

FINAL BROADCAST :

BROADCAST BY THE PRIME MINISTER, THE RT.  
HON. SIR ROBERT MENZIES, OVER NATIONAL  
STATIONS AT 7.15 P.M. ON WEDNESDAY, 27th  
NOVEMBER, 1963.

---

This campaign began with contests in the fields of foreign affairs and defence, contests which continue in full vigour and political significance. We then moved into domestic problems - particularly housing and education - about which I will say something.

But, quite late in the campaign, Mr. Calwell has produced a brand-new item of policy, of tremendous importance. Labour, if elected, will abolish preferential voting for the House of Representatives, a voting system which has operated in Australia for 45 years, unchallenged by either Party. Its whole purpose is to ensure that no man may be elected a Member if most of his electors don't want him. Take a simple example: Suppose there is a country seat which is being contested by Labour, Liberal and Country Party candidates. Both Liberal and Country Party candidates support the Government. The real question is: "Which of the two Government parties should win a clearly Government seat? Let the people decide."

Now, under preferential voting, suppose the count of first preferences showed -

Labour	18,000
Liberal	16,000
Country Party	11,000

The second preferences of the Country Party candidate, if they went only 80 per cent. to the Liberal and 20 per cent. to Labour, would produce a final count of -

Liberal	24,800
Labour	20,200

This would be a proper result, since clearly most voters did not want Labour.

Mr. Calwell now promises to abolish this voting system by reverting to "first past the post". This would mean that Labour would win the seat with 18,000 votes out of 45,000!

I hope you will clearly understand what Mr. Calwell is after. He would destroy all minority parties, such as the DLP and other groups, by making their votes virtually votes for Labour.

In short, if Labour wins this election, it will "rig" the voting system so as to make Labour undefeatable for a long time. There are curious aspects of this matter. It was Mr. Calwell, in the Chifley Government, who was the architect of the new Senate voting system - proportional representation. Up to that time, Senate voting was "first past the post", which left minorities in a State with no representation at all.

Mr. Calwell proposes to keep the new Senate system, since in every State it assures Labour of some Senators. He is all for proportional representation to keep control, or near-control, of the Senate, and now all for "first past the post" for the House of Representatives to keep control of that House.

But the matter does not end there. Labour wants "first past the post" for the House of Representatives. But it chooses its own candidates for Parliament by the preferential voting system!

And how does it choose its Parliamentary leader and the members of its Parliamentary Executive? By exhaustive ballot - not by "first past the post". Let's say that there are 80 Labour Senators and Members meeting to choose a leader. And let's suppose that four offer themselves for election. On the first vote, A gets 30 votes, B 25 votes, C 20 votes and D 5 votes. So the chairman of the meeting strikes out D, and another vote is taken, and so on until somebody has 41 votes, or an absolute majority. As you will see, the purpose is the same as in preferential voting. Yet, under the system Mr. Calwell now advocates for the House of Representatives, A would instantly win, with 30 votes out of 80!

I urge you to beware of this recently-disclosed Labour Policy. It is designed to destroy minorities, and to give Labour perpetual power. And who will exercise this power? Not the people you send to Parliament, but the outside Executive, the 36 men who owe you no responsibility at all, but whose decisions and orders a Calwell government would be bound implicitly to obey!

Our housing and education programmes, to which I made a brief reference earlier, have been attracting great attention among younger voters. This has been manifest in each State and at all my meetings. These voters acknowledge generously what we have achieved in both fields; but they are looking forward to marriage, to home building, to children, and to the education of those children to be good citizens, good builders of a growing nation. In effect, what they are saying to us is - "What can you do to help us to help ourselves and our children and the nation?" Now, this is no selfish attitude. It is a constructive and imaginative attitude. We have tried to meet it in our policy. Thus our scheme for subsidising a saved deposit on a home at the rate of £1 for £3 for married people in the "under 35 age group" with a maximum subsidy (that is, a gift not repayable) of £250, will give great encouragement to those who need it at the right time and in the right way. For most ambitious young married couples want to have a home of their own. This indeed is the ideal of genuinely civilised democracy. The ownership of a home is the kind of security which naturally attracts them because it represents a measure of independence. I understand the Opposition now questions the validity of our proposal. Mr. Calwell will be surprised to see how valid it is.

Similarly, in our new education proposals, we have been looking in a practical way to the future. The parents of families want their children to have the best education they can afford. They want this education to enable their child to advance in life, in character, in skill, and in reward. The best parents, I have no doubt, want their children to be trained to be good citizens and good contributors to the advancement of the nation.

Recognising this, we have put forward three completely new propositions.

The first concerns the encouraging of secondary school students to put in some extra time on their secondary studies so that they may be better qualified thereafter, and the encouraging of their parents to persuade them to take this extra time. This is frequently a matter of great family difficulty.

To facilitate extra training for bright boys and girls at secondary schools, we will award each year 10,000 scholarships, tenable for the two later years at secondary schools; each scholarship will be worth up to £100 a year for fees and books, and £100 a year for maintenance. Secondary schools will include those which are public and those which are independent.

Second, the provision of 2,500 technical school scholarships will be made on the same terms and for similar purposes.

The demand in Australia for technically skilled people is growing. Indeed, the supply of competent technicians very frequently determines the extent to which any enterprise can employ unskilled labour. To assist in this field, we are proposing to find each year a non-repayable grant of £5M. a year to the States for the building and equipment of technical school facilities.

Third, it is essential that provision for science teaching in the secondary schools should be modern and adequate if we are to draw from them into the universities and into post-graduate and research work the scientists and technologists we will increasingly need. We are therefore proposing to distribute £5M. a year among secondary schools, again without discrimination, for the building and equipment of science laboratories and, in this way, the encouragement of science teaching.

It has been clearly observed by large audiences of younger electors whom I have addressed that these practical proposals, well-considered, not extravagant but most valuable, will open up new avenues in life for many thousands of younger people who might otherwise fail to enter them.

Finally, I go back to where I began - to foreign affairs and defence - to the vital matter of national security, without which no domestic progress can be achieved. When you recall how much the present Government has strengthened our alliances on a basis of co-operation, diplomatically and militarily, for the common security against Communist aggression, do you really feel tempted to entrust our relations with the United Kingdom, the United States, and our other friends, to the left-wingers and the compromisers who make up the great majority of Labour's non-elected Parliament? It is because we think that such dangerous nonsense will never be entertained by a majority of our Australian people that we ask you with confidence for a sweeping victory on Saturday.

---