

Mr President, ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much indeed for the organisation you've put into the events of today. It was a great meeting in the park this morning and this is a magnificent gathering for lunch now. And I'm most heartened at the reception you gave the newest minister, the youngest minister, in the Australian Government. Only 31 years old, he's been in the Parliament less than six years; I can assure you there is very great competition to get into the ministry. But you've been able to hear and see the quality of the man, who less than six years in the Parliament, barely 31 years of age, is able to win a ballot, a secret ballot, among very tough competition. And I can assure you, in giving you, as your new Minister for Northern Australia, a man of this capacity, this drive, this capacity to comprehend and convey the big things, the big opportunities, to approach, and we trust, solve the big problems of this immense area of our continent, we've made a very good decision indeed. And I thank you for the reception you gave him; he deserves it; he'll need a lot of support, and I know the Labor people of this Territory, and indeed all the people who are here in this Territory to develop it, to produce a good community in this Territory, will give him their support.

Now ladies and gentlemen I spoke earlier in the park and so I needn't go over all the things I said then. There is one particular thing that is rousing people from one end of Australia to another. And this is the fact that for the first time in the seventy-five years that we've had a nation, and a national Parliament, the Senate has taken it on itself, to block the Budget. It's true that in April last year they moved a motion to defer the Supply Bills, and in those circumstances, I advised the Governor-General to dissolve both Houses, to have a double dissolution of the Parliament. There were a great number of things which needed to be solved, and one of the things which needed to be solved were some of the Electoral Bills, including the bills which were to give you representation in the Senate - this you remember was in the policy speech in 1972, it was in the policy speech in 1969 as well. And in Opposition we had brought in bills to give the representation and vote to people in the Senate from the Territories. This has been a very long-standing platform of the Labor Party and I've put it on the Labor Party's behalf at many elections, and our opponents never objected, never. Sure, they stalled it when we brought the bills in in Opposition; but never during a campaign did they ever say, least of all of course, in the Northern Territory where there was a member for the House of Representatives, that they objected to you having members in the Senate. They never said it. Well, there were six bills in April last year which they had twice rejected in the Senate, and this was one of them - Medibank was another, other electoral ones were also involved. So we thought, right, we'll settle it, we'll have, dissolve both Houses, we'll start off with a clean Parliament. And at that time, they said, we said, that we were seeking to have the opportunity of governing Australia for three years. They lost; they made a grievous mistake; we won; we got a comfortable majority in the House of Representatives; we got as many

Senators as they got - in the whole Parliament we obviously had the majority. That is, the majority of the members of Parliament; but of course, in the community as a whole, we had a very large majority of the votes. In the House of Representatives I think we got half a million more votes than all our competitors in the Parliament combined, that is, the representatives of the Parties in the Parliament. And in the House of Representatives we got 165,000 more votes for the Labor candidates, in the Senate, than were cast for the candidates of all the other Parties that are represented in the Senate. So by every basis, every test every criteria, we ought to have been able to govern uninterrupted for three years. But our opponents who courted that election, who lost that election, haven't seen fit to abide by the verdict of the people. And they're up to the same game again. Once again they've passed the motion to put off a vote on Money Bills, on the Budget itself. And three times now they have carried a motion to defer debate on three of the Budget Bills - the Loan Bills and the two Appropriation Bills - three times they've done this for each of the three bills. And this time I'm not going to buckle under because if I did, not only would I, not only would this Government, but any future Prime Minister, any Government that the people elect, would have the same threat hanging over them. And the threat would be made twice a year, because every October you have to pass the Budget Bills to pay for the business of Government for the whole of the financial year - from the first of July previous, to the thirtieth of June following. And every April you pass the Supply Bills to make provisional appropriation for the next financial year, from the first of July to the thirtieth of November, until the Budget in turn is passed for the whole of that financial year. Twice a year money Bills come up and if the Senate rejects those bills and is thereby able to produce an election for the House of Representatives, no Government can carry out any programs - it would have to govern for a few months ahead alone. And the wicked part of it is that the Senate could, usually, avoid going to the people itself. Because most of the people in the Senate are safe as long as their Parties endorse them - they're safe from the wrath of the electorate - because the number 1 and 2 on the Liberal and Country Party tickets, the number 1 and 2 on the Labor Party ticket in each of the six States is certain to get back - it's only the fifth person that there's any battle over - whether it's to be Labor or whether it's to be Liberal and Country Party. There's only one-fifth of the Senators who are in any jeopardy when there's an election for the Senate. But on most of these occasions there wouldn't be an election for the Senate at all. You can only have an election for the Senate in two circumstances: one is when half the Senate is about to come to an end at the end of the following June - you can have an election for that half of the Senate at any time during the previous twelve months - that is, half the Senators - well there've been a couple who've left the Senate - and so 28 of the Senators who are there now, will be replaced or confirmed some time in this financial year, and they'll take their places or people will take their places on the 1 July next.

But at the present moment there are very special circumstances. When there is an election for the Senate or for the House of Representatives then for the first time there will also be two Senators elected from each of the mainland Territories and there will also be a choice by the people to, for senators to replace the two former Labor Senators whom the New South Wales and Queensland Premiers had replaced with anti-Labor or non-Labor people - that is the successors for Murphy and Milliner would take office from the day the result of the election for the Senate was declared. So as soon as there's half a Senate election, which can take place any time in this financial year, and the election is usually held in November or December, then on this occasion the new Senators will take office, not from the 1 July only, but there will be six who will take office from the time the election result is declared. So that's one circumstance in which you can have an election for the Senate.

And the other circumstance in which you can have an election for the Senate is where there is a Bill, or more than one Bill which has been twice rejected by the Senate. Now that is the situation now as it was the situation, of course, in the first half of last year when we had the double dissolution. But if there is not half a Senate coming up, or if there has not been a double rejection of any Bill by the Senate, then there can't be an election for the Senate. And in those circumstances - and these were the circumstances for the first seven months that we were in Government, and they again were the circumstances for the first seven months after we were re-elected in May last year, then they can cut off the Budget, they can cut off Supply and, they believe, can then bring about an election for the House of Representatives without having to face the people themselves. Now this is an end to stable government in this country.

I've been astonished and gratified by the number of migrants who come to our meetings. And one of the reasons, I'm convinced, why they come to our meetings on this issue, is that they have so often come from countries where democracy has been destroyed or where it is very fragile or where it is under challenge. And they thought that Australia, an independent pioneering country, but nevertheless a country which was the heir to British parliamentary traditions, at least was a country where people could change the Government at the ballot box, where there could be a peaceful transfer of power if the people saw fit, from a Government to an Opposition. And then if the Opposition became the Government it had a fair go, it had three years in which to justify itself. And then if it couldn't, it would then go back into Opposition and the previous Government would come back. At least they thought that in our democracy it was possible to change governments peacefully and by your private decision at the ballot box and then the government you chose could govern.

I am determined to see that governments which are elected by the Australian people are allowed to govern. I will not

have an election for the House of Representatives or the Senate or both until the Budget is passed. And that's to be quite clear.

I've never had any doubt as to the result of an election between the Liberal-Country Parties on one hand and Labor on the other. When it came to an election, when people had a choice, where they saw the alternatives, where they saw us for better or for worse, and where they had to size up our opponents for better or for worse, they once again would choose us. I believe the remarkable thing of the last three weeks has been the perception by the public of the type of man Mr Fraser is. They've seen him to be impatient and greedy, because he's not the sort of person that knows what the Australian people want in the cities or the outback. Sure, he represents what's called a country electorate. But if you go to that country electorate which he represents, you will see that it is a long-settled, very serene sort of place. That is, it's not bursting with vitality; it is not a pioneering outback electorate; it hasn't got the new resources which Australians want to develop for themselves; it's an old-fashioned electorate - good people undoubtedly, but not the sort of people that have to face the problems which now have to be faced in the cities and in the outback. He's not in touch with the Australian people and the people to whom he turns for advice are newspaper proprietors - including the expatriate proprietor who owns your papers in the Territory - I don't know how Rupert Murdoch remains on the electoral rolls or remains as the owner of television or radio stations because you're supposed to be Australian residents if you're to be on the rolls or if you're to own the electronic media - and he's not an Australian resident.

Nevertheless the other people that back him are the Country Party, and the Country Party are the most selfish people in Australia - no question about it. And it was the Country Party, as well as the Liberals, who didn't want you to have votes in the Northern Territory. They thought you would upset their apple-cart and - if you go for your advice, if you seek the views of newspaper proprietors and Country Party leaders you'll go wrong, and that's what Mr Snedden did, and he went wrong, and he went bad, and this is what Mr Fraser has done as well. I've always thought he'd betray himself this way - he's done the wrong thing, and he's been found out and the people have noticed it. Now I've always been certain that if we have an election campaign and they have to give up just relying on our sins and try to project some virtues of their own, they'd flop, and they will - whenever I call the election. But the big thing is that I've got to ensure that whatever the Government is the people choose, is able to govern. It was a great shock to the conservative system when we were elected in December 1972. They felt that we were usurpers - we were trespassers, and they are doing their very best to see that the people's will, twice expressed, is frustrated. They've wanted to keep us off balance, or to get us off balance - they're not going to. Because we are fighting for a proper principle - that if the people

choose a Government, that Government must be given a fair go.

What's the alternative? The extraordinary thing I hear them expressing now is that if a Government can't get things through the Senate then the Senate ought to choose a Government. But they haven't got a majority in the Senate either - they have 30 members, half the Senate - and if you're to get something through the Senate, you've got to get a majority. If a vote is even in the Senate, then the motion or the Bill is not passed.

Now they've not had a vote on the Budget and it's plain from what Liberal senators have said on TV that if there was a vote on the Budget the vote would go in the affirmative - that is, the Senate would pass the Budget. But the device they've used, three times, on each of three Bills, is to put up a motion that the debate should be deferred. That is, as I put it at the meeting this morning, they've gone on strike - they won't do the job. And of course, even then they wouldn't have carried it if Bjelke-Petersen hadn't put in an anti-Labor person to succeed Milliner. If Milliner had been there, then the vote would have been even and the vote to adjourn or to defer would have been defeated. Now that is the technicality, the illegitimate technicality, upon which they have gone on strike.

Now I put to you this morning a couple of things which I believe are very great arguments to use in the Territory. One is the way they've cut things off for the Territory. Because here, and in Canberra, you depend on the Federal Budget alone. There is no part of Australia, with the possible exception of Canberra, where so many people depend on national Government payments - they're on the payroll or they're doing contracts for the Government. If federal money wasn't spent in the Northern Territory most people in the Territory wouldn't have a job, or they wouldn't be able to get contracts, or make supplies. This Territory depends on the federal Government more than any other part of Australia. It depends on the federal Budget more than any State depends on the federal Budget, and the State Government Budgets and the Local Government Budgets combined. Private enterprise is certainly valuable in the Territory as it is everywhere in a mixed economy like Australia - but private enterprise, for historical and understandable reasons, bulks smaller in the Northern Territory than anywhere else in Australia. For better or for worse you depend on the Government in the Northern Territory more than any other part of Australia depends on Governments. You don't have State Governments - you depend, you only have a couple of local councils, - you depend more on the national Government than any other Australians depend on all Government activities - employment, orders, contracts, - combined. And this is what they've done to you in the Budget. In the Budget, which they've stalled, there's \$439 million for the Northern Territory - there's \$58 m for housing and construction; there's \$45 m for education; there's \$113 m to run the Department of Northern Australia; there is \$40 m for health services and there is \$32 m for Aboriginal welfare and

advancement. And in total \$439 m held up. Now I believe the people in this Territory will be outraged when they see what is happening at the hands of the Liberal and Country Party.

And then I come to the other argument which I believe is overwhelming, overpowering in this Territory. The next election there is in this Territory, or anywhere in Australia, the next time there's an election for the House of Representatives in Australia, the next time there is an election for the Senate in any State in Australia, there will also be an election for two Senators from the Northern Territory and I believe in these circumstances you ought to be able to get two-thirds of the votes, you ought to be able to get in both Ted Robertson and Kevin Frazer - Frazer spelt with a 'z' - I noticed from most of the signs around Australia, the other Fraser is spelt with a swastika! And you know they've got the gall now to contest the Senate situation in the Northern Territory. They've tried their level best, by every means, to prevent the Northern Territory and Canberra having the right to elect Senators. It's astonishing in this day and age that a Parliament which makes laws for any community should not give that community the right to choose members in the law-making body. I mean this wouldn't occur, we would think, anywhere else in the world, but you have to obey the laws passed by the federal Parliament and the laws can only be made if they go through the House of Representatives and the Senate as well. And they've said every Liberal and every Country Party man, except one, on one occasion, has said that you shouldn't have senators in from the Northern Territory, you shouldn't have a voice, still less a vote, on anything in the Senate, even if it concerns the Northern Territory alone, as some legislation does. You can not choose your law-makers - that's their proposition. And three times we had to put this bill up in the Senate: on the first time it came before the House of Representatives the Liberals voted against it, - they've been consistent; the Country Party on the first time voted in favour of it. When it went to the Senate, they all there voted against it. And it was defeated. So with an interval of three months, which is required, we brought it up again; it passed through the House of Representatives; in the Senate once again, every Liberal and Country Party member voted against it. And then that was all we could do in that Parliament, but it was one of the bills for the double dissolution. After the double dissolution we again put it up in the Senate - it was passed by the Reps; we put it up in the Senate, and again, every Country Party and Liberal senator voted against it, although it had been, once again, one of the pledges the Government made. The first time they'd been a double dissolution and the Senate had not passed the bill had produced the double dissolution. So for the first time in history we have to have a Joint Sitting and we had the numbers in the Joint Sitting and every Country Party and Liberal member voted against the Territory getting representation in the Senate - except Sam Calder; he cuts no ice among his own crowd, because they all voted against him -

He did vote for it himself, but he was terribly embarrassed because for the first time he made a scene in the House - he wanted to be thrown out so he wouldn't have to vote - but we weren't going to accommodate him that way; he had to stay. So he voted for it; the best vote he's ever cast in his years in the Parliament. And all his mates deserted him.

These Country Party candidates- don't forget that every Country Party man in the Senate, there's no women in the Country Party, has voted against having representation in the (interjector whistles) - they wouldn't be worth whistling for if they were! Everybody, John Gorton, Billy McMahon, Billy Snedden, Malcolm Fraser - you seem to have forgotten the others - they were no better - and Anthony and Sinclair and Nixon, and all of them - they all voted against it. So when in the Senate campaign any Liberal or Country Party person comes up here say - Why did you vote against us having a vote for the Senate? Why - because they all did. But then of course, when it was finally through, that wasn't enough, a Country Party Premier, Bjelke-Petersen, he then asked the High Court to say that it was unconstitutional, that is, something that the people had endorsed, one would have thought at the '72 elections and again at the '74 elections, something that had been passed by the House of Representatives three times, and at a Joint Sitting, this was then said to be unconstitutional. And he was supported by the Liberal Premier of Western Australia. Well the High Court determined, three weeks ago yesterday, that it was constitutional. I notice somebody in the audience this morning blamed Murphy for this. I mean Murphy did the sensible, decent thing. I mean some people seem to think that there's something wrong in having a Labor Attorney-General on the High Court, but it's O.K. to have a Liberal one. And there's no need for me to tell you how Barwick voted on this, and how he voted, and how Murphy voted on this. on the Court. And Senator Greenwood made a great to-do about this three weeks ago: how monstrous that Murphy should have given judgment on a piece of legislation on whose constitutionality he had advised. Now the fact is that back in 1961, when Barwick was Attorney-General, he advised the Government that there shouldn't be a vote for people in the House of Representatives from the Territories except on matters which concerned the Territories alone. So one would have thought that Barwick's views on representation and voting for the Territories in the House of Representatives and the Senate were well known, just as well known as Murphy's, and they've been consistent, both of them; they've been consistent. I don't blame Barwick for being consistent, but I think it's a bit of a cheek to blame Murphy for being consistent. On this matter they were 'paired'. But not only this - Bjelke-Petersen heaped insult on injury by saying that the member of the House of Representatives from the Northern Territory shouldn't be able to vote either - now we know he never speaks, but Bjelke-Petersen said he shouldn't vote either - that you not only shouldn't have people in the Senate, with seats or votes, the chap you had in the House of Representatives could have a seat, couldn't speak - that makes no difference - but couldn't vote either.

So I think it's pretty clear, up in this Territory, you know what the striking Senators from the States, the Liberal and Country Party Senators from the States, who've gone on strike, what they think of the Territories. Canberra and the Northern Territory ought to be outraged on this because they suffer more than any other part of Australia. It's the Liberal and Country Parties who are provoking unemployment in this country. Just when we seem to be turning the corner, in these respects, inflation and unemployment, they are now wanting to exacerbate the position, to bring about a deterioration. They're the wreckers. This Budget of Bill Hayden's is the best the country has had for years - everybody in the Territory will benefit from it. And they don't want to give it a chance to work. They say that in certain circumstances they'd pass the Budget. Mr Fraser made a speech on the Budget himself - made quite a number of criticisms in fact - and then they were shown to be very shallow or in fact falacious. And he now says that his Budget is 'inoperative' - the old Nixon word - you remember Nixon's Press Secretary, Ziegler, said that one of the answers, not altogether accurate answers, that the President gave was 'inoperative'. Well Mr Fraser's speech on the Budget, in his own words, is now 'inoperative'. He doesn't want ours to operate either. He's got no alternative; purely negative.

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm certain that when, sometime before the end of next June, there is for the first time an opportunity for the people of this Territory to choose representatives in the Senate, that they will choose people who will not brook any further damage to this Territory; who will insist in the Territory having its full rights in the national Parliament, and they will turn to the Party which has fought for those things, through all the obstruction, through all the opposition by States and Courts and Senate that they will see that the Senate is only properly represented from this Territory by two Labor candidates - Robertson and Frazer with a 'z'.
