

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY



EMBARGOED UNTIL 4PM (D.S.T.)
EMBARGOED UNTIL 1PM (W.A. TIME)

PRIME MINISTER

CEDA LUNCHEON - PERTH - 19 NOVEMBER 1984

WHEN AUSTRALIANS GO TO THE POLLS ON 1 DECEMBER THEY WILL CHOOSE THEIR GOVERNMENT FOR THE NEXT 3 YEARS. THEY WILL ALSO DECIDE TWO CRUCIALLY IMPORTANT REFERENDUMS.

THOSE REFERENDUMS ARE OF PROFOUND SIGNIFICANCE FOR AUSTRALIANS IN ALL WALKS OF LIFE.

CEDA'S INTEREST IN THESE MATTERS HAS BEEN OF LONG-STANDING. INDEED, CHERYL SAUNDERS RECENT PUBLICATION "THE REFERENDUMS, 1984" - PUBLISHED AS PART OF THE CEDA STUDIES SERIES - IS A VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE ISSUES INVOLVED.

BOTH PROPOSALS FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE - SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS (OR TERMS OF SENATORS) AND INTERCHANGE OF POWERS - ARE IMPORTANT STEPS TOWARDS BETTER GOVERNMENT IN AUSTRALIA.

THE SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS PROPOSAL WILL BRING BETTER GOVERNMENT BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF ELECTIONS. IN THE LAST 20 YEARS WE HAVE HAD TWELVE FEDERAL ELECTIONS, OF WHICH THREE HAVE BEEN HALF-SENATE ELECTIONS. THE ADDITIONAL COST OF A HALF-SENATE ELECTION IN CURRENT TERMS IS \$19.2 MILLION.

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS WILL SAVE THE AUSTRALIAN TAXPAYER A GOOD DEAL OF MONEY. IT WILL ALSO REDUCE THE DISRUPTION TO BUSINESS AND THE COMMUNITY GENERALLY CAUSED BY TOO FREQUENT ELECTIONS - THAT MEANS SIMPLY, BETTER GOVERNMENT.

BUT THE REFERENDUM QUESTION ON WHICH I WISH TO FOCUS TODAY IS THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL, WHICH WILL ENABLE THE COMMONWEALTH AND STATES VOLUNTARILY TO REFER POWERS TO EACH OTHER.

THIS PROPOSAL, IF PASSED, WILL HAVE POTENTIALLY VERY SIGNIFICANT BENEFITS FOR BUSINESS. LATER IN THIS SPEECH I WILL ADDRESS THESE BENEFITS AT SOME LENGTH.

BUT BEFORE DOING SO I WISH TO MAKE SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE OPPOSITION'S POSITION ON THESE REFERENDUMS.

THESE TWO REFERENDUM PROPOSALS ARE BEING PUT TO THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE BY A FEDERAL LABOR GOVERNMENT. THEY ARE BEING OPPOSED BY THE OPPOSITION, UNDER MR PEACOCK AND MR SINCLAIR.

YET AS IT HAPPENS THESE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS ARE AS MUCH OPPOSITION PROPOSALS AS GOVERNMENT PROPOSALS.

THE OPPOSITION PARTIES HAVE PREVIOUSLY SUPPORTED THESE PROPOSALS CONSISTENTLY BOTH IN OPPOSITION AND IN GOVERNMENT. YET NOW THEY HAVE DECIDED TO CHANGE TOTALLY THEIR POSITION FOR THEIR OWN SHORT TERM POLITICAL REASONS.

CONSIDER, FIRST, THE SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS PROPOSAL. THE FRASER GOVERNMENT ITSELF PUT THIS PROPOSAL TO THE PEOPLE OF AUSTRALIA IN 1977. MR PEACOCK AND MR SINCLAIR SUPPORTED THE SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS REFERENDUM WHEN IT WAS PUT TO THE PEOPLE IN 1977.

THEN DURING THE 1983 ELECTION CAMPAIGN MR FRASER, AS PRIME MINISTER, GAVE AN UNEQUIVOCAL PROMISE TO PUT A REFERENDUM FOR SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS IN HIS NEXT TERM OF GOVERNMENT.

SO THAT WAS THE OPPOSITION'S POSITION IN GOVERNMENT. IN OPPOSITION, UNDER MR PEACOCK AND MR SINCLAIR, THEY MAINTAINED THAT POSITION UNTIL VERY RECENTLY.

LAST YEAR THE OPPOSITION SUPPORTED IN PARLIAMENT BOTH THE SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS PROPOSAL AND THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL, WHICH WERE TWO OF FIVE REFERENDUMS THE GOVERNMENT WAS THEN PROPOSING. THEY SUPPORTED THEM AND THEY VOTED FOR THEM. BUT NOT ONLY THAT, MR PEACOCK HIMSELF SPOKE IN GLOWING TERMS OF THE MERITS OF BOTH THESE PROPOSALS.

SPEAKING IN PARLIAMENT ON 20 OCTOBER LAST YEAR MR PEACOCK SAID:

"... THE OPPOSITION SUPPORTS THESE BILLS ... WE BELIEVE THEY WILL CONTRIBUTE TO BETTER WORKING OF THIS PARLIAMENT AND OF THE GOVERNMENT"

HE STATED:

"ALL THE PROPOSALS ARE USEFUL; INDEED SOME ARE VERY NECESSARY. IF CARRIED, THE CHANGES WILL HELP TO ENSURE THAT THE CONSTITUTION IS MODERN AND RELEVANT TO AUSTRALIA'S NEEDS ..."

BUT WHAT HAPPENED WHEN THE GOVERNMENT DECIDED TO PUT THESE TWO PROPOSALS TO THE PEOPLE ON THE SAME DAY AS THE ELECTION? MR PEACOCK AND MR SINCLAIR DECIDED IT WAS POLITICALLY CONVENIENT TO OPPOSE THE PROPOSALS.

NOW CONSIDER THE OPPOSITION'S POSITION, SPECIFICALLY ON THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL.

THIS PROPOSAL WAS FIRST PUT FORWARD BY THE VICTORIAN LIBERAL (HAMER) GOVERNMENT AT THE 1973 CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION. THE OPPOSITION HAVE SUPPORTED THE PROPOSAL EVER SINCE THE 1973 CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION - UNTIL NOW.

SHADOW ATTORNEY-GENERAL, SENATOR DURACK, IN MAY 1983 SAID OF THIS PROPOSAL ON BEHALF OF THE OPPOSITION:

"IT HAD AS FAR AS I COULD SEE, UNANIMOUS SUPPORT AT THE ADELAIDE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ... AND IT SEEMS ... A USEFUL FACILITY TO HAVE IN THE CONSTITUTION".

EVEN SIR JOH BJELKE-PETERSEN RAISED NO OBJECTION WHEN THE PROPOSAL WAS DISCUSSED AT THE ADELAIDE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION LAST YEAR. AND, INCIDENTALLY, SENATOR BJELKE-PETERSEN VOTED FOR THE PROPOSAL IN PARLIAMENT.

SO THE SITUATION IS THIS. THE OPPOSITION WHEN THEY WERE IN GOVERNMENT THEMSELVES PUT THE SIMULTANEOUS ELECTIONS REFERENDUM TO THE PEOPLE IN 1977 AND CONSISTENTLY SUPPORTED IT EVER SINCE. THEY PROMISED IT IN THE 1983 ELECTION CAMPAIGN. THE OPPOSITION THEMSELVES ORIGINATED THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL AND HAVE CONSISTENTLY SUPPORTED IT EVER SINCE. MR PEACOCK SPOKE IN GLOWING TERMS ABOUT BOTH PROPOSALS IN 1983 AND THE OPPOSITION UNDER MR PEACOCK SUPPORTED BOTH PROPOSALS AND VOTED FOR THEM IN PARLIAMENT.

BUT THEN WHEN THIS GOVERNMENT DECIDED TO PUT THE PROPOSALS TO THE PEOPLE ON THE SAME DAY AS AN ELECTION MR PEACOCK AND MR SINCLAIR SUDDENLY CHANGED THEIR MINDS. THEY DECIDED IT WAS'NT POLITICALLY CONVENIENT TO MAINTAIN THEIR LONG-HELD POSITION. THEY DECIDED THERE WAS SOME SHORT TERM POLITICAL GAIN TO BE HAD IN OPPOSING THE GOVERNMENT FOR THE SAKE OF OPPOSING. SO THEY TOTALLY REVERSED THEIR POSITION A FEW MONTHS AGO - DESPITE THEIR OWN FIRMLY HELD AND PUBLICLY STATED CONVICTION THAT BOTH THESE PROPOSALS WERE IN THE INTERESTS OF THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE. WHAT THEY'VE DONE IS PUT THEMSELVES FIRST AND PUT AUSTRALIA LAST.

I'VE HAD CAUSE TO DESCRIBE THIS OPPOSITION AS THE MOST NEGATIVE OPPOSITION IN LIVING MEMORY AND THIS OPPOSITION LEADER AS THE MOST NEGATIVE OPPOSITION LEADER IN LIVING MEMORY. IN VIEW OF THEIR BEHAVIOUR ON THESE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS I THINK YOU CAN UNDERSTAND WHY.

THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE HAVE A RIGHT TO REASONABLE STANDARDS OF CONSISTENCY AND HONESTY FROM THEIR POLITICAL LEADERS, AND THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY HAS JUST AS MUCH OF AN INTEREST IN THIS AS THE REST OF AUSTRALIA. THE OPPOSITION HAVE NOT DISPLAYED THOSE STANDARDS ON THESE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS.

IN VOTING ON THE REFERENDUMS THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE WILL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SUPPORT PROPOSALS WHOSE MERITS ARE - IN FACT - CLEAR TO BOTH SIDES OF POLITICS. BUT THEY WILL ALSO HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SAY THEY'VE HAD ENOUGH OF OPPOSITION FOR THE SAKE OF OPPOSITION AND THAT THEY EXPECT REASONABLE STANDARDS OF CONSISTENCY FROM THEIR POLITICAL LEADERS.

I NOW TURN SPECIFICALLY TO THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY. THIS PROPOSAL HAS SPECIAL RELEVANCE TO THE ISSUE OF BUSINESS REGULATION.

IN DELIVERING MY PARTY'S POLICY SPEECH LAST WEEK, I SAID THAT THE RECONSTRUCTION OF AUSTRALIA NEEDS THE SYSTEMATIC REMOVAL OF UNNECESSARY INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL IMPEDIMENTS TO APPLYING OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES TO THEIR MOST PRODUCTIVE USES.

I UNDERTOOK THEN THAT OVER THE TERM OF THE NEXT PARLIAMENT WE WILL REMOVE LEGISLATION AND REGULATION WHICH IS DAMAGING TO BUSINESS AND EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION, AND WHICH IS NOT JUSTIFIED AS AN EFFICIENT MEANS OF PROMOTING ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL OBJECTIVES.

EXAMPLES OF BUSINESS REGULATION LEADING TO ECONOMIC INEFFICIENCY REQUIRE LITTLE ELABORATION TO A GROUP SUCH AS THIS. DIFFERING REQUIREMENTS FOR PACKAGING, FOR EXAMPLE, ADD GREATER COSTS TO BUSINESS AND THE CONSUMER WITHOUT SUBSTANTIALLY ENHANCING PRODUCT QUALITY OR CONSUMER PROTECTION.

AGAIN, IN THE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY, THERE ARE PROBLEMS CAUSED BY DIFFERENT TESTING REQUIREMENTS AND STANDARDS OF APPROVAL.

THERE ARE OTHER PROBLEMS SUCH AS THAT OF OVERLAP BETWEEN STATE FEDERAL LAW LEADING TO UNNECESSARY DUPLICATION OF FUNCTIONS. A WELL-KNOWN EXAMPLE OF THIS, WHICH CAME TO PROMINENCE A COUPLE OF YEARS AGO, IS THE OPERATION IN SOME STATES OF DUAL COMMONWEALTH AND STATE MEAT INSPECTION SYSTEMS.

CONVERSELY, LEGISLATIVE CHANGES AT EITHER STATE OR FEDERAL LEVEL CAN RESULT IN PROBLEMS OF GAPS IN REGULATORY COVERAGE WHICH BENEFIT NEITHER BUSINESS OR CONSUMER.

I WISH TO TALK ABOUT THE SOLUTIONS TOWARD WHICH WE WILL BE WORKING TOGETHER AFTER DECEMBER 1 AND THE MECHANISMS WE NEED TO ACHIEVE THOSE SOLUTIONS.

FIRST, IN SEPTEMBER, IN AN ADDRESS TO THE BUSINESS COUNCIL, I ANNOUNCED AN INVITATION TO BUSINESS GROUPS AND TO THE ACTU TO WORK WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ON PRIORITIES IN THE REFORM OF BUSINESS REGULATION.

EARLY LAST MONTH, WITH A NUMBER OF KEY MINISTERS, I MET REPRESENTATIVES OF THE BUSINESS COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA, THE CONFEDERATION OF AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY, THE AUSTRALIAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, THE NATIONAL FARMERS FEDERATION AND THE ACTU AND ASKED THEM TO IDENTIFY CONCRETE AREAS WHERE REGULATION WAS NOT COST-EFFICIENT OR BENEFICIAL.

THE UNDERTAKING I HAVE GIVEN IS CLEAR -

"WE WILL EXAMINE CRITICALLY THE WHOLE RANGE OF BUSINESS REGULATION, MOST IMPORTANTLY WITH A VIEW TO ASSESSING ITS CONTRIBUTION TO LONG-TERM GROWTH PERFORMANCE.

WE WILL MAINTAIN REGULATION WHICH, UPON CAREFUL ANALYSIS, CLEARLY PROMOTES ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY, OR WHICH IS CLEARLY AN EFFECTIVE MEANS OF ACHIEVING MORE EQUITABLE INCOME DISTRIBUTION.

AND WE WILL ABANDON REGULATION WHICH FAILS THESE TESTS".

OUR SECOND INITIATIVE WILL TAKE PLACE IN THE FIRST WEEKS OF SITTING OF THE NEW PARLIAMENT. MY GOVERNMENT WILL ESTABLISH AN ALL-PARTY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE, TO BE CALLED THE JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE FOR BUSINESS AFFAIRS. THIS WILL HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE BRIEF TO EXAMINE EXISTING AREAS OF REGULATION AND PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE LEGISLATION AFFECTING BUSINESS.

OUR THIRD INITIATIVE, AND MY MAJOR REASON FOR BEING HERE TODAY, IS TO REMIND YOU OF THE CENTRAL IMPORTANCE TO US ALL OF THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS REFERENDUM. THIS MEASURE OFFERS US A VITAL MECHANISM FOR THE STATES AND COMMONWEALTH TO FIND THE RIGHT TIER OF GOVERNMENT AT WHICH THE RIGHT KIND OF REGULATION SHOULD OCCUR.

ATTEMPTS TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS OF BUSINESS REGULATION OF THE KIND I HAVE OUTLINED HAVE FOUNDERED IN THE PAST ON AN UNDERSTANDABLE RELUCTANCE ON THE PART OF STATE GOVERNMENTS TO DISCUSS THE REFERRAL OF POWERS WITHIN A CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK WHICH PERMITS SUCH REFERRAL ON A ONE-WAY BASIS ONLY - THAT IS FROM THE STATES TO THE COMMONWEALTH. THE PASSAGE OF THIS REFERENDUM WILL PERMIT THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW SPIRIT OF CO-OPERATION IN FEDERAL/STATE RELATIONS IN TACKLING THE PROBLEM OF BUSINESS REGULATION.

THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL DOES THIS BY ENABLING THE COMMONWEALTH TO REFER THESE EXCLUSIVE LAW-MAKING POWERS TO THE STATES AND BY CLARIFYING THE TERMS ON WHICH THE STATES CAN REFER POWERS TO THE COMMONWEALTH.

IT ALLOWS THE STATES TO PUT CONDITIONS AND TIME CONSTRAINTS ON ANY POWERS REFERRED TO THE COMMONWEALTH, AND ALLOWS THE STATES TO CONTINUE TO EXERCISE THEIR OWN POWERS AND TO REVOKE THE REFERENCE OF POWER, AND VICE VERSA.

AS THE PREMIER, MR BURKE, HAS SAID PREVIOUSLY, THE INTERCHANGE PROPOSAL "MAKES A LOT OF SENSE". EQUALLY IMPORTANT FOR THE STATES IS THE FACT THAT NOTHING CAN BE FORCED ON ANY STATE.

IN STRESSING THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS REFERENDUM, I EMPHASISE AGAIN THAT IT SHOULD HAVE RECEIVED BIPARTISAN SUPPORT. INDEED, I CAN DO NO BETTER THAN TO QUOTE THE WORDS OF DICK HAMER, THEN LIBERAL PREMIER OF VICTORIA, IN MOVING THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL AT THE HOBART CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN 1976.

HE SAID: "IN THIS MOTION THE CONVENTION HAS ITS GREATEST SINGLE CHANCE OF ACHIEVING A REALLY IMPORTANT CHANGE IN THE CONSTITUTION, WHICH WILL AT ONE STROKE GIVE IT A FLEXIBILITY AND RESPONSIVENESS IT DOES NOT YET HAVE, AND AN ABILITY TO DEAL WITH SITUATIONS AS THEY ARISE, WITHOUT ANY OF THE PARTNERS - FEDERAL OR STATE - SURRENDERING ANY OF THE POWERS OR DISCRETIONS THEY NOW HAVE".

THE PASSAGE OF THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL ON DECEMBER 1 WILL ALLOW JOINT ACTION BY COMMONWEALTH AND STATES ON A VOLUNTARY BASIS AND IN A CO-OPERATIVE SPIRIT.

THERE ARE A NUMBER OF AREAS CRYING OUT FOR SOLUTION, WHICH CAN BE HELPED BY THE INTERCHANGE PROPOSAL AND THE GOVERNMENT'S REVIEW OF REGULATION.

THE FIRST AREA IS COMPANY LAW AND BUSINESS LAW IN GENERAL. DESPITE A GREAT DEAL OF COMMITTED WORK BY THE STATES AND COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENTS OVER A NUMBER OF YEARS, THE CO-OPERATIVE COMPANIES SCHEME SEEMS TO BE VIEWED BY THE PEOPLE IN IT - BUSINESSES AND THEIR ADVISERS - AS IN NEED OF RE-EVALUATION AND SIMPLIFICATION.

THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL WOULD MEAN THAT THERE COULD BE GREATER RATIONALISATION OF OUR INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SYSTEMS TO THE BENEFIT OF UNIONISTS AND INDUSTRY GENERALLY. THE PROBLEMS OF DUAL REGISTRATION OF UNIONS IN FEDERAL AND STATE JURISDICTIONS COULD BE OVERCOME BY DEVISING A SINGLE SYSTEM OF REGISTRATION FOR BOTH JURISDICTIONS.

THE INTERCHANGE PROPOSAL WOULD ALSO MEAN THAT, WHERE A STATE WAS IN AGREEMENT, GAPS COULD BE FILLED IN FEDERAL LAW RELATING TO COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES SUCH AS INSURANCE.

THE COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT HAS THIS YEAR STREAMLINED AND CLARIFIED THE LAW WHICH GOVERNS INSURANCE CONTRACTS. HOWEVER, TO EXTEND THE LAW TO ALL INSURANCE COMPANIES AND OFFICES IN THE COUNTRY REQUIRES JOINT LEGISLATION BY BOTH STATE AND COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTS.

AS A FINAL EXAMPLE, THE INTERCHANGE PROPOSAL WOULD ENABLE THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE STATES TO TAKE STEPS TO ACHIEVE AN INTEGRATED COURT SYSTEM, THEREBY OVERCOMING JURISDICTIONAL UNCERTAINTIES IN A NUMBER OF AREAS.

MOST OF THE COMMONWEALTH'S POWERS ARE CONCURRENT. THE PROPOSAL WILL HAVE NO APPLICATION TO THESE SINCE THE STATES RETAIN THE SAME POWERS TO LEGISLATE SUBJECT ONLY TO ANY OVERRIDING COMMONWEALTH LEGISLATION. ONE OF THE FEW EXCLUSIVE COMMONWEALTH POWERS - AND THE ONE WHICH HAS ATTRACTED SOME INTEREST - IS THE POWER TO IMPOSE EXCISE DUTIES. THE OFFICIAL 'NO' CASE MAINTAINS THAT THIS IS THE REAL REASON FOR THE PROPOSAL BEING PUT FORWARD. NOTHING COULD BE FURTHER FROM THE TRUTH.

THE OPPOSITION, CONSISTENT WITH THE NEGATIVE AND OPPORTUNISTIC APPROACH THEY HAVE TAKEN THROUGHOUT THIS ELECTION CAMPAIGN, HAVE ALSO SUGGESTED THAT A MAJOR REASON FOR THIS REFERENDUM PROPOSAL IS TO MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR THE COMMONWEALTH TO TRANSFER TAXING POWERS TO THE STATES, AND TO HONOUR ITS COMMITMENT NOT TO RAISE THE OVERALL TAX BURDEN.

THIS IS BLATANT RUBBISH. THE REASONS FOR SUPPORTING THE REFERENDUM HAVE ALREADY BEEN OUTLINED. IF STATES WISH TO RAISE TAXES, OR INDEED TO REDUCE TAXES, THEY DO NOT REQUIRE THE INTERCHANGE POWERS. WHAT A POSITIVE OUTCOME ON THIS REFERENDUM WOULD PERMIT IS A GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN OUR CONSTITUTIONAL FISCAL ARRANGEMENTS IF THE STATES THEMSELVES, REPEAT THEMSELVES, PUT FORWARD PARTICULAR PROPOSALS IN REGARD TO TAXATION.

IT IS SIMPLY NOT POSSIBLE, HOWEVER, FOR THE COMMONWEALTH TO FORCE THE STATES TO CHANGE THEIR TAXING ARRANGEMENTS OR THE LEVEL OF TAXES IMPOSED.

IN THIS TIME OF ECONOMIC RECOVERY, WE HAVE AN EXCELLENT OPPORTUNITY, AS WELL AS A GREAT NEED, TO REDOUBLE OUR EFFORTS TO REFORM POLICY AND INSTITUTIONS IN MANY AREAS. IMPORTANT TO LONG TERM ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE.

THE GREAT TASK OF REVIEWING THE GREAT VOLUME OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS AFFECTING BUSINESS WHICH HAVE ACCUMULATED OVER THE PAST 84 YEARS OF THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION HAS ALREADY BEGUN. IN THE PERIOD AHEAD WE WILL BE WORKING WITH A WIDE RANGE OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY GROUPS TO REMOVE UNNECESSARY INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL OBSTACLES TO NATIONAL ECONOMIC RECONSTRUCTION.

THE CHALLENGE IS CONSIDERABLE. IT IS NOT A JOB FOR ONE LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT ALONE. IT IS ONE ON WHICH WE MUST ALL PULL TOGETHER. EVERY MECHANISM WHICH WE CAN HAVE AT OUR DISPOSAL TO ASSIST US IN REVIEWING REGULATION IS IMPORTANT.

THE INTERCHANGE OF POWERS PROPOSAL IS THEREFORE CENTRAL TO THIS PROCESS. IT CAN PROVIDE THE MECHANISM THROUGH WHICH FEDERAL-STATE CO-OPERATION IN SIMPLIFYING BUSINESS REGULATION CAN OCCUR.

I COMMEND THE REFERENDUM PROPOSALS TO YOU.

.....