Last week, the Parliamentary session ended. There has been the usual end of rush legislation and there has been a vigorous use of the guillotine which is a device designed arbitrarily to limit debate on a particular bill. These procedures prevented a large number of people speaking and it is bad Parliamentary practice. I know some will say that the previous Government fell into the same error. It's true. In earlier times we did, but in the last year or two, we had introduced special procedures in which any bill that was going to be passed in the Parliament in a particular session would be introduced a certain minimum time before the end of the session.

This was designed to give the Opposition plenty of time to study the bill and to allow people time to debate it. One of the distinctions that needs making in this session is the importance of a large number of the bills which have been introduced late and debated hurriedly.

The Airlines Bill would have given a new authority power to establish a complete monopoly of transport and would have allowed the authority to enter into super spreading, road transport and unlimited expansion of hotels. It was certainly quite unnecessary for the efficient and proper operation of the two airline system.

The Pelines Bill to establish a national gas pipeline would enable the authority involved in it to become a monopoly buyer and a monopoly seller. It could say to a particular company, we are not interested in your product. We won't buy from you. We won't give you the right to use the pipeline to carry your natural gas.

The Submerged Lands Bill has been introduced without any consultation with the States. It has been delayed in the Senate and I hope the State Premiers will press for discussions concerning it, because part of this bill establishes an off-shore mining code which has been arbitrarily determined by the Commonwealth.

The Grants Commission legislation gives to the Grants Commission powers which it does not in fact need. It will establish a new bureaucracy and further undermine the authority of the States. I think I said last week that there are much better ways of getting necessary additional financial support for local government and I agree that that financial support ought to come directly from the
Commonwealth and not bypass the States.

There has been a statement on Australian defence policy which is a quite tragic document, because I read it as laying the foundation for a break up of Australia's defence forces. The myth is beginning to be spread that we live in a world in which defence forces are no longer necessary. I would expect to see significant reduction in the defence vote as the years pass, if not in absolute terms, at least in relative terms. But the statement on defence and the statement on foreign policy, which I particularly wanted to participate in, were ones which were not properly debated because there was not time given to them.

Under this kind of pressure, the Parliament does not work as effectively as it should as an instrument of constructive criticism of the Government.

No Australian likes double standards. There are too many of them about. It's right for Australians to protest about French nuclear tests in the atmosphere, but it is wrong for Australians to protest about French nuclear tests alone. The Government has threatened breaking off diplomatic relations with France. I am certain they won't do it, because they would then have to break off diplomatic relationships with China, and they won't want to do that. China's tests fall out over areas of maximum population density. The French tests fall out over areas of minimum population and while it is right to protest, the protest should be made about both countries and not merely about one. But of course to protest about the Chinese tests would jeopardise Mr. Whitlam's efforts in leading Australia into the third world and to Peking. He doesn't do it. That is one fine example of a double standard.

A representative of Taiwan wanted to come to Australia - as I understand it, as a private citizen for a conference. He was refused a visa. Taiwan is a country with whom we have had close and friendly relationships for many years. Why should a citizen of Taiwan be refused a visa, coming in a private capacity? Even though he is a member of the Government it was not for a political discussion. It was so that he could take part in a forum of the Pacific Basin Economic Council, held in Sydney and opened by Mr. Whitlam. I think we have only to compare this with pictures of Jim Cairns, who seems now to take pride in being called Chairman Jim, feting North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegates on a recent occasion in Sydney. There is no
difficulty in getting into Australia at the moment if you are a representative or if you come from any communist power, but if you come from a number of other countries - even as a private citizen - you are excluded.

The refusal of the visa to the Taiwanese has just shown this up plainly and blatantly, and the unanswered question in all this is, whether or not the matter was referred to Peking and whether or not Peking objected. For my own part, I would not be surprised if that did take place. I wonder how many Australians now realise that there is not a country in the world that would regard our foreign policy as being aligned with Britain and the U.S.A., traditional friends and helpers. They would regard us as being aligned with the third world, with the non-aligned countries, or with China. I doubt if that is what the majority of Australians want.