The Prime Minister has claimed that he supports principle, that he upholds the traditions of Parliament. He does this when it suits him and not otherwise. We already know what occurred when, for the first time in the history of the English speaking people, the Prime Minister failed to back the Speaker of his own choosing who had taken disciplinary action within the Parliament. That brought Parliament into disrepute but there are other matters in which double standards have been revealed.

A person who wants to come to Australia to talk about cricket is not allowed a visa to come to Australia. Representatives of the P.R.G., the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, against whom Australian, South Vietnamese and American forces were fighting until two or three years ago, are encouraged to come to Australia.

Dr. Cairns, the Deputy Prime Minister, has made it quite plain that he believes the P.R.G. are correct. On more than one occasion in the Parliament in recent weeks, the Prime Minister has blamed South Vietnam and the United States for breaking the Geneva accords concerning the supposed ceasefire in South Vietnam. The Prime Minister ignores the fact that the North Vietnamese army has doubled in size in South Vietnam from 150,000 to 300,000 since the ceasefire was signed. He ignores the fact that Russian tanks are within 20 miles of Saigon, that Russian and Chinese supplies have continued to pour into South Vietnam, down the trails and into the South. He ignores the fact that North Vietnamese forces have provided the stiffening in Cambodia which could well lead to the imminent fall of Cambodia to North Vietnamese subjection.

He blamed South Vietnam and the United States for this continuing situation. He has put the view that they are the ones that have violated the ceasefire. He puts the view that because we have representation in Saigon, we have a duty to make our objections known to Saigon and South Vietnam but not to North Vietnam, with whom his Government has also established diplomatic relations.

If the Prime Minister was concerned for equality and for peace, at the very least he could and must have complained equally to Saigon and Hanoi. If he was more concerned with justice he would have blamed the aggressors and not the defenders.

And even though the South Vietnamese war was a divisive and difficult one for the Australian community, and even though Australia is not now directly involved in these matters as she once was, the double standards exhibited by the Prime Minister must appal many Australians.

We have other examples around the world. The Palestinian Liberation Organisation is seeking to establish an office...
Mr. Hartly, well-known in the Labor Party, was promoting that move. Bob Hawke, President of the Labor Party and of the A.C.T.U., strongly opposed it. Because of his opposition and only because of it — for which I praise him fully — the Government refused to allow the appropriate permission and visas.

Last week in the Parliament, the Prime Minister made it plain that he was planning to reverse his plan and allow the P.L.O. to establish an office in Australia. A day after the Prime Minister made that statement, terrorists from the P.L.O. attacked a number of people and held them hostages in a hotel in Tel Aviv. A number of people were killed. It was a blatant act of terror.

The P.L.O. does not even admit that Israel has a right to exist. Their stated objective is to destroy Israel. They have shown that they embrace the weapons of murder and terrorism against innocent people and against women and children and the Prime Minister makes it plain that he is going to allow them to establish an office in Australia, but a cricketer who wants to talk about cricket is not allowed to come to Australia.

The Prime Minister might believe that he is moving on the tide of history. He might believe that there is an inexorable movement in which those who embrace terror and murder and war will be successful in their objectives. If he believes that is the tide of history, there is little hope for the continued freedom for people who live in democracies such as Australia.

In democracies like Australia people are concerned for peace, to lead their own lives unhindered. There has always been a tendency for such people to believe that the rest of the world marches in the same way.

Such views invaded the democracies in the 1930's and paralysed them. Such views paralysed the League of Nations, made it impotent against Italy's aggression in Abysinia. Such views encouraged Germany to march into the Rhineland. The impotence of France's hundred divisions against three German battalions who had their withdrawal orders in their pockets if one French policeman should say no, led quite directly to the 2nd World War and to the death of 60 million people.

When people in countries like the United Kingdom, France, Australia and the United States lose their will and resolution, they move the world inexorably into a dangerous and difficult situation in which those who wish to achieve their objectives by illicit means will become bolder, more aggressive and more dangerous.

The Prime Minister's actions have encourage the P.R.G. and the North Vietnamese. They have encouraged the Palestinian Liberation Organisation.
His actions over many months have concerned our old friends. His actions have been directed towards taking Australia to the third world and the socialist world, to opening close links with China and with Russia. I have no objections to such links being established and, indeed, I pointed to a need to change the relationship with China in one of the first speeches I made as Defence Minister many years ago, but I do have objections to making these moves at the expense of Australia's natural interests and at the expense of the people who are our real friends.

It is double standards. Refusal for a cricketer to come to Australia to talk about cricket, but admission for the P.R.G. against whom Australians fought, admission for the P.L.O. who embrace murder and terror against innocent people as a basic weapon.
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