, they are scattered right across the nation and their welfare as they work their destiny out in lonely and scattered places surely must be the concern of all of us. I invite honourable senators to peruse not only the findings of the Committee but also its recommendations in particular. They reflect the great yearning felt by the community most affected by the report for an improvement not only in educational facilities but also in all conditions and circumstances that will make for a better quality of life for them and also for their better contribution as citizens of Australia.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

Debate adjourned.

ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT (FINANCIAL SUPPORT FUND) BILL 1976

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 27 May, on motion by Senator Cotton:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Senator WRIEDT (Tasmania—Leader of the Opposition) (10.19)—The Bill before the Senate is the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (Financial Support Fund) Bill 1976. Australia's involvement in this agreement began in 1975 under the previous Government. This legislation really does no more than ratify the agreement, as is essential with virtually all international agreements. The original need to establish this Fund arose as a result of the very significant changes which took place in balance of payments matters involving members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development during 1974 and 1975 following an increase in world oil prices. We are all aware of the quite dramatic shift of financial resources at that time, from what I suppose could be called the traditionally wealthy countries, North America and Europe, to the oil producing countries which make up the Organisation or Petroleum Exporting Countries. The amount involved in 1974, as has been pointed out, was in the vicinity of $60 billion. Because of the vast increase in the cost of these fuels to members of OECD it became necessary, in order for them to protect their balance of payment programs, to institute a fund of this nature. Where the need arises they can call on the Fund in order to rectify or to right their balance of payment problems.

I feel sure that we all agree that the concept of the Fund was a good one. With the passage of time it would seem that the Fund has not been called upon or that the need for the Fund has not been established to the extent that was then thought necessary. In other words, member nations have not been confronted with the problems that they thought at that time they would face. Nevertheless the Fund does serve a worthwhile purpose and it is not beyond possibility that at some time in the future members of OECD will be again confronted with some similar sort of stresses relating to their international payments. I am sure we hope that situation will not arise, but the fund is now in existence and Australia is a member of it. Our commitment, limited to approximately SA275m, is not likely to be called upon. We, as a major exporter of raw materials and primary produce, would not anticipate a situation to arise which would place us in that position but the situation could change in the years ahead as our import bill for fuel oils obviously will increase and increase dramatically over the next 10 years. On the other hand we are all conscious that our exports could equally be dramatically increased.

This agreement is under the auspices of OECD and there are one or two points I wish to raise now at the second reading stage of this Bill rather than to take the time of the Senate by doing so in the Committee stage. The Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Cotton) and his
advisers may be able to help me at this stage. If not I would appreciate some comments from him at a later stage. I want to refer to 2 aspects of the agreement. The first is Article IV, section 2, on page 5 of the agreement—I think the agreement has been circulated—which refers to the liability of the OECD. It states:

The OECD shall bear no liability for the acts or omissions of the Fund.

I am not clear on this point and nowhere can I find clarity as to why the Fund itself presumably is the body that bears liability. I would have assumed that the OECD would have some responsibility in this area. I would appreciate clarity on this point. I assume that the Fund is a legal entity in its own right and that it assumes all responsibilities independent of the OECD.

The other matter about which I question the Minister concerns Article V, section 3, paragraph (e). That paragraph contains the following clause:

The Governing Committee shall keep the economic policies of the borrower, as well as the implementation of the conditions referred to in paragraph (c) of this Section, under review.

I ask for clarification of that clause because of the dispute—I think that is a fair word to use—which has existed within the International Monetary Fund over the past two or three years as concerning withdrawals from that Fund. When a certain stage of withdrawal is reached—from memory I think it is the third stage, or the third tranche, as it is termed—the Fund is given authority to oversee or in some way inquire into the economic policies of the country which has made the withdrawal. At the recent conference in, I think, Nairobi this year, this matter was the subject of considerable discussion. I ask the Minister whether he could tell me whether the same conditions will apply in respect of any borrowings by Australia, or any other nation for that matter, from this Fund.

I do not think there is any need for us to delay consideration of this legislation. When one looks through the agreement one finds that it is an extremely complicated document. I have no doubt that both the previous Government and its advisers and this Government and its advisers—probably the advisers are the same people—gave thorough consideration to the implications for Australia notwithstanding the fact that the likelihood of our requiring to use the Fund is remote. Notwithstanding those factors, the Opposition is not opposing the legislation.

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (10.27)—in reply—We could use the debate on this Bill to have an interesting debate on the general ramifications of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and on another occasion perhaps one could have enjoyed that. However, this is a non-contentious measure. The Leader of the Opposition, Senator Wriedt, raised a couple of queries and I hope to have answers for him in a little while. However, as he noted, this arrangement was introduced in effect in Paris in April 1975 during the term of the previous Government and at a time of greater difficulty in the oil surplus and oil deficient countries of OPEC and OECD. There were balance of payments problems because of the transfer of resources from one group to another. The OECD moved in at that time to set up this arrangement of a financial support fund and it seems to me to be an admirable device to try to hold a problem like that.

The agreement is worth looking at, if one had sufficient time, in order to see the number of countries that are involved in the OECD. Increasingly in this country we have taken more and more of our general measures of economic understanding from the joint operations and research of the OECD. We have tended to regard what it has had to say as being of great importance. Both the previous Government and this government have modelled some of our economic behaviour on the recommendations of the group of nations making up the OECD. That seems to me, of itself, to have been a very good development over the last 10 years. It has led in the direction of much greater common sense in international financial and economic understanding and in general development and cooperation in difficult times. As Senator Wriedt said, this matter really arose at a time of very massive distortion in balance of payments and these difficulties did not develop to the extent envisaged. Nonetheless the Fund is one which we have supported. We joined in it and I believe we should not only continue in it but that we should continue to support it. In fact I am all in favour of taking a very serious interest in all these areas of international economic realisation.

Senator Wriedt raised 2 particular queries, one relating to article IV and the fact that the OECD bears no liability for the acts or omissions of the Fund, and the other relating to Article V which deals with the general oversight of the economic policies of borrowers.

As to the first question, I could understand why that would be the case because what we really have here is the OECD in Article IV making it clear that it is really acting as a kind of marriage broker in getting groups of people together,
setting up fund arrangements to transfer surpluses into deficiencies and, in effect, to have a management scheme among them. Under such conditions, it would be likely that the OECD itself, being a body more of advice and consultation and rather less a financial underwriting body, would pass the responsibilities to the Fund itself that it had in effect set up in holy matrimony. I have received a note from the adviser. I trust that what I have said off the top of my head will bear some relationship to the facts in the note from the adviser. The Financial Support Fund is a separate legal entity; hence it is proper that it and not the OECD bears liability for its acts or omissions. Of course, the membership of that body and the OECD are identical; but they are separate.

In fact, if the Fund goes broke, I imagine we would not be called upon as OECD members but as members of the Fund. Section 3(e) of Article V provides that borrowings from the Fund will be subject to policy conditions because the Fund is in the nature of a last resort facility. Some drawings from the International Monetary Fund are not conditional, but when borrowers from the IMF increase their drawings, policy conditions are imposed, as the Leader of the Opposition has suggested. So, I think there is some limitation imposed here on what might be called the general pattern of economic behaviour of those who are involved. I suppose this is because one would not want to have somebody totally out of control destroying the position of those who were involved with them.

It seems to me that this is in the direction of economic rationalisation when one is working to get international arrangements such as this, where the overall body itself does their consultative general research, the fact finding, the laying down of guidelines. Where it sets up devices those devices ought to be rather more autonomous, rather more self-supporting; they should be able to stand on their own feet, pay their own liabilities, and take their own charges.

Those remarks would seem to me to cover the situation. If there is any more information that is necessary, I would adopt the practice that I always have here in these technical matters involving Treasury and say to the adviser that he should read carefully the Hansard report and, if the information given by me is not accurate or needs elucidation, have a letter sent through me to the Leader of the Opposition to make all points thoroughly and properly clear.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee

The Bill.

Senator GEORGES (Queensland) (10.33)—I wish to seek a little information and perhaps some clarity on this Fund. As Senator Wriedt has said, our Party does not oppose the Fund. In fact, we support it with some enthusiasm. But I have one or two reservations. I want to know whether the intention is that this Fund will become a permanent arrangement. That seems to be the case from what the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Cotton) has said. I ask further whether the Fund is to maintain and assist or influence trading and financial relations between the major countries? If that is the case, could it not be interpreted that the Fund is a sort of club for wealthy countries which may in a way continue the rather inequitable arrangements that exist between the developed countries and the under-developed countries.

Let me illustrate what I am trying to arrive at. Here we have a Fund being established. In what way is it different essentially from the International Monetary Fund? Is it necessary to project the Fund in the way in which it has been projected in this Bill when the International Monetary Fund is there to carry out, shall we say, assistance to under-developed countries? Will this Fund in some way inhibit the International Monetary Fund? I return to my reservation: I fear that this is co-operation between essentially wealthy countries for their own protection. It arises out of the problem with the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries which increased their oil prices and formed some sort of cartel to protect the oil-producing countries. In this rather vague way I ask the Minister exactly what the Fund intends to do. Does it intend to continue; is it necessary for it to continue when we have the International Monetary Fund? Is it wise for Australia to be supporting a Fund among the developed countries, perhaps to the disadvantage of the less developed countries?

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (10.36)—We are here in an extremely interesting area which goes well beyond the general range of this rather closed-end operation, which grows out of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. The OECD is made up of a group of countries which have formed an organisation for economic co-operation and development. I will list the countries concerned. The governments involved in the OECD are: The governments of the Commonwealth of Australia, the Republic of Austria, the Kingdom
of Belgium, Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark, Finland, the French Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Republic of Iceland, Ireland, the Italian Republic, Japan, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Kingdom of Norway, the Portuguese Republic, Spain, the Kingdom of Sweden, the Swiss Confederation, the Republic of Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. It is a very large assembly of countries which, I suppose, might best be described as western democracies. There is an equally large number of countries which are by no means involved. One does not see in that list the names of countries from South America or Africa, nor the names of countries in COMECON or the Middle European blocs. As such it is a body which, as the agreement states, has as its purpose economic cooperation and development. Out of that body, in a crisis situation amongst its members because of the total price structure change between oil exporting countries and oil importing countries, this device was arrived at to try to overcome the great disturbances in their payments and their transfers.

The question of the status of the International Monetary Fund is brought into this matter. This is really a separate arrangement and a separate organisation. There are other separate organisations dealing with the transfer of resources from so-called developed countries to underdeveloped countries. In addition to the programs of aid transfers, there are World Bank activities together with the activities of various development banks and the work of the groups in the World Bank which perform development activities. There are various arrangements. This matter is something which really calls not for a debate this evening but—and this view is reinforced by the remarks of Senator Georges—for a definitive paper from somebody to illustrate to us all the relationship in these various areas with which we sometimes come in rather marginal contact in a fashion such as this. I for one would be grateful if I could have that information even if it ran into a couple of pages only. If it was sent to me, I would pass it around.

Some points have been highlighted by the questions asked. I rather gathered in my own mind from earlier reading that there are a number of agencies that work in this area but whose work is not necessarily co-ordinated. Perhaps some areas are not covered; perhaps some bodies are doing the same sort of work twice. I do not know. This is a subject on which we might well do some work—but not tonight. The OECD Fund is not permanent. It has authority to lend for only 2 years after it enters into force. I was asked whether it was a club for the rich countries? Separate provisions to deal with the position of the developing countries exist in the International Monetary Fund and in the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—for example, the normal IMF drawings, the IMF compensating financial facilities, the IMF trust fund and the IBRD third window facility, and others. It is also relevant that the bulk of the balance of payments financing problems associated with oil price rises were incurred by OECD countries rather than other countries. I understand that. It is equally true that this sort of problem may arise in another place and in another area at a later date. I appreciate the overall question. We might try to find out some more about that matter later.

Bill agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; report adopted.

Third Reading

Bill (on motion by Senator Cotton) read a third time.

PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES BILL
1976

Second Reading

Debate resumed from 19 May, on motion by Senator Cotton:

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Senator BUTTON (Victoria) (10.41)—The Opposition does not oppose the Psychotropic Substances Bill 1976; indeed, it supports it. I understand that the purpose of the Bill is to adopt one portion of the Convention on Psycho
tropic Substances that was adopted at Vienna on 21 February 1971. I refer to the Articles of the Convention, which are appended to the Bill and which refer to consignments entering or leaving the territory of a party that are not accompanied by an export authorisation being detained by the competent authorities. That reference is to be found at the back of the Bill. I referred to the Convention on Psychotropic Substances adopted at Vienna. I think that most honourable senators will know what a convention is. It will be recalled that we used to have conventions in the Senate. I believe that some honourable senators will know where Vienna is. It was, as I recall, the location for the film The Third Man, which centred
around a person called Harry Lime. It is probably because of that film that this Convention was adopted at Vienna in 1971.

I suspect that there are one or two honourable senators who do not know what a psychotropic substance is. In case there be any doubt about that, let me say that the Bill has a Schedule at the back which sets out what are psychotropic substances. I refer honourable senators to it. In fact, the Bill has 4 Schedules dealing with psychotropic substances, the names of which are listed in various categories in each of the Schedules. I think that some honourable senators will recognise the references in Schedule 1 to LSD and mescaline. I think that LSD is commonly known as 'acid'. Mescaline is the drug that was used by Aldous Huxley when he wrote his book *The Doors of Perception*. I think that few honourable senators will recognise the other drugs mentioned. Indeed, because of that and because I have some doubts about psychotropic substances, earlier in the day I asked Senator Chaney what they were. Senator Chaney said that he thought that psychotropic substances were mad dogs or Englishmen. *If* the Schedule does not make the position clear to honourable senators, I refer them to a definition of the term 'psychotropic substances' which was given by the Minister for Industry and Commerce (Senator Cotton) in his second reading speech and which reads:

'Psychotropic substances' is a term used to refer to substances that have the capacity to produce a state of dependence and central nervous system stimulation or depression resulting in hallucinations or disturbances in motor functions, thinking, behaviour, perception or mood and, in respect of which, there is evidence of a likelihood of abuse so as to constitute a public health and social problem.

Hallucinogens or psychotropic substances are drugs which interfere with a person's mind.

We on this side of the Senate say that in 2 respects the legislation probably does not go far enough. For example, it could be said in a philosophical sense that there are some people's minds which ought to be interfered with. The legislation does not deal with that. Secondly, it may be said that it is discriminatory in that there are all sorts of available substances which do not appear in the Schedules but which clearly fall within the definition of a psychotropic substance in that they do interfere with persons' minds. So there are certain assumptions in the legislation that perhaps require further examination by the Government and the Senate.

There is one other aspect in respect of which we say that the legislation does not go far enough. That relates to the fact that under the external affairs power the Convention probably could have been extended in this legislation to enable uniformity between the States in the standard of prescription of dangerous drugs that are allowed in each State. We hope that the Government will examine this aspect which is one of some concern, and see whether it cannot, by a more imaginative use of the external affairs power, overcome it. There are in fact many matters in the Convention that need further examination if Australian law is to accord with the spirit of the Convention.

I would like to make one reference in the debate on this Bill to the work of the Senate Select Committee on Drug Trafficking and Drug Abuse. I am sure that most honourable senators will have read that report. I think that is vitally relevant as a document relating to this legislation. The serious purpose of this Bill—I mention this because I would hate the Senate ever to vote on anything that all honourable senators did not understand—is to try to stop the transport of drugs of the kinds listed in the Schedule through Australia to other countries. We believe that in that sense it is a step in the right direction. It is necessary, having regard to the sophistication of international drug smuggling. We believe that the Bill could have gone further. But, as far as it goes, it is welcomed by the Opposition. We commend the Bill to the Senate.

**Senator DURACK** (Western Australia—Minister for Repatriation) (10.48)—I am indebted to Senator Button for having enlivened the Senate as to the meaning of the term 'psychotropic substance', which is a task that I thought I would have to undertake in my reply as it is some time since this Bill was introduced into the Senate and the explanation given to honourable senators. I thank the Opposition—particularly Senator Button, who led for it—for its support of this important Bill. I would like to emphasise that the Bill itself is concerned, as Senator Button has pointed out, with only one actual aspect of the misuse of drugs, that is, the use of Australia as a transit stage for the transportation of such drugs.

Lest it be thought that the Bill is inadequate in that it deals only with that one aspect of the Convention on Psychotropic Substances, I emphasise that in Australia we have very many other laws dealing with the misuse of drugs, whether they be psychotropic substances, narcotics or drugs of any other kind. Various Acts are in force. The Customs Act, of course, deals with the importation of and trafficking in such drugs and there are State laws dealing with the use and possession of such drugs. We have in Australia very elaborate
laws covering the field. That is why this Bill picks up only one aspect of this Convention—an aspect not provided for in the existing laws of Australia.

I inform the Senate that there is a standing body on the control of drugs. It is chaired by the Permanent Head of the Department of Business and Consumer Affairs and it includes State officials. That body keeps under consideration and review the question of the adequacy of the existing laws in Australia. Honourable senators will be interested to learn that the Convention which we are ratifying by this Bill has now been ratified by the requisite number of signatories and is now in force. When the legislation was first introduced into the Parliament that was not the case. Indeed, it was thought that our ratification by this measure would be an important step in achieving the ratification by the requisite number of countries. However, since the Bill has been in the Parliament the Convention, during the last recess, was ratified.

Senator Button mentioned the use of the external affairs power to enable Parliament to give wider effect—I think that is what he had in mind—to the provisions of the Convention. Of course, we do not accept the wide interpretation and use of the external affairs power which the Opposition would seek to exercise. As I have said, in any event it is the Government's view that this is not necessary because we already have adequate laws in Australia, both at the Federal and State levels, to cover the matters which are dealt with in the Convention. Those laws are kept under constant review at both Federal and State level. I thank the Opposition for its support of the Bill.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time, and passed through its remaining stages without amendment or debate.

ADJOURNMENT
Amnesty International—Growth Centres—Natural Gas Pipelines—Governor-General's Establishment

Motion (by Senator Cotton) proposed.

That the Senate do now adjourn.

Senator MISSEN (Victoria) (10.55)—I desire to bring before the Senate during the adjournment debate some matters which I think are of importance and which I think should be known to the Senate and to the public generally. They relate to information which I have obtained and brought back from the Soviet Union in the course of a trip I made some two or three weeks ago. They relate to the position of dissidents in the Soviet Union and to the Soviet's action in regard to the Helsinki Agreement to which it is a signatory. In the course of obtaining this information I was travelling in the Soviet Union after discussions with the Amnesty organisation, I being a member of the executive of the Parliamentary group here in Canberra. It was at the suggestion of members of Amnesty International headquarters that people who are in a position to do so ought to make visits to those who are struggling in the Soviet Union to obtain human rights and to ensure their enforcement.

I did receive a very adequate briefing from Amnesty International in London, and some idea of the situation and of the great difficulty in communication which they were having with their embattled colleagues in Moscow. Consequently I went to both Leningrad and Moscow. I certainly recommend to other members of the Senate and to people generally that they go and see the situation in that country and particularly to give some solidarity and support to those who are endeavouring legally and openly to proclaim the need for human rights and civil liberties in the Soviet Union. I found that there was difficulty of contact, even in Leningrad, because the general position is that those who are involved in human rights groups in the Soviet Union do not have a telephone any longer. The telephone will ring but it is not answered. The telephone is not connected to them. This is a common feature of those who have taken rather outstanding parts in this human rights struggle in the Soviet Union.

In Moscow I made contact and also spoke to Dr Sakharov, the Nobel Prize winner who is a leading member and of course an outstanding member of the human rights movement in the Soviet Union. He is one who has a telephone and whom the authorities do not dare, because of world opinion, to attack openly. Although I had a telephone conversation with him and his daughter it was interrupted on 2 occasions when I was cut off and had to ring again just to keep contact. But still, he has a telephone.

Then by arrangement which had been conveyed to the Moscow group of Amnesty International I had a long discussion with Dr Valentin Turchin whom I regard as one of the great heroes of the modern world. He is the Chairman of the Moscow Amnesty group and a man who has been fighting for years, cheerfully and with courage to keep alive this battle in the Soviet Union and to keep the human rights movement alive in the Soviet Union. He has lost his job since he became associated with Amnesty. He is a leading scientist and a most eminent man in all respects. Although various organisations in the Soviet Union would readily employ him, they are not permitted to do so. He
and other leading members of the Amnesty group are out of employment. As a result of this discussion, I have reported at length to the Amnesty organisation in London.

I want to give the Senate some idea of the problem and the organisations that exist at the moment in that country. There are 3 particular organisations, one of which is the Human Rights Movement. It has existed for some years and has produced documents, one of which is *The Chronicle of Current Events* which is not allowed to be distributed in the Soviet Union. These organisations support those of their members and others who are prosecuted for the sorts of charges that are prevalent in the Soviet Union—slander of the Soviet system and like charges. According to Amnesty's records no political trial of this nature ever fails. Criminal trials—may fail but nobody is ever other than convicted in a political trial.

The Human Rights Movement is one group which has worked for years for those people who are victimised. Among these are the prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union.

There is another group now about which I shall say something. It is a committee that has been formed this year for the implementation of the undertakings of the Soviet Union under the Helsinki Agreement. I shall say more about that. A third group is the Moscow Amnesty Group. Many of these groups have interlocking memberships and are not completely separate but the Moscow Amnesty Group is a part of the worldwide Amnesty movement and is an organisation which also has a number of members who are prisoners of conscience. It had one Spanish prisoner assigned to it and it worked for that prisoner and wrote letters.

It did not know, until I arrived and told them, that their Spanish prisoner had been released 2 months previously. It did not know because the letters from Amnesty International telling them this had not been delivered. They were pleased to know that their efforts had had some results. They want to have another prisoner and will have one. Part of their job, in all the difficulties that they have, is to fight not only for their own members who may be charged—some have been charged and have been dealt with—but also to fight as a normal Amnesty group for prisoners abroad. Their aim is to help in the cause of publicising and, if possible, freeing those who are prisoners of conscience—persons who are not men of violence but who appear to have been dealt with unjustly.

In addition to these groups there are many other groups in the Soviet Union, known to the Amnesty groups, and others. There are groups concerned with or suffering religious persecution—the dissident Baptists and the Catholics in Lithuania, the German groups and Jewish groups both of whom want to migrate from the country but who are not allowed to do so. Even the Tartars, 300 000 of them who were removed from the Crimea during the last war and who have never been allowed to return to their homeland, are the concern of some of these groups. They are all involved in a general movement towards freedom and the granting of human rights.

I want to say something about the Helsinki group because I think it has done something strikingly important in recent times. People in Victoria know that I have taken some steps to publicise this in that State. The Helsinki group is concerned with the obligation of the Soviet Union under the Helsinki Agreement. They are aware, of course, as we all are, that under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights obligations are imposed upon the Soviet Union to carry out and to enforce rights of freedom—rights of freedom of movement, rights to leave the country, rights to have a nationality and many other rights. These are the normal human rights which we enjoy in this country. In addition to this the Soviet Union was one of the signatories a year ago to the Helsinki Agreement, an agreement signed by 35 nations, mostly in Europe but including the United States of America and the Soviet Union. In some documents I read in the Soviet Union that were produced by the Government on the celebration of its first anniversary, no reference was made to the human rights provisions of the Agreement. The Helsinki Agreement, a copy of which I hold in my hand, contains very clear obligations which are headed in Part VII 'Respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief'. I shall not read this as the obligations are familiar to members of this Senate.

Additional obligations are imposed under the Helsinki Agreement upon its signatories. They call for better communication of written material from one country to another, improvement of tourism, and improvement of the rights of people to move from one country to another.

The Helsinki group has analysed the failure of the Soviet Union to implement in any way the duties it has undertaken under the Helsinki Agreement. I brought from the Soviet Union a document written in the Russian language. It is headed: 'Evaluation of the influence of Conference on Safety and Co-operation in Europe in
part relating to human rights in U.S.S.R.—1 August 1975—1 August 1976'. I desire to have that document incorporated in Hansard. I spoke with and delivered a copy of this document to the Leader of the Opposition in the Senate (Senator Wriedt) today. I have in my possession and shall table a copy of the document in the Russian language which may not be familiar to all members of the Senate. I would like a translation which I have to be incorporated in Hansard. I ask leave to incorporate it.

The PRESIDENT—Is leave granted? There being no objection, leave is granted.

(Document read as follows)—

EVALUATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF CONFERENCE ON SAFETY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE IN PART RELATING TO HUMAN RIGHTS IN U.S.S.R.

1st August 75—1st August 76

1. GENERAL EVALUATION

In the present review the external political problems are not examined, since they do not come within the scope of activities of the Co-operation Group. Let us remember, however, that there is a close tie between the struggle for human rights and the reinforcement of efforts to create realistic and fundamental guarantees of safety.

Points in the final Act relating to human rights have been formulated considerably weaker than the similar articles of other international Conventions, for instance the 'Common Declaration for Human Rights'. Obligations of that kind in the Final Act concerned themselves in the main not with the guarantee of the civil and human rights of the individuals, but with the betterment of the government regulations in the sphere of contacts established between countries and convenient to the State (which automatically put the State with the legally confirmed monopoly on fundamental human rights in a better position). Nevertheless, Article VII of Division 1, and other Articles directly relate to the human rights of man.

The analysis of the appropriate aspects of the internal policy confirms that the Soviet Government does not intend to carry out its international obligations relating to the human rights of man.

As before, many hundreds of political prisoners languish in prison and camps—people condemned simply for their political, ethical or religious beliefs, or condemned for attempts to pass independent information to the public. Their prison regime has, in some respects, become more cruel this year.

Also, the practice of psychiatric repression has neither been condemned nor stopped.

No changes for the better have come about in the questions of free emigration and, particularly relating to the problem of uniting families. The number of refusals known to us has even increased this year.

All forms of independent information are persecuted.

Any attempts to create an association independent of the leadership of the KPPS (Communist Party of the Soviet Union) are persecuted.

However, in this well known picture, which has not changed in the course of many years, certain telling details can be traced, which are directly connected with the European Conference.

Compatible reaction of a number of internal and international factors, compelled the Soviet Government to better manoeuvre and, at the same time, react more forcefully to the accusations of the breaches of human rights in the U.S.S.R. Let us enumerate some of those factors.

1. As distinct from previous declarations which contained obligations relating to the human rights, the Soviet Government this time gave such obligation in exchange for important political concessions from the Western countries. This has conducted, however timid, nevertheless unprecedented attempts of the Western leaders in the last ten years or so, to insist on the compliance of those obligations.

2. Information disseminated on persecution for convictions, the breaches of human rights and on the truthful character of the Soviet democracy on the whole, which continuously is directed towards public opinion by the members of the movement for civil rights in the U.S.S.R., has, it seems, begun to reach the awareness of wide groups of the Western society, and has even shown influence on the tactics applied by some Western political parties.

3. The setting of the same trend was also helped by different factors, such as the preparation for the conduct of the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the cessation of war in Vietnam by the U.S.A., war in Angola which had begun after the European Conference, large failures in the agricultural economy of the U.S.S.R. which brought about massive purchases of grain from abroad, and other factors.

All this taken together, has compelled the Soviet Government, already concerned about the form of their prestige in the West at the end of 1975 and beginning of 1976, to make concessions in regard to individuals who are well known abroad and persecuted for their convictions (for greater detail please see next chapter) and to some degree to slowdown the obvious offensive on the human rights of man in the U.S.S.R., which had begun prior to the European Conference, was toned down during the Conference and unfolded immediately after the Conference. Now the repressions, more ferocious than ever, are continuing, primarily in those cases where for some reason or another there is no timely information disseminated regarding them.

Far-reaching extrapolation based on the experience of last year, has clearly indicated that:

If the movement for the civil rights in the U.S.S.R. could considerably increase its task in informing the people within the country and to supply information to the West,

If, at the same time, the Western society refused to accept the existing non-equalitarian interpretation of the principle of non-intervention, and actively supported the movement for human rights in the U.S.S.R.,

then—

The Soviet authorities would be compelled to diminish the repressive policy and this, in turn, could manifestly help to realise the democratic rights.

Little likelihood of such development should not deter endeavours in this regard, since it is particularly our efforts which increase the chances of the ultimate goal.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OFFICIAL REACTION TO THE EUROPEAN CONFERENCE

Until the Soviet Government signed the Final Act, the official press vigorously condemned the demand for a free exchange of people and ideas as 'intervention in the internal affairs'.

As soon as the Final Act was signed and published, the Soviet powers ignored fully its humanitarian articles and even introduced a definite 'demonstration of strong line' in
an endeavour to rely, to some extent, on their own interpretation of the principle of non-intervention in the 'internal affairs' which are stressed in the Final Act.

Trials were held, which gave tough sentences for the social activities to Vladimir Osipov, editor of the Samizdat Journal 'VECHE', Sergei Kovalev, member of the activity group for the protection of human rights in the U.S.S.R., also a member of the International Amnestiy; to Sergei Solidov, Kolya Misuk, Mātī Kūjezd, Atdem Tsekevich—members of the Democratic Movement in Estonia, and others.

All these activists were arrested some months before the European Conference, and tried after the Conference. This was done with Andrej Tverdokhlebov, Mustafa Dzhemilev who, as is well known, was charged with a new case on the eve of his leaving the camp; also Vyacheslav Ignurov; with the active members of the Jewish Emigration movement Lyov Roybur (Odessa), Yakov Vinarov (Kiev), Anatoly Malkin (Moscow). The government obviously intended to inflict a powerful blow to the movement for human rights prior to the Conference.

The court trials began soon after the Conference and carried the character of slightly covered up sentences. This was a blow both to the movement for human rights, and the act of frightening the sympathizers, as well as the act of reconsidering the situation of the public opinion in the West after the Conference. In the case of the weak reaction from the West, the 'demonstration of the strong line' would finally strengthen the Soviet interpretation of the articles of the Final Act, and the already established interpretation of the principles of non-intervention in the internal affairs.

However, in the course of 1975, at least some part of the Western society, it seems, was freeing itself from the illusions regarding the Soviet system. Discussions on humanitarian problems in connection with the European Conference on the Government level brought about a great deal of attention from the public. Something the Soviet authorities counted on. In this sense, the momentum of the Conference did not turn out to be altogether favourable for the Soviet Government. Strong repressions immediately after the Conference, particularly the continuation of the treatment in the special psychiatric clinic of Leonid Plushchev, have brought about Western reaction, forcing the Government to make single demonstrative concessions. In truth, they used some of the currently arrested dissidents as an example to let out the steam from a boiler.

Vyacheslav Ignurov was sentenced (for the dissemination of literature) to the treatment in a psychiatric clinic of normal type. Although the expert of the Siberian Institute qualified him (prior to the European Conference) as 'particularly dangerous' and recommended 'special' psychiatric clinic.

Michail Narita—writer who spent time in the camp and the special psychiatric clinic, was again arrested in November 1975 for anti-Soviet propaganda and sent for an expert psychiatric opinion, was released.

In the meantime, sentences relating to the taking away of the children from the believing parents, are not carried out (see document of the Group of Co-operation).

A few better known of the activists of the Jewish movement were given the permit to emigrate after a long time of refusal.

Later, Andrej Tverdokhlebov received a completely unjustified but, from the point of view of the Government, 'soft' sentence—five years exile.

Valentin Moroz, who was directed to the Serbsky Institute for expert psychiatric analysis, was prudently declared to be sane.

Once again, we maintain that all these people are innocent, even from the Soviet legal point of view, and their persecution was brought about by wrongful interpretation of the law.

Arrests, psychiatric and other repressions in this period have continued, embracing dissidents who, for some reason or another, are not well known to the public. We bring attention to the obvious calculation by the Government of this circumstance.

Let us now bring the list of the dissidents repressed after the Soviet Union had signed the Final Act (we are convinced that this is only a small part of those who were subject to repression at this time).

4. Valerii Timokhin (Article 170 of the Criminal Code of R.S.F.S.R.) put in Sychevsk Special Psychiatric Clinic (has been arrested before, but put into clinic after Helsinki).
5. Alexandre Sîl'întsîk (Krasnodar) sentenced for his refusal to serve with the Army, to which he was called up after submission of request to emigrate to Israel.
6. Andrei Mat'ko—Article 70 of the Criminal Code of R.S.F.S.R.—has been put into special psychiatric clinic (arrested before, sent to the clinic after Helsinki).
7. Pavel Bashkirov (Jakutsk)—Fellow in the Museum, arrested under Article 190-1 of the Criminal Code of R.S.F.S.R.
8. Alexandre Argentov was on the 14 May put into psychiatric clinic No. 14 in the city of Moscow. This is the last case known to us where compulsory hospitalisation and psychiatric clinic treatment is accorded for political motives.

The Group has at its disposal more evidence referring to the re-direction of the plaintiffs to the psychiatric clinics from various Soviet institutions.

3. MANIPULATION OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE QUESTIONS OF EMIGRATION

Approximately along the same lines, the Government manipulates in the questions regarding emigration.

In the first months after the Conference at Helsinki, the official departments concerned with the emigration policy from the U.S.S.R., simply ignored humanitarian Articles of the Final Act. Those who pointed to this Declaration, heard in answer that it had nothing to do with emigration to Israel, since Israel did not sign it, or as the matter is not specifically mentioned in the Declaration, there is no need to refer to it. However, later compatibly with the attention of the West to human rights problems in the U.S.S.R., this approach has changed. On 16 April, 1976, the Assistant Head of the Administrative Section of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., in meeting with Jewish people who asked to emigrate to Israel, stated that the Soviet Government intends to carry out and does carry out its international obligations, however without bringing harmful effects to the State. He stressed that the Soviet powers regard that 'the interests of the State stand above the rights of men'.

Finally, in June, the head of the All Soviet OVIR, Vladimir Osdin, explained that the Soviet competent organs would be thoroughly influenced by the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference, in an issue of visas for emigration,
but would give out visas only for re-unification with the family, and that the family is only regarded as husband and wife and their unmarried children. Refusals of visas for the reasons of inadequate state of relationship are now as common as the reasons for the sake of 'secrecy'. Thus, the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference has become the support for the limiting of emigration. There is no need to explain such two-faced explanation of the Helsinki Declaration, whose human values are directed towards the liberation of emigration policy, which is supported and confirmed by the members of the Helsinki Conference, to act in conjunction with the aims and principles of the Declaration of Human Rights and the pact of civil and political rights in which there is a definite confirmation of every man to leave any country including his own. In addition, the activities of the Soviet Governments are inconsistent with their own explanation of the question concerning the unification of families, since there are cases of refusal to emigrate to the members of families who are recognised as such by the Soviet code relating to the marriage and family (see Document No. 5 of the Group of Co-operation).

It is important to stress that such unacceptable interpretation of the Final Act, to which authorities now relate, makes it impossible to affect an exit from the country for the Soviet citizens who wish to emigrate, not for the purposes of re-uniting with their families, but for religious, political, national, professional or other motives. The number of such people, according to our information, is growing continuously.

On the whole, the emigration policy in the last years has not changed for the better. Permission to leave the country to some known dissidents (mainly before the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.) hides the increasing number of real dissidents.

Widely proclaimed changes relating to the procedures for application for exit, are not significant per se, apart from the fact that they are not practically applied.

Contrary to the rules laid down by the Helsinki Declaration, the instigation for approaches for exile, as before, leads to the changes in the status of applicants, and the members of his family (dismissal from work, dismissal from institutions, army call up, and so forth). Indeed, in the course of the last years, the call up for the Army of young men was continuously used as a weapon to fight emigration after an application for exit has been lodged. This brought about the conviction of Ayrikyan, Malkin, Ja. Vinaver, A. Shulitsky. Such a threat hangs over many young men who wish to emigrate from the U.S.S.R.

In the course of the last year, there was an increased frequency in campaigns in the central and local press, against people wishing to leave the Soviet Union. The conditions of the Helsinki Final Act, concerning particularly expeditious examination and satisfactory result of uniting families with sick and old people, are completely ignored by the Government.

4. FIGHT OF THE GOVERNMENT AGAINST THE DISSEMINATION OF EXPOSURE INFORMATION

The Soviet Government regards the exposure information as a particularly dangerous activity. They correctly surmise that the absence of an independent information service creates real difficulties to the movement for civil rights within the U.S.S.R. and leaves that movement without the support of world opinion.

The Government has always fought very hard against the independent dissemination of information, but from the end of 1975 it has felt particularly in its rejection of power, and its influence on world opinion. Therefore the Soviet Government ignored its obligations in regard to the development of the exchange of information signed in Helsinki and, with its usual attitude to obligations of such a nature, the Soviet authorities have undertaken a number of measures to make the exchange of information more difficult.

Postal and telephone communication between many people who continued to exchange information between themselves and with the West, was broken, but a particularly difficult time was given to prisoners and exiles.

Already very rare visits of the family members to the political prisoners have been greatly diminished. The technique of frightening the visitors has increased. At the time of the visit, any attempt of the political prisoner to relate something about the conditions of his life, or even his illnesses, is interrupted. The political prisoner of Vladimir prison, Yakov Susliensky, whose health has been undermined by the continuous detention to the extent that in June 1976, during the visit of his wife, she could not come out by himself—was supported by the arms—when he made an attempt to tell his wife about his illness, the controller who was present during the visit, prohibited him to do so, or else he would stop the visit.

An effort has been made to deprive the rights of the political prisoners to write. Letters from them and to them are not passed on, for different reasons: there may be, as it were 'inadmissible expressions' or 'hidden meanings'. Often the letters disappear on the way to the addressee.

The censorship of the correspondence has increased. Already the above-mentioned political prisoner of the Vladimir prison, Yakov Susliensky, received back his letter to his wife, so that he would excise from the text his complaint regarding the state of his health. Some political prisoners, as a token or protest, have refused to write letters (Kronid Lubyansky, Vladimir Prison). All this brought about the cessation of postal communication with the prisoners of conscience. Thus the mother of Vladimir Bukovsky (Vladimir prison) has not had a letter from him for eight months, and cannot establish whether he receives her letters. Maria Gel', wife of Ivan Gel' (Mordov Camp No. 1) did not receive letters from her husband for three months. In April-May, no letters arrived from Vyacheslav Chernovol (Mordov Camp No. 3), and so forth.

In the last year, the searches of political prisoners, and in Vladimir prison, have become more frequent and devastating. In the Camp No. 1 (Mordov), the examination of personal effects has increased to twice a week (previously from time to time). Hand-written notes, poems, sketches, extracts from the Bible, proceedings and applications of official applications, are taken away, so that they are not 'published in the West'. The head of the prison, Krivov, said to the political prisoner Paruyr Ayrtykyan, who was deprived of his copy of the letter to the Presidium of the High Court of the U.S.S.R., that if such letter should appear in print in the West, then Ayrtykyn would be facing a new trial. For information passed on to freedom, political prisoners of Vladimir prison Georg Davydov and Virol Abankin have received solitary.

For information passed on to freedom, Semen Glusman was threatened with a new sentence (Perm' Camp No. 35). Official warnings by KGB wer given to Vasilii Stus, Vyacheslav Chernovol, and Boris Penson (Mordov Camp).

Once again, we invite your attention to the fact that the foreclosure of humanitarian streams of information is a crude breach of the spirit and letter of the Final Act.

5. DICHOTOMY BETWEEN THE LAWS OF THE LAND AND THE SIGNED CONVENTIONS

One of the sources of scepticism regarding the future of human rights in the U.S.S.R. is the absence of any tendency to bring about a formal conformity between the Soviet laws and the international conventions on human rights to which the Final Act relates in part.
True, the morals in principles can, in the final analysis, turn out to be better than the moral laws of the land, but during the present oppressive climate of authoritarian policy which slowly influences morality, this is difficult to hope for.

Some contradictions between the Soviet laws and the international conventions are principally of a character which reflects some of the knotty moments in the structure of power in U.S.S.R.

This, Article 126 of the Constitution requires that the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. comprise 'a leading nucleus of all working organisations, both government and social'. This directly contradicts Conventions Nos 87, 98 and 111, relating to the rights of association, which have been ratified by the Soviet Union. According to the above mentioned article of the Constitution, neither workers, nor farmers, nor even scientific workers are allowed to form any professional organizations (political organizations are not even mentioned) for the protection of their interests, apart from the Government Professional Unions which are directed by the Communist Party. Thus not one category of worker has an independent representation which does not rely on Party control, which in turn can formulate and act in their own interests; people deprived of work for ideological reasons cannot rely for support on their professional comrades.

Another example—Article 52 of the Code regarding Marriage and Family in R.S.F.S.R. (and compatible articles in the Codes of other Soviet Republics). This article requires that the parents 'bring up their children in the spirit of moral law of the builders of Communism'. Article 59-64 regulates the order which enables to deprive the parents of the custody right and take from them the child, partly in connection with non-compliance with the above mentioned obligations, which is in stark contrast with the text of the Final Act and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Articles 70 and 190-1 of the Criminal Code of R.S.F.S.R. (and other compatible articles of Codes of other Republics) also contradict the spirit of human rights in the Final Act and other Conventions.

6. ACTIVITY OF THE GROUP OF CO-OPERATION IN CARRYING OUT THE HELSINKI AGREEMENT

Having regard to the past, the Soviet dissidents have adopted in the beginning a sceptical view of the results of the European Conference, thinking, for good reasons, that the authorities intended to use it for the strengthening of their power. The first few months after the Conference have, it appears, confirmed those fears. However, with the passing of time, it has become obvious that people under pressure for ideological, political, national and similar reasons, have begun to rely more and more in their complaints to the authorities on the humanitarian articles of the Final Act. Naturally, the authorities, at best, ignored such supplications. However, the protests stemming from world opinion and the references to the conditions of the Final Act, have shown that it can be used as a support in the struggles of human rights. Having regard to this, 11 members of the movement for human rights in the U.S.S.R. have, on 12 May, 1976, created a Group of Co-operation for the Carrying out of the Helsinki Agreement. In the following two months, the Group gave to the public and the heads of the governments which have signed the Final Act, five documents containing information relating to the breaches of the humanitarian articles:

(1) about the persecution of Mustafa Dzhemilev (18 May 1976)
(2) about the breach of contact among people in the sphere of international telephonic and postal communication (27 May 1976)
(3) about the conditions of prisoners of conscience (17 June 1976)
(4) about splitting families who asked for reunification (17 June 1976)
(5) about repressions against religious families (17 June 1976).

Apart from that, the Committee of Co-operation was approached with several requests to create international commissions (regarding information No. 1 and No. 3, and also regarding the detention of Valentin Moroz in Serbsky Institute for expert psychiatric analysis).

Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of our appeal in regard to information on Dzhemilev and the conditions of the detention of the prisoners of conscience. Valentin Moroz, as is well known, was not sent to the special psychiatric clinic, and in this world public opinion played a decisive role.

The fundamental difficulty in the work of the group is not only the collation of information (we know that we are only aware of a small part of the breaches in the articles of the Final Act) but the passing of the information to the heads of the governments. We have not received confirmation of receipt of the documents which we have sent to the various relevant Consulates in Moscow by registered mail.

Dated: 22 July, 1976. Moscow

[Signatures]

Senator MISSEN—That document is one that I believe honourable senators and others who read it will find striking for it is in strong language and was signed by 9 citizens of the Soviet Union who have endeavoured to publicise the material in it. Of those people who have signed it—nine in all—I will refer just to three of them. The chairman of the Helsinki group is Dr Juri Orlof, a man of great scientific achievement, a man who, of course because of these human rights activities, now has no job. He has been out of work for 2½ years. He is also the Acting Secretary of Amnesty in Moscow and a great fighter for human rights. Another, A. Ginsburg, is a person well known as a human rights fighter. General Petr. Grigovenko—a man who has suffered for his convictions. Since the Czechoslovakian invasion in 1968 when he was arrested he has been placed in a psychiatric hospital, quite wrongly of course, but he was later released. He is a man who has fought consistently for human rights.

These 9 men have prepared this document in which they set out, among other things, the conclusion that, the Soviet Union does not intend to carry out its international obligations relating to the human rights of man and refer, to Article VII. In addition to this, they say that the repressions
since Helsinki are more ferocious than ever and are continuing. They give examples of this and they set out the names of persons who have been dealt with. They deal, of course with the 2 members of Amnesty who were arrested and tried, when there was not much public pressure from abroad. The first of them, Sergei Kovalev, has been tried since the Helsinki Agreement, on trumped up charges. He has been sentenced to 7 years and a period of exile. The secretary of Amnesty, Andrej Tverdokhlebov, over whom there was international pressure, is now exiled for 5 years in Northern Siberia. While he has been there another man whose name I have brought to Amnesty from the Soviet Union is Pavel Bashkirov, a man who travelled to Jakutsk to see the exiled Amnesty secretary. He was a physicist, a man of great experience, but now working on an electric saw. Since he saw Tverdokhlebov, this man, Bashkirov has been arrested and his friends do not know what has happened to him. He has not been tried. So there is an attempt to put a wall around those members of Amnesty who are in prison or in exile.

The situation is such that it is necessary for groups like this to get publicity for violation of human rights. This particular group of 9 people sent by registered post a copy of the document I have now presented to the Senate to all the embassies in Moscow of the countries that signed the Helsinki Agreement. None apparently was delivered. They have received no receipts back and although some information might have got to some of the embassies, they have not been able, by the ordinary proper channels, to make their complaint.

I have done what I can to remedy that. Copies of this document have now gone to all the embassies in Australia or, where there is no embassy in Australia, then to the foreign ministries of all the countries that were signatories at Helsinki. This is by all accounts the way in which I can best help these people who are fighting for liberty in the Soviet Union.

The great man who leads and inspires these groups, Dr Andre Sakharov, has written about the need for people in the West to point out things. In his Nobel Prize lecture, which of course he could not deliver personally because he could not leave the country, but which his wife delivered, he said:

He went on to say:

The Final Act of the Helsinki conference confirms yet again the principle of freedom of conscience. However, a stern and relentless struggle will have to be carried on if the contents of this treaty are to be given reality. In the Soviet Union today many thousands of people are persecuted because of their convictions, both by judicial and extra-judicial means; for their religious beliefs and for their desire to bring their children up in the spirit of religion; for reading and circulating—often to only a few acquaintances—literature which is unwelcome to the State, but which in accordance with ordinary democratic practice is absolutely legitimate, e.g. religious literature; and for attempts to leave the country.

Those are only some of the things that are complained about. In summary, I wish to give some examples of the troubles these Soviet people have. They have restrictions on their telephones and mail. A scientific conference was to be held in a house in Moscow. But the owners of the house were arrested and the people were driven away, the scientific conference could not be held. It was something which the State did not wish to see happen. Threats of action and of punishment are made against people, designed to frighten and drive them away from working for human rights. Jewish people who want to migrate from the country in many cases are denied jobs or lose their jobs and are called up for army service if they come within the age group. Many of these people lose their employment or are incarcerated in psychiatric hospitals because they believe in human rights. The document which has been incorporated indicates that such use of psychiatry is continuing to this day—a cruelty which I think parallels that of the regime of Hitler in its absolutely disgraceful performance.

Material is available and documents have been produced by Amnesty over the last few years indicating that, in the Soviet Union, there are 330 prisons or prison camps to their knowledge where political prisoners are known to be incarcerated. The number of prisoners is not known with any exactitude, but it is believed that, with the inclusion of religious groups, there are something like 10 000 prisoners of this type—prisoners of conscience—remaining in the Soviet Union.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I believe there is an obligation on those of us who work in a free community, whether we be members of Parliament or businessmen or ordinary tourists, who have the opportunity to go not only to the Soviet Union but also to other countries in the world where this type of persecution is going on. For example, I draw attention to the tortures referred to very graphically in a Time article last week. We do have a duty to take advantage of such
opportunities of revealing such behaviour or helping prisoners. I do not expect to have the opportunity of going to the Soviet Union again, but I do hope that others will make use of such an opportunity to highlight the fact that these people live in a state of injustice.

It is regarded, and I say this with authority, as being most important that we highlight and bring to public notice the persecution of these individuals. That is the sort of thing which makes punishment less likely. It makes the operations of such people more valuable and gives them a sense that they are not alone in the world, and tells them that there are many other people who believe in the same values that they have.

I feel that it is my duty to put this matter before the Senate. I hope that all honourable senators will read the document which has been incorporated and will take an ever-increasing interest in the concern being shown for prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union.

Senator SIBRAA (New South Wales) (11.14)—As someone who has been to the Soviet Union, and especially to Estonia, to look for some of the problems referred to by Senator Missin, I listened to his speech with a great deal of interest. However, I might suggest that recent statements by the Leader of his Party probably did not help him in his undertaking while he was in the Soviet Union. My reason for speaking on the adjournment debate tonight is to raise the serious problems which face people living in the electorates of Macquarie and Calare in New South Wales because of this Government’s decision concerning growth centres and decentralisation and because of the long delay in construction of the lateral gas pipelines to bring natural gas to these areas as part of the national pipeline grid. The issue of natural gas laterals is also directly linked to that of decentralisation and development. These issues should concern a number of Government Ministers, including those holding the portfolios of National Resources; Environment, Housing and Community Development; and Employment and Industrial Relations. The problems range from energy supply to job opportunities and the whole future of decentralisation in country areas in New South Wales. The cities of Lithgow and Bathurst-Orange are included in the areas that I mention, and these are regions which I visit as a New South Wales senator. Therefore it is incumbent on me to bring these matters to the notice of the Government for the urgent attention that they require.

I refer, firstly, to the matter of natural gas. The construction of the national pipeline grid has been from its inception and remains to this day primarily a federal responsibility. That has been borne out by statements made by the member of the New South Wales Legislative Assembly for Bathurst, Mr Clive Osborne, and the former Minister for Mines and Energy in the Willis State Government, Mr George Freudenstein. I would like to quote Mr Freudenstein’s formal request to the Minister for National Resources (Mr Anthony) in April 1976. Mr Freudenstein said:

New South Wales has withdrawn request for deferment of laterals, and State now requests you proceed to build laterals in accordance with agreements signed between Pipeline Authority and Australian Gas Light Company. Such agreement recognises and acquires conditions and powers previously held by the State.

Thus is quite obvious that a federal obligation is very important in this matter, and attempts by Government backbenchers in another place to avoid that responsibility will be quickly seen through by their constituents in Macquarie and Calare electorates. We all know that natural gas is a clean form of fuel. It is economical and it is preferable to most other forms of fuel for these reasons: Industry in the areas of Lithgow and Bathurst-Orange, including decentralised industries, are eagerly awaiting natural gas supplies to fulfil their fuel and energy requests. I can give an example which I am sure Senator Cotton knows about, and that is Albaware Tiles Pty Ltd in Lithgow which has made numerous requests in relation to this matter. Natural gas means job opportunities and security. Failure to construct the laterals means greater unemployment in that area, which is already running at 85 per cent higher than in 1975. I think my colleague, Senator Douglas McClelland, might have mentioned this afternoon when he spoke that Lithgow was one of those areas that he had visited during the parliamentary recess. As I said, unemployment is 85 per cent higher than it was in 1975. It also means greater business failure and economic hardship.

Senator Baume—Your coal export levy did not help.

Senator SIBRAA—What the Government did last night in relation to growth centres was lip service only. The New South Wales Government has made it plain through Mr Hills, the Minister for Mines and Energy, that it is formally committed to the construction of the laterals. The New South Wales Government fully appreciates the importance of those laterals and is ready to cooperate with AGL, the Pipeline Authority and the Federal Government to build the spur lines. This Government must therefore take urgent
action in the form of increased allocations for the construction of the laterals. That now seems a remote possibility and unless the Government rethinks its position the people of Lithgow and Bathurst-Orange will not have natural gas this decade. The allocation of $2m which was announced last night for the Bathurst-Orange growth centre was an insult to the people who live in the electorates of Macquarie and Calare. The Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development (Mr Newman) has completely disregarded assurances that were given to the electors in that area in November-December 1975 by the Liberal Party on the future of that area. I wish to quote from a Liberal Party advertisement which was used in the Macquarie electorate in 1975. In that advertisement the Liberal candidate for that seat said:

We'll get our growth centre. For sure. But the first thing to get back is growth.

However, growth centres, together with the Australian Assistance Plan, Medibank, the Children's Commission and many other schemes, have been abandoned by this Government. I believe that the Government must make immediate provision for a sustained continuation of the growth centre program, particularly that of Bathurst-Orange, otherwise promising opportunities for decentralisation in that area, the opening up of new employment prospects and chances for better living conditions will be lost. Now a decision has been made by the New South Wales Labor Government to proceed with the transfer of the Central Mapping Authority to Bathurst. This will be of no avail. The Bathurst-Orange city, as a growth area, will fail and the fault will lay squarely on the shoulders of this Administration. Senator Greenwood, the former Minister for Environment, Housing and Community Development was honest enough to say in the Senate that he acknowledged the fact that the Fraser Government had no real policy on urban and regional development. We are now seeing the fruits of such neglect. I think there are issues which I have raised which concern at least 2 Ministers. I hope that they have taken note of these remarks tonight.

Senator McLaren (South Australia) (11.21)—I desire to place on the record tonight an answer that I received to a query I raised during the debate on Appropriation Bill (No. 3) 1975-76 which appears at page 2036 of Senate Hansard of 27 May 1976. My query was in relation to the costs of running the Governor-General's VIP aircraft. I had some difficulty during that debate in obtaining some clarification on the matter. To refresh the memories of honourable senators, I want to quote what I said at that time. The Committee of the Whole was specifically dealing with Division 230, Australian Defence Force, sub-division 1, item 03—Permanent Air Force—for which an amount of $9,518,000 was sought. I said:

I wish to know what portion of that amount of money can be attributed to the VIP flights which were undertaken by the Governor-General. A quick perusal of the manifests which have been tabled—and they only go up to the early days of February of this year—reveals that in the 10 months for which information is available the Governor-General has made 90 flights in and out of Canberra. That averages out at 9 flights a month. That is more than two a week. Some of them occur day after day. I am seeking the cost of those flights.

Senator Cavanagh—His appropriation has doubled this year.

Senator McLaren—I will refer to that, Senator Cavanagh because it disturbs me greatly. I received a letter from Senator Withers, the Minister for Administrative Services, dated 23 June 1976, in which he said:

Dear Senator McLaren,

In reference to my undertaking of 27 May 1976 to provide you with a breakdown of the cost of VIP flights by the Governor-General, I provide you with the following information:

Flying hours by aircraft type and costs of VIP flights by the Governor-General for the financial year 1974-75 and for the 1975-76 financial year to 31 March 1976.

Under the heading of 1974-75, the Minister outlined that the BAC111 aircraft flew 255.4 hours at $675.88, giving a total of $172,619.75. The HS748 aircraft had total flying hours of 64.7 hours at $178.35 making a total of $11,539.25. The Mystere 20 aircraft flew 123.8 hours at $379.57 per hour giving a total of $46,990.77. The total amount for the transport by air of the Governor-General in 1974-75 was $231,149.77.

Senator Cavanagh—How much?

Senator McLaren—It was $231,149.77. For the year 1975-76—that is, to 31 March 1976—the Governor-General used the BAC111 aircraft for 149.2 hours at $797.10 per hour giving a total amount of $118,939.26. He used the HS748 aircraft for 93.7 hours at $224.80 per hour giving a total of $21,063.76.

Senator Jessop—You had better be sure about it.

Senator McLaren—I am sure about it. I will cite the figures again for Senator Jessop if he cannot understand them. The HS748 aircraft flew 93.7 hours at $224.80 an hour giving a total of $21,063.76. He used the Mystere 20 aircraft for 33.1 hours at $449.82 giving a total of $14,889.04. This brought the total to 31 March
this year—a period of 9 months—to $154,892.6. I turn to page 2 of the document:

Expenditure for the operations of aircraft of 34 Squadron is met from various Defence appropriation items including pay, stores, rations, and others. Recovery based on a rate per flying hour for VIP operations is made from appropriations under the control of the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet.

The cost elements included in assessing the flying hour rates are 'excess' costs only and include petrol, oil and lubricants, tyres and tubes, oxygen, contractor servicing and spares.

Your sincerely

R. G. Withers.

Senator Douglas McClelland—What is the total cost?

Senator McLAREN—For 1974-75 the cost was $231,149.77; and for the first 9 months of this year the amount is $154,892. But we have to add something to that. We have to add a special appropriation made in this Parliament during the autumn session of $60,000 for the Governor-General's overseas trip. If we add that amount to the $154,000 we get well over $200,000 for the first 9 months. If we look at the House of Representatives Hansard of 20 May we find on page 2362 question No. 457 asked by Mr Morris, who is our shadow Minister for Transport, and answered by the Prime Minister (Mr Malcolm Fraser). Mr Morris asked a series of questions about expenditure on travel by the Governor-General. In paragraph 4 of his question Mr Morris asked:

What was the total cost of the trip and, in particular, the cost of (a) travel, (b) accommodation, (c) car hire and (d) gifts?

In answer to that paragraph of the question Mr Fraser said:

Costs of the visit have not yet been finalised.

On 27 May we debated a special appropriation of $60,000. Yet 7 days prior to that Mr Fraser had said that the total costs had not yet been finalised. So we may envisage that the total costs will be in excess of that amount.

So here we have the Governor-General spending large amounts of the taxpayers' money in flying around Australia at a time when this Government comes in with its Budget and tells us that to bring about some stability in the economy of this country we must cut down on wage rates of the workers, we must exercise wage restraint. What has this Government done in respect of wage restraint and the costs of running the Governor-General's establishment? Let us have a look at page 110 of Appropriation Bill (No. 1) 1976-77 which was tabled as a Budget paper last night. Division 504 under the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet deals with the conveyance of the Governor-General, Ministers of State and others by RAAF and Department of Transport aircraft. Under the Whitlam Government the expenditure for 1975-76 was $1,197,969. Yet this Government, which is preaching wage restraint, has sought an appropriation this year of $1,243,000. This is an increase of $45,000 on what we spent last year. Division 505 is concerned with the official establishments of the Governor-General.

Senator Jessop—The only person you are impressing is yourself.

Senator McLAREN—Mr President, I know that this is hurting honourable senators opposite because they have preached wage restraint and they do not like people out in the community to know that they are seeking an appropriation which represents a fantastic increase in wages and expenditures for a person who does not need it. The pensioners and workers of this country need every extra penny they can get. However, these people are suffering because of the Government's policy of wage restraint. This is why honourable senators opposite are getting so vocal and so upset tonight. But they will not put me off. Even if I have to remain here until 2 o'clock I am going to put on record what this Government is prepared to spend on a person in a very high place in this country. I think that what the Government is appropriating is a fantastic waste of taxpayers' money. As I have said, Division 505 deals with official establishments. In 1975-76 the Whitlam Government expended a total of $1,163,212. But the present Government is appropriating $1,345,700 under the legislation introduced last night. That is an increase of $182,488. This Government preaches wage restraint, and yet it wants an extra $182,000 for one person in this community—the Governor-General.

We come now to the Governor-General's Office, in division 506. This is the real crunch, considering that this Government is preaching wage restraint. Subdivision 1 deals with salaries and payments in the nature of salary. What do we find was the expenditure under that subdivision in the last Budget, the Hayden Budget of the Whitlam Government? It was a total of $130,141. What do we find in the Budget this year? We find an amount of $240,800—an increase of $110,659 for one person in this community. The wage earners, the people who do the work in this great country of ours, are having preached to them all the time that wage restraint is the whole crux of getting the economy back on a stable level. How will the Government convince the people of that? I will go out and explain
the position to them. I want to put on record the 2 faces of this Government: On the one hand it is preaching wage restraint to the real workers of this country and on the other hand it is giving an amount of $110,659 extra to the Governor-General of this country—a person who does not need it.

I hope that what I have said here tonight goes out to the people at large. I will have much more to say on this matter during the Budget debate and during the consideration of the Estimates. I will not let it rest here. I will sheet home to honourable senators opposite the fact that they are two-faced in preaching one thing for the working class of this country on the one hand and handing out money to the wealthy sections of the community on the other.

Senator MULVHILL (New South Wales) (11.32)—I want only to enlarge on the political persecution that was mentioned by Senator Missen. I think we all are appreciative of the organisations the honourable senator cited. Political persecution does not happen to be the monopoly of one country. I think Senator Missen would agree with me if he read a very comprehensive article that appeared in *Time* magazine about 2 issues ago. Countries such as Spain and South Korea in particular figured on the blacklist. I rise to speak only in order to say that there are ways, in some instances, in which we can apply some practical leverage. The Estimates will be dealt with shortly and they show the countries which are recipients of Australian economic aid.

Four years ago on a night such as this my illustrious South Australian colleague, Senator Bishop, and I complained, on a trade union basis, about aid being given to South Korea at a time when both Methodist and Catholic non-Korean missionaries were hoisted out of the country because they told the textile workers to organise themselves into a trade union. They were unceremoniously hoisted out, allegedly because they were infected by Marxism. At that time Senator Bishop and I threatened to cause considerable agitation because of the amount of aid that was going to South Korea. Within a month—Senator Bishop will agree with me on this—certain trade union leaders were released and there was a great deal more harmony on the part of the gentlemen of the cloth who were adopting a more proletarian attitude to their role on this earth. That was an occasion on which the South Korean Embassy began to wonder about its image.

The other matter to which I refer relates also to what Senator Missen has said. The Australian trade union movement has been under siege for its attitude to the cessation of wheat sales to Chile. Chile has been a recipient of a tremendous amount of World Bank capital, allegedly to put it on its feet. I think Senator Missen would be well aware that of all the South American countries Chile has the worst record for a very rarefied type of torture of people whom it describes as being against the government and as unsettling things. Unfortunately I have to say here tonight that the present Government no longer puts intending Chilean migrants in the category of those who are politically persecuted. I think that Senator Knight would know of the term which is used, 'subject to political duress'. It is true that there are people in that category. It may be asked—I do not say that Senator Missen would ask it—what about the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics? The point I am making is that the U.S.S.R. does not ask for any privileges.

It might be argued, as Senator Sibraa interjected, that we should cease trade either with China or Russia as super powers because of political oppression. We may want to exert pressure on behalf of people who are in gaols because of their political beliefs, but a country that puts the hand out and asks for economic aid is the one from which one expects a higher degree of democratic thinking and procedures. When the Estimates are being considered we can certainly ask questions about the countries that get Australian handouts and ask whether they can justify them if they are not attempting at least to give people with a dissenting viewpoint the right to express such ideas. I say that very solemnly. I think when the Estimates are before us we can apply leverage very effectively.

Senator YOUNG (South Australia) (11.36)—I sat and listened in silence to another tirade from Senator McLaren this evening. It is not the first time on which I have heard him issue a tirade, nor is it the first time when I have heard Senator McLaren endeavour to denigrate a personality. The one thing that does annoy me is that a senator is prepared to get up in this chamber and attack a personality who does not have the opportunity to come in here and answer him. Having said that I go no further with this other than to ask the Minister—

Senator Georges—Mr President, I rise on a point of order. What Senator Young is saying is that Senator McLaren personally denigrated the Governor-General. I do not think he did that.

Senator YOUNG—I said 'endeavoured'.
Senator Georges—That is what he is saying. If that is the case I think that is a reflection on you, Mr President, because I do not think you would have allowed Senator McLaren to do that. I think Senator McLaren was pointing to a very grave disparity between the attitude of the Government to ordinary workers and the attitude of the Government to the position of the Governor-General in making it a very highly paid position with substantial fringe benefits. I do not think that Senator Young should infer that Senator McLaren did cast aspersions on the Governor-General.

Senator Young—Mr President, may I speak on this point of order? The impression I had from Senator McLaren’s remarks was that the Governor-General was abusing his position and over-using VIP aircraft. I felt that he was attacking the Governor-General for what Senator McLaren considered was an over-use of VIP aircraft.

Senator Cotton—Mr President, I gather that that is no longer a matter that Senator Young wishes to take any further. We have had 5 people speaking tonight on a range of subjects. I should like them to know that I have noted their remarks.

The PRESIDENT—Order! Senator Young, had you finished your remarks?

Senator Young—No, Mr President, I had finished them on the point of order. That is all.

Senator Cotton—I am sorry, I thought Senator Young had finished.

The PRESIDENT—I listened very intently to that which Senator McLaren said tonight. As honourable senators know I am very aware of the provisions of standing order 417. As I listened intently I did not hear anything said that would have required me to call Senator McLaren to order or ask him to withdraw. There is no substance in the point of order.

Senator YOUNG—Thank you, Mr President. The only further remarks I wish to pass are basically in the order of a question which I should like to put to the Minister for Administrative Services (Senator Withers) to whom Senator McLaren addressed himself this evening through the Chair. I ask the Minister whether he can say what was the actual cost of the use of VIP aircraft by Mr Whitlam in his last 12 months as Prime Minister and also what was the cost of his overseas trips.

Senator COTTON (New South Wales—Minister for Industry and Commerce) (11.40)—in reply—I start with Senator Missen’s comments. I listened to them with a great deal of interest because I have spent time in Russia. I found it an interesting country but rather frightening and some of the things he said brought back memories. I am grateful to have had the chance of listening to him.

Senator Georges—What frightened you, senator?

Senator COTTON—I was listening to the problems of that country and, although this is not the time for reminiscing, I remembered that when I was there somebody said to me: ‘You know, Russia is much freer than it used to be’. I mentioned this to one of my friends in Russia and she said: ‘Yes, but when the Lubyanka prison is empty we can talk about that, can’t we?’

Senator Sibraa was talking about the problems in the Orange-Bathurst growth centre over the pipeline extension. I have noted his remarks. Senator McLaren talked at great length and in an extremely loud voice about a lot of things in the Estimates—

Senator McLaren—I had to talk over your members, senator. I could not be heard.

Senator COTTON—At one stage I was going to rise and suggest to Senator McLaren that he might appreciate that the microphone system was still working but it was not necessary because he finally stopped. It was a great relief for everyone. Senator Mulvihill also spoke of political persecutions. It too was most interesting. In reply to Senator Young, I shall endeavour to obtain the figures for which he has asked.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Senate adjourned at 11.42 p.m.
ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The following answers to questions were circulated:

**Political Broadcasting**

(Question No. 451)

Senator Douglas McClelland asked the Minister representing the Minister for Post and Telecommunications upon notice:

1. What was the expenditure by each political party on political advertising during the 1974 and 1975 Federal elections on (a) commercial broadcasting and (b) commercial television stations, in the categories of capital city and non-capital city areas.

2. How much time was devoted to each political party during the 1974 and 1975 Federal elections on (a) commercial broadcasting, and (b) commercial television stations in (i) peak and (ii) non-peak listening and viewing times in the categories of capital city and non-capital city areas.

3. How much time was made available to each political party by the Australian Broadcasting Commission during the 1974 and 1975 Federal elections on national broadcasting and national television stations.

Senator Carrick—The Minister for Post and Telecommunications has provided the following answers to the honourable senator’s questions:

1. Table ‘A’ below provides answers sought by the honourable senator.

2. Unfortunately, in respect of question (2), the stations do not provide the Australian Broadcasting Control Board with details of (i) peak and (ii) non-peak listening or viewing times of political announcements. To obtain such information would necessitate a considerable amount of administrative work and an individual approach to each broadcasting and television station in Australia. However, Table ‘B’ sets out the total time devoted to each party.

3. Table ‘C’ below explains the position with regard to the national stations.

It should be noted that Tables ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ are based on information supplied to the Board by the licensees of commercial broadcasting and television stations and by the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

**TABLE ‘A’**

**COMMERCIAL BROADCASTING STATIONS EXPENDITURE BY POLITICAL PARTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>34,310</td>
<td>32,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>25,550</td>
<td>35,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP (CP 1974)</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>29,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>5,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61,214</td>
<td>104,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE ‘B’**

**EXPENDITURE BY STATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.A. (includes N.T.)</th>
<th>W.A.</th>
<th>Tas.</th>
<th>Total Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>7,099</td>
<td>5,306</td>
<td>8,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>14,419</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>3,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP (CP 1974)</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>2,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>4,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,259</td>
<td>11,462</td>
<td>20,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M : Metropolitan
C : Country
### TABLE 'A'

**COMMERCIAL TELEVISION STATIONS EXPENDITURE BY POLITICAL PARTIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N.S.W.</th>
<th>Vic.</th>
<th>Qld.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>136,839</td>
<td>71,659</td>
<td>65,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>171,962</td>
<td>87,741</td>
<td>260,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP (CP 1974)</td>
<td>8,586</td>
<td>53,486</td>
<td>6,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>83,069</td>
<td>12,905</td>
<td>37,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>53,766</td>
<td>36,777</td>
<td>7,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>454,222</td>
<td>262,568</td>
<td>388,111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 'B'

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF TIME DEVOTED TO EACH POLITICAL PARTY DURING THE 1974 AND 1975 FEDERAL ELECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Metropolitan</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mins</td>
<td>Mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mins</td>
<td>Mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>2 183</td>
<td>3 721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 606</td>
<td>10 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>3 128</td>
<td>4 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 044</td>
<td>10 930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP (CP 1974)</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 259</td>
<td>8 629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td></td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 354</td>
<td>9 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 749</td>
<td>32 293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 'C'

**NATIONAL TELEVISION STATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hrs</td>
<td>Mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NATIONAL BROADCASTING STATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th></th>
<th>1974</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hrs</td>
<td>Mins</td>
<td>Hrs</td>
<td>Mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aboriginal Schools in Northern Territory

**(Question No. 771)**

**Senator Kilgariff** asked the Minister for Education, upon notice:

**AUGUST 18 1976**

(1) What number of children are (a) enrolled, and (b) attend Aboriginal schools on each settlement and mission in the Northern Territory, in pre-school, primary school, and post primary classes.

(2) What has been (a) the overall enrolment each year, and (b) the percentage attendance, for the past ten years.

**Senator Carrick**—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

Information to answer the honourable senator’s question is set out in the attached tables. I would also draw attention to my reply to question No. 230 (Hansard 8 April 1976, page 1178).

**Number of children enrolled and attending Aboriginal Schools on Settlements and Missions in the Northern Territory.**

### APRIL 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlements—</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre.</td>
<td>Prim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoonguna</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areongya</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baqot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banyili</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borroloola</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delissaville</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docker River</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcho Is.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Point</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Creek</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Creek</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Evella</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maningrida</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper River</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Bay</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbakumba</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrabri</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Hill Centre</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>504</td>
<td>2 027</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2 858</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1 625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government on Mission—**

| Angurugu | 40   | 146  | 34   | 220  | 22   | 84   | 23   | 129   |
| Croker Is. | 18  | 44   | .    | 62   | 12   | 31   | .    | 43    |
| Goulburn Is. | 27 | 58   | .    | 85   | 20   | 42   | .    | 62    |
| Numbulwar | 32   | 87   | 25   | 144  | 17   | 79   | 24   | 120   |
| Oenpelli | 32   | 135  | 49   | 216  | 14   | 78   | 37   | 129   |
| Yirrakla | 41   | 169  | 44   | 254  | 16   | 97   | 39   | 152   |
| Milingimbi | 46 | 190  | 69   | 305  | 26   | 136  | 45   | 207   |

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>1 286</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Missions—**

| Bathurst Is. Boys | . | 38  | 25  | 63  | . | 38  | 25  | 63    |
| Bathurst Is. Girls | 73 | 193 | 25  | 291 | 63 | 193 | 25  | 281   |
| Hermannsburg      | 44  | 127 | 26  | 197 | 39  | 107  | 22  | 168   |
| Port Keats        | 50  | 238 | 40  | 328 | 28  | 220  | 40  | 288   |
| Sante Teresa      | 30  | 107 | 29  | 166 | 24  | 95   | 29  | 148   |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre.</td>
<td>Prim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daly River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Totals</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENTS AND MISSIONS 1966-1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools on Settlements—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoonguna</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagot</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamylil</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>173.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borroloola</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delissaville</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docker River</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Point</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Creek</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>139.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Creek</td>
<td>New</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maningrida</td>
<td>220.5</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>311.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>208.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>271.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper River</td>
<td>Ex Mission</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Bay</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbukumba</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrabri</td>
<td>169.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>171.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Hill Centre</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumun</td>
<td>210.0</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>263.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1548.5</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>1499.8</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>2012.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.

(b) Percentage Attendance.

**ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENTS AND MISSIONS 1966-1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools on Settlements—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoonguna</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areyonga</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagot</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamylil</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>181.4</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borroloola</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delissaville</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docker River</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Point</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hooker Creek</td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>161.9</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Creek</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maningrida</td>
<td>405.4</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>376.1</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papunya</td>
<td>268.3</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>308.8</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper River</td>
<td>161.1</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snake Bay</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umbukumba</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>163.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrabri</td>
<td>199.8</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>242.5</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wave Hill Centre</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuendumu</td>
<td>260.9</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>251.4</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>2 475.6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>2 583.4</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>2 413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.
(b) Percentage Attendance.

### ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENTS AND MISSIONS 1966-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools on Missions—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angurugu</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>126.9</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>193.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croker Island</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn Island</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milingimbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbulwar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenpelli</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirrkala</td>
<td>178.9</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>182.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>263.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>433.6</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>404.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>550.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.
(b) Percentage Attendance.

### ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENTS AND MISSIONS 1966-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Schools on Missions—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angurugu</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croker Island</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goulburn Island</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milingimbi</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>274.3</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbulwar</td>
<td>109.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenpelli</td>
<td>164.7</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yirrkala</td>
<td>313.4</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>301.3</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td>1 214.0</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>1 211.8</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>1 194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.
(b) Percentage Attendance.
### Answers to Questions
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**ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENT AND MISSIONS 1966-1975**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Schools—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Is. (Boys)</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Is. (Girls)</td>
<td>245.0</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>207.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>253.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>244.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>186.0</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily River</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcho Island</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>239.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>365.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>361.0</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>418.0</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermannsburg</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>172.1</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>196.6</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>203.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Evella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millingimbi</td>
<td>158.0</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>230.3</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbulwar</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenpelli</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>121.5</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>147.3</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Keats</td>
<td>137.0</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>185.9</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>241.2</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper River</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>163.7</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1 387.2</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>1 192.1</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1 676.8</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1 515.2</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>1 390.0</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total:</td>
<td>3 369.3</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>3 096.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>4 239.6</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>4 658.9</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>4 736.5</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.

(b) Percentage Attendance.

### ENROLMENT AND % ATTENDANCE OF ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AT SCHOOLS ON SETTLEMENTS AND MISSIONS 1966-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Av.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Att.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Enr.</td>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Schools—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Is. (Boys)</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathurst Is. (Girls)</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily River</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Arm</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elcho Island</td>
<td>397.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>449.2</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermannsburg</td>
<td>213.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>229.8</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Evella</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millingimbi</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbulwar</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oenpelli</td>
<td>Government School On Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Keats</td>
<td>282.7</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>272.0</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roper River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Teresa</td>
<td>167.1</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>174.5</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>1 479.8</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>1 542.4</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>1 520</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>1 639</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>1 550</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total:</td>
<td>5 169.4</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>5 337.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>5 127</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>5 210</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>5 396</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Average Daily Enrolment.

(b) Percentage Attendance.

### Statements by the Prime Minister

(Invoice No. 729)

Senator Cavanagh asked the Minister representing the Attorney-General, upon notice:

Did a representative of the United States Central Intelligence Agency, on 9 or 10 November 1975, seek from the Australian Security Intelligence Organization's liaison officer in Washington explanations of alleged statements made by the Australian Prime Minister.

Senator Durack—The Attorney-General has supplied the following answer to the honourable senator's question:

The Australian Security Intelligence Organization's liaison officer in Washington explained that the allegations made by the Australian Prime Minister were not based on any evidence obtained from the Central Intelligence Agency.
This Government and its predecessors have adhered to the policy established by Prime Minister Chifley in 1949 that details of the operation of the Australian Security Intelligence Organization are not disclosed.

Local Government Finances

Senator Carrick—On 1 June 1976 (Hansard, page 2103) Senator Wriedt asked me, as Minister Assisting the Prime Minister in Federal Affairs, whether I could advise the Senate what proportion of moneys that were paid to the States in the last financial year was eventually used by local government authorities throughout the Commonwealth.

I draw to the honourable senator’s attention the document ‘Payments To or For the States and Local Government Authorities 1975-76’ (Budget Paper No. 7), chapter five of which provides the figures necessary to calculate the proportion he wishes to know. I would, however, repeat two warnings spelt out in that chapter, namely:

(1) that the payments listed do not include Commonwealth payments to States passed on to local government authorities where the amounts involved are not subject to the approval of the Commonwealth Government, and

(2) that owing to a lag, which occurs in some cases between payment of the funds to the States and their allocation by the States, the amounts of funds paid to the States for local government authorities under a particular program in any year are not necessarily precisely equal to the amounts paid to authorities in that year.

International Conferences

(Proposal No. 813)

Senator Archer asked the Minister for Administrative Services, upon notice:

(1) How many applications have been received for Government assistance with expenditure incurred in the holding of international conferences in Australia in each of 1974, 1975 and 1976.

(2) From whom were they received.

(3) How much money was applied for in each case.

(4) How many and which ones were successful.

(5) What amount was granted in each case referred to in (3).

Senator Withers—The answer to the honourable senator’s question is as follows:

(1) and (2) Applications for assistance towards the following conferences were considered in the 2 year period 1974-75 to 1975-76:

1974-75—Total 28 applications:

United Nations Regional Conference in Australia/International Women’s Year.


Third International Congress of Immunology, Sydney 1977.


International Institute of Refrigeration Meeting, Melbourne 1976.

Pacific Indian Ocean Area Regional Conference of the Royal Commonwealth Society in Australia.

First Pacific Congress of Psychiatry, Melbourne 1975.

Ninth Congress of World Association of Anatomical and Clinical Societies of Pathology, Sydney 1975.

1977 Conference of World Association for Advancement of Veterinary Parasitology.

8th International Conference of the International Association on Water Pollution Research, Sydney 1976.

8th World Congress of the International Organisation of Consumer Unions, Sydney 1975.


Association for Science Co-operation in Asia, 1975.

Asian Youth Council Seminar, Melbourne 1975.

Assembly of Asian Zone of World Crafts Council, Sydney, May 1975.

Convention of the International Council of Jewish Women, Melbourne, April/May 1975.

Conference of International Federation of Air Traffic Controllers’ Associations, Melbourne, April 1975.

Regional Copyright Seminar, November 1975.


Symposium on Recent Developments in the Analysis of Soil Behaviour and their Application to Geotechnical Structures, Sydney 1975.


First International Santa Gertrudis Congress, Brisbane 1975.

UNESCO Regional Seminar on ‘Learning to Be’.

International Conference: Transport in the Years Ahead, Sydney, September 1975.

1975-76—Total 21 applications:


First Asian and Oceania Congress of Nuclear Medicine, 1976.

International Electronics Convention, August 1975.
United Nations Industrial Development Organisation—
Seminars on the Development and Manufacture of Basic
Land Transportation Vehicles, November 1975.


General Meeting of the Asian Association of Develop-
ment, Research and Training Institutes, August 1975.


Regional Habitat Meeting.

International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic

Congress of Thoracic and Cario-Vascular Surgeons of
Asia, 1976.

Assembly of the International Institute of Welding and

Conference on Recent Developments in Planetology,
1976.

Sixth International Congress of Endocrinology, 1980.

Symposia of the Federation Internationale de la Precon-
traine, 1976.

Australian National Commission for UNESCO: Regional
Seminars on the Development and Organisation of School
Library Services, 1976.

Fourth Meeting of the International Society of Hyperten-
sion, 1976.


International Conference of the World Education Fellow-
ship, 1976.

(3) and (4) 89 per cent and 62 per cent of applications
considered in 1974-75 and 1975-76 respectively, were suc-
cessful. A specific amount is not always applied for in each
case and in some cases Government support is given "in prin-
ciple" subject to the examination of a detailed budget closer
to the date of the proposed conference.

(5) Details of grants paid in 1974-75 in respect of inter-
national conferences are disclosed in the Second Schedule to
the Appropriation Act (No. 1) 1975-76; details of grants
paid in 1975-76 will be similarly disclosed in the Appropri-
ation Bills for this financial year.