

PRESS, RADIO AND TV CONFERENCE
GIVEN BY THE PRIME MINISTER, MR. JOHN GORTON
AT PARLIAMENT HOUSE, CANBERRA, A. C. T.

18 JUNE 1970

PRIME MINISTER : I'll be quite short, gentlemen, I think we have recently concluded a Session which you will agree was full of incident and which, I suggest, was full of some accomplishment.

There have been significant statements on defence and on foreign affairs, charting our course for the future. We sat for 38 days, which is a long Session, the longest Autumn Session, I think, in the last ten years, and we passed 61 bills. Up to lunch-time, the Senate had passed 51, which is not quite a record, but, again, close to it for the last ten years. A lot of them were comparatively small bills, but I think bills of some significance for a lot of people in Australia and some of them for Australia itself.....bills dealing with capital assistance to handicapped children, dealing with paying higher pensions to married couples who are separated, setting up commissions of enquiry into dangers to the Barrier Reef and into the Crown of Thorns star fish, providing a loan to the Queensland Government for the development of central Queensland which could be an extremely significant development for Australia. And a whole variety of bills which I won't go into.

But three significant proposals, two of which have now become law, two passed through the House during the time; one, the establishment of an Australian Industry Development Corporation and one, the Health Scheme which has taken some considerable debate before it finally reached its present stage. And on the notice paper is still the bill for the territorial sea and the continental shelf. So there was quite a lot of incident, quite a lot of accomplishment and some significant things which I believe were done. I will now pass this conference over to you. You will no doubt have other matters on which you would like to ask questions but I hope there will be some on what I have considered to be significant actions.

Q. Jack Commins, ABC : In the Senate just a while ago, the DLP did say that it would vote against the Receipts Duties Bills which would mean the defeat of the measures. Will the Government take it as far as a double dissolution?

PM. Well it can't take it as far as a double dissolution unless it is defeated twice, can it? All this legislation does is to enable the Commonwealth Government, acting as an agent on behalf of the States at the States' request, to collect a particular portion of a tax for them. We told the States we would try and do this for them. If the States' House won't help the State Governments who have indicated that they want this revenue, then that is a matter which affects the States more than it affects us. But the question of a double dissolution doesn't arise until quite a period of time has passed and matters are rejected twice, as far as I can remember.

2.

Q. David Solomon of the Australian : On the same subject, Mr. Prime Minister, will you have an election for the House of Representatives because of the defeat soon to come of the Receipts Duties Bill and will you provide money for the States to recompense them the \$50 million which they would have got under the bill, will you provide this in some other way?

PM. The answer to the first question is of course we won't have a House of Representatives election on a matter which is not our legislation. It is legislation we are acting as agents on behalf of the States for. As regards the other part of your question, we would have to discuss that with the States. In any case, there are always other opportunities, you know, for continuing endeavours in these fields - in that particular field of legislation.

Q. Frank Chamberlain, AFP, Macquarie : Mr. Prime Minister, on the question of States, you have a Premiers' Conference next week. Will this question which was raised in the Senate today be discussed with the Premiers?

PM. Which question was this?

Q. The receipts duty. Will you discuss that and also will the opportunity be taken to discuss again the offshore minerals problem?

PM. We haven't had an agenda from the States on this. We have asked the States for proposals they would like to have on an agenda, but so far we haven't received them. I would doubt very much if the offshore minerals....let me call it by its proper title - The Territorial Sea and Continental Shelf Bill - would be the subject of discussion. If it was sought to be, it could be, and similarly with the whole field of financial assistance to the States which could well involve the attack on their taxation rights which the Labor Party seems to be making in the Senate. You see, no matter what arrangements are made in the future for Commonwealth grants of finance to the States - no matter what arrangements are made in the future - if the States are denied the opportunity for us to act as their agents to raise this particular tax, then no matter how much we give them they will always be denied the extra amount which they could have raised.

Q. Wal Brown, Courier Mail : When do you propose to proceed with the territorial sea legislation in the face of the strong opposition from several States?

PM. I would hope to proceed with it in the Budget Session.

Q. Do you hope to confer with the States again before you go ahead with it?

PM. We would be quite happy to confer with the States again. What we would be conferring with the States about would be the heads of agreement and the arrangements for administration and royalties and all the rest of the matters which form a part, at the moment for example, of the petroleum agreement. Now, the petroleum agreement deals with such matters as administration, royalties, various fees, things of that kind, granting of titles, but it specifically puts aside without resolution the claim of the States to have legal sovereignty, not only over the territorial sea but right out to the limits of the continental shelf, and the claim of the Commonwealth to have the same sovereignty. It puts that aside, it doesn't resolve it, and the resolution of that is necessary. But it is a completely different question from the working out of administrative arrangements and spreading of royalties and so on, which would need to be brought into operation, no matter which way the decision in the High Court went on this matter. So does that answer your question?

Q. Peter Martin, Seven National News : Prime Minister, does that mean that there will be no discussion on the question of the Territorial Seas Bill, on the question of the legal rights, but there may be discussion on administrative arrangements for other things like the offshore minerals?

PM. Yes, I think we need to resolve the question of who has the legal sovereignty over the seas which lap Australia's coast. It seems to me to be quite absurd for Australia to be the only nation in the world that doesn't know, the only Federation in the world that doesn't know who has got sovereignty over the seas around its coast. And this needs to be resolved. Now, it will be resolved one way or the other. I mean, even if our legislation didn't go ahead - and I am not suggesting for a moment that it won't - but even if it didn't it would be resolved because this question having been raised by the various High Court decisions, there will undoubtedly be cases concerning fisheries or concerning minerals or concerning something which will lead to a case which will ultimately resolve it. But the sooner we can get it resolved the better, as the Premier of New South Wales agreed with me the other day.

Q. Stan Stephens, Adelaide Advertiser : While we are still on State matters, Sir, could I get in a parish pumper which is rather important. The South Australian economy, as you know, is geared to the motor body industry and to the home appliances industry. The South Australian Government is deeply concerned over the effects of the higher interest rates and the credit squeeze on the South Australian economy. Will the Commonwealth do something to help South Australia urgently?

PM. I haven't studied this particular matter that you raise, nor has it been brought to my attention by either the previous or the present South Australian Government. Perhaps because one hasn't had time. But you used the phrase "credit squeeze" and I wonder why you used it?

Q. It was the term Mr Dunstan used. It was a pity I didn't introduce the subject better, but he made an appeal for assistance for South Australia. He made an appeal yesterday.

PM. It is not unusual for him to say that. I am intrigued by these words that you used - or he used : "credit squeeze". I have always thought of a credit squeeze as an occasion where a government calls up money from the trading banks and puts it into the Reserve Bank or where it gives directions or guidance as to fields in which money should be lent or shouldn't be. The sort of thing that happened in 1961. Now what is happening today is nothing whatever like that. Last time I came and talked to you gentlemen, you were talking about the economy and you pointed out that the Treasurer had said there was a dangerous situation - those were the words, I think. Don't hold me to them....

(Interjection) Menacing.

PM. Menacing, right. And I said, "Well, I think it is potentially menacing." But I think it is only potentially menacing because there is going to be towards the end of this year a considerable decline in liquidity because we budgeted for a \$500 million surplus and that is going to have its effect towards the end of this year, and it is having its effect, it is as a result of the surplus which was budgeted for, tightening up the amount of money available. But this is different, I think, from what people have in their mind, when they talk about a credit squeeze. And I believe it will loosen again as soon as the financial year is over and people begin to get refunds of taxation which will be quite considerable in the first quarter of the financial year.

Q. Does that mean, Sir, that you are suggesting that we can hope that the Budget mightn't be as tight as at present it appears it might?

PM: Well, I am not going to talk about the Budget except to say that I don't think that is completely logical because if there is going to be a considerable loosening up of finance available, then the conclusion you draw from it wouldn't necessarily follow. I wasn't putting this in a Budget context at all. I was just saying I believe that at the present time there is a very tight money market which was foreseen, which I pointed out to you last time we were here, which is a result of budgeting for a surplus. This will - again I say this - this will, in the first quarter of the next financial year quite considerably be relieved by a very considerable amount of taxation refunds which will take place, apart from anything else.

5.

Q. A taxation adjustment for middle income groups, for instance?

PM. Wouldn't you be surprised, really, if I gave you answers to things that are going to be in the Budget?

Q. On that very question, Sir. Your last press conference ended in some confusion Barnes from "The Age" on this question of taxation cuts for the middle and lower income groups. At the time you said you didn't want to discuss the Budget. What I want to do is to draw your attention to the fact that you had already discussed the Budget in the Governor-General's speech when you said the Government aimed to put before Parliament specific provisions for relief in the next Budget. Does that still stand, Sir?

PM. What you have quoted, let me repeat to you, was that I said it would be my Government's aim to put proposals before Parliament designed to carry out our promises. Now, the Budget should be brought down about August 18 and at that stage, your queries ought to be fully answered.

Q. I just wanted you to give your aims, Sir. That's all, just the aims....

PM. One always aims to do the best possible.

Q. Peter Samuel, the Bulletin : In the middle of April, the Cambodian Government - switching to foreign policy - the Cambodian Government made an urgent request to the Australian Government and other governments for military assistance to defend itself against the Vietnamese communists. For two months now, there has been no response that we have heard about to that request. If there hasn't been a ny response, when do you expect there will be a response? And, secondly, how important does the Australian Government consider the independence of Cambodia?

PM. Well, in answer to the first part of your question, the request has been under consideration by the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Defence. They have now prepared a joint paper on what they are prepared to recommend to Cabinet that it should do, and we will quite shortly be deciding on what is suggested by these Departments. We attach a considerable amount of importance, a very great deal of importance to the independence of Cambodia. That, of course, was one reason why we were so pleased that our Foreign Minister was able to go to Djakarta to join in a conference with other Asian nations designed to try to mobilise world opinion in support of the neutrality of Cambodia and therefore of the independence of Cambodia. I don't suggest that this conference has had any concrete effect. I don't suggest that. .

but I do, in answer to your question say that we regard it as of very great importance indeed and that we regard the fact that this conference in Djakarta was held as being of great importance, even though it may not have any concrete effect.

Q. Laurie Oakes, Melbourne Sun : One of the problems with this press conference format is that you don't get a chance to follow up questions. Sir, you haven't yet answered Stan Stephens' question about your attitude to the South Australian Government's appeal.

PM. Well I gather from Stan Stephens that it was made yesterday apparently publicly and not through the normal channels and I would prefer to wait and see whether it was made through the normal channels before I consider it. You can't go answering anybody who rushes out in a newspaper - I beg your pardon, gentlemen - anybody who rushes out in public and makes these sort of remarks or whatever they are.

Q. And now my question. In September last year, you were quoted in Parliament that the new Melbourne airport at Tullamarine does not necessarily come under the night flying ban. I know that you spent today looking at files in view of the current controversy, but I am wondering can you announce now whether you are prepared to lift the ban, or whether you are sympathetic to Sir Henry Bolte's demands that you should?

PM. Well, first of all, I have not spent the day looking at files on this, but nevertheless it is an important question. I have been looking at it but not at files. One of the things that fascinates me about it is the way everybody rushed in and assumed and has gone on television on the assumption that the Minister has said he wouldn't lift the ban on jet flying at Tullamarine. As far as I can discover he has never said anything of the sort. What happened, as I understand it, from examining it today, was that a representative of the "Melbourne Herald" rang up the Minister and the Minister said - I quote from memory but it is pretty accurate - "There is at the moment no proposal before me from the Department or from any other source for altering the hours of jet curfew." That's all he said. That was comparatively faithfully reported in the "Melbourne Herald", after which a whole lot of people made comments on the assumption that he said he wasn't going to lift the jet ban. Now the position is this. There is a joint Commonwealth/State Committee which has been looking into the operation of Tullamarine. It comprises representatives of the Department of Civil Aviation, of the State Town Planning Authority, and the Melbourne and Metropolitan Board of Works, and they have, so I am told, just reported to the Minister for Civil Aviation and to the State Minister concerned on their recommendations of how Tullamarine should be operated, and both the State Minister and the Minister for Civil Aviation are examining those reports. So, you know, it is not quite

so frantic as it has been made to appear, and I think the line they are taking when they operate these airports is to endeavour to see how you can get the greatest operational efficiency out of the airport married with the greatest protection for populations living around the airport. They shouldn't be living around there anyway, but we won't go into that at the moment, or the reasons why they are. But I think there is no decision taken on this yet. This Commonwealth/State Committee Report is being examined in both places, and there is a report of our own House of Representatives Committee which would also have an effect upon any decision which is ultimately taken, though I understand the Premier of Victoria is not very well disposed towards Senate or House of Representatives Committees, but nevertheless, we would pay some attention to this one.

Q. Michael Willesee - "Four Corners" : Prime Minister, the Press and the media have been under some examination recently. I wonder if I can ask you what you see their function to be in relation to - what you think their function should be in relation to government and politics. And having told us that, I wonder if you could then tell us if you think that function is being fulfilled adequately?

PM. What should their function be? I think they have got a very important function, and quite inalienable rights in fulfilling that function. I think their function should be to criticise... well, let me change that. I think their function should be to examine proposals which are brought forward by a government and after that examination to give criticism or support, supplying their readers with the reasons for that criticism or that support, not suppressing reasons, not inventing reasons, not slanting anything. And also to report anything that appears to them to be instances of governmental injustice to individuals or groups of people or matters of that kind. This, I believe, is a function of the Press which is essential if a democracy is properly to run. And they have that right. Having that right, they have also got a duty because you cannot have a right without a duty or an obligation in any field. And that duty is to report accurately, to comment having given both sides of the question, but coming down on one side - not to suppress one side and only put forward the other and not deliberately to misrepresent it. So they have the right which it is necessary to defend to the utmost, and they have a duty which I think they should carry out. I would add just one more thing to this. I haven't been particularly terribly disturbed, as far as I know, about criticisms of me, and I think the Press should never - or the media, let us say - should never get into a position where they could be thought to be saying "We are above criticism. Nobody else is, but we are. We musn't be attacked for what we have done or what we have recorded because we are above reproach." They haven't got that right but they have got every other right that I have mentioned.

Q/ The second part of the question, Prime Minister - do you think that function is being fulfilled adequately?

PM. I think it is being fulfilled adequately, though if you ask me personally, I think there are instances I could point to where I would think the criteria I have laid down have not been fully followed, so can Members of the Opposition. But I am not only talking of political matters. I am talking generally. You asked me, let me give you an example of a field which is not strictly political where I don't myself think a full and proper coverage was given, and that is when "Four Corners" went to make a story on Duntroon. I think a great deal too much - I am not getting personal here - a great deal too much was devoted to people cleaning their boots and getting shouted out by a sergeant-major walking around on a parade ground and all that sort of stuff, and far too little attention given to the fact that it is a place where more academic work is done than the sort of work that was shown, that people come out of it with the equivalent of a university degree, recognised by the University of New South Wales and that it is not really a spit and polish establishment and a place to bring up automatons but a place to partake of a university education as well as the discipline of an army. Now anybody can argue against that view that I have got, but I have got a right to put it.

Q. If I could just say one little bit more there, Prime Minister. Do you go along with the sort of expressions that the Postmaster-General and the Queensland Premier have made in the last week?

PM. I don't go along with the expressions of the Queensland Premier... I think one of them had something to do with me if I remember rightly, and I haven't read in detail what the Postmaster-General said last week, but surely, having just answered your question at some length in the way that I have, my own position ought to be fairly clear.

Q. Tom Connors - "Financial Review" " On the question of assistance to the wool industry, you said at the last conference that we had that you were waiting for the report of the Gunn Committee?

PM. Yes.

Q. I believe that they have completed their first report. I was wondering whether the Government has received it and have you any comment at this stage?

PM. Well, I haven't received the report of the Wool Industry Advisory Committee. I don't think the Minister for Primary Industry has received it, but I was talking to him today and we expect to receive the report within the next fortnight.

Q. I just want to hop on to that question of wool. Mr. McEwen is going to Japan. I thought this might be an opportunity for you to clarify the reports that when you were in Japan you discussed the idea of a negotiated price.... in the unofficial reports. Would you clarify this for us, Sir?

PM. Yes, I think so. Clearly, the question of an auction system completely unchanged from the present auction system; a system where you have one purchasing authority which has been put forward without any detailed explanation of what is meant by it by the various woolgrowers' bodies; a question of some kind of marrying of an auction system and a negotiated system for particular classes of wool are all possibilities and this matter of seeking to - shall I say sell wool in the same way as we sell iron ore, or partly sell wool in the same way as we sell iron ore is a matter that would need to be discussed and taken into consideration.

Q. Alan Reid of the Daily Telegraph : On health. The New South Wales medicos are reported to be contemplating a rise of nine per cent in fees. How will this affect your health scheme? Will it affect it adversely, and if the New South Wales medicos take unilateral action, will this prompt you to implement your suggestion of a participatory scheme?

PM. Well, I was talking to Dr. Forbes on this matter, perhaps two days ago and I am not sure of the basis of the report, and neither is he, that the New South Wales Branch of the AMA is considering adopting the rise you spoke of. I understand there was some member of an economic advisory committee who leaked to the newspapers, or leaked to somebody, the idea that he thought that this could be justified. But I have got nothing so far to indicate to me that the New South Wales Branch of the AMA would adopt his proposition. If they did, they would be adopting it in a way which I think is not normal because normally they have been waiting two years, all the time, and it is only less than a year before there was a rise. So I am not by any means accepting that this would in fact happen. Now, if it did happen then of course it would adversely affect the patients of our health scheme in New South Wales, because there would only be two courses open to us. One would be to increase the scale of benefits so that the patient didn't suffer, which would mean that the doctors at their own sweet will could decide what burdens the taxpayers would have to pay. One would be to increase the scale of benefits, or the other would be not to increase the scale of benefits whereupon the patient benefits would be eroded. Now this clearly would affect the patient adversely, and we would have to consider if this became a common thing just what we could and should do to protect a patient without slugging the taxpayer at some outside body's instigation. As I said when I was talking to the Liberal Conference, our health scheme and any other health scheme - medical benefits scheme - must depend on most of the doctors charging an agreed common fee and that common fee only being increased at reasonable intervals and by reasonable amounts. Now, that sort of co-operation is essential from the doctors for any health scheme of this kind to work, and if it is not forthcoming - and I have no indication to say that it won't - then we really will have to look at how we can make it work.

Q. John Bennetts of the "Canberra Times" : Does the Government intend to prosecute any of the people who in recent days have been urging defiance of the National Service Act?

PM. Well, you are talking mainly I take it of the Victorian Labor Party Conference....

Q. And others.

PM. I think the really serious part about this is the Victorian Labor Party Conference and what their delegates said and did there, but I have been in touch with the Attorney-General on that question and his preliminary advice at any rate is that he believes there is not sufficient grounds to prosecute and also there is the difficulty inherent in prosecuting every member of a political party in particular which could be extraordinarily divisive. But it is a very difficult question this one and one that I would want to talk a bit more about with my Cabinet colleagues. But the really serious thing in this is that not more than eight months ago there was an election in this country in which specifically the Government said they believed they would have to continue National Service and they would continue National Service, and they put that before the people. And, specifically, the Opposition said they would abolish National Service and they put that before the people. And by the ballot box, the people supported the proposition that we would continue National Service. Now it is a really grave and sombre thing in Australian politics so soon after that, or at any time after that, any political party in Opposition could urge not that the law be changed, not that all sorts of arguments should be put forward to make the people change their mind or the Government change their mind, but that the law, as propounded by a government and supported by a people should be broken, urging that it should be broken. This is something new in Australian politics. Having been done in this case, how many other cases can it be done in? Does it not really completely break down the concept of democratic government we have got in this country for any Party in Opposition to take this sort of line? In a short-term political way, it could, on my judgment, be advantageous for this sort of thing to happen - advantageous to my Party. In the long-term Australian way, I think it is extraordinarily grave and dangerous.

Q. Bob Baudino, "Daily Telegraph" : Talking about the law, it is equally important to enforce the law as it stands. We have been told by your Minister, Mr. Snedden, that there is something like fifty people who have broken the law now by refusing to register for National Service. Nothing has been done against these people as yet. Is anything to be done against them?

PM. Yes, I think the law will have to be enforced. As you know, the Cabinet was looking to try and find a civilian alternative for people who refused to carry out the declared obligations. I think you will forgive me if I point out to you that there are many ways in which people can avoid being called up for National Service. For example, if they join the CMF, they do not have to be called up for National Service. If they can convince a court that they are conscientious objectors, they are not called up for active service. And there are the people who remain who take their chances in a call-up, and 99.8 per cent of them accept their obligations. For those who don't and who can't show they are conscientious objectors, we nevertheless looked to try and find a civilian alternative, a civilian alternative which would need to be as subject to discipline as would service in the Army, which would need to require as much dislocation of life as service in the Army, which didn't give an advantage to the person who said "I won't go into the Army". And we couldn't find one which we felt did that, so we believe we will have to enforce the law as it stands.

Q. Has the civilian alternative been abandoned, Sir?

PM. Well we haven't been able to find one which meets the criteria that it doesn't give an advantage to the person who....

Q. Sir, you say you will prosecute 20-year-old youths who don't register, and yet you imply you are not going to prosecute the Victorian ALP Conference delegates, Sydney poets, professors, and GPS headmasters who defy the Crimes Act. Isn't this selective enforcement of the law?

PM. Well, it is two different laws for a start. One is the obligation to render National Service and if the law was not applied in that instance, then you might as well not have National Service because anybody could just say, "I won't go into National Service" and nothing would happen, and the whole concept of National Service would be destroyed. The other area is an area inciting people not to register which is different from the first, and that is, I think, a difficult field, but I would draw a distinction between that and refusing to render National Service when one became liable for it.

Q. Is one a less important offence in your mind?

PM. In my own mind, it is less important, a less significant offence to say to people, to say to somebody else you don't believe he should do something than to refuse to do it, but when I say that, I am not saying it is unimportant.

Q. Aren't they saying rather, Sir, "We believe you should not. You should defy the law rather than....."

PM. Well, some are saying "We believe you **should** defy the law", some are not. Everybody has got lumped together in this, but the Victorian ALP Executive was saying they believed you should defy the law.

Q. Has your attention been drawn to the fact, Sir, that the New South Wales ALP followed your concept, in other words, advocated the change of the law rather than the breaking of it.

PM. Yes, this appears to me to be the only proper and responsible way for a political party to go on.

Q. On a related subject, Sir, can you give any details of plans to withdraw our troops from Vietnam?

PM. No more than when I announced in the House that we would be withdrawing troops and they would be out by November....

Q. One battalion only....

PM. Yes, and some supporting troops.

Q. Peter Barron from the "Sydney Sun" : On the civilian alternative, you said "We have not been able to find a suitable alternative". Did you mean "we, the Cabinet" or "we, the Government Parties"?

PM. We, the Cabinet. I am not sure what is inherent in your question. We looked for a civilian alternative in the Cabinet and we put to the party room a possible civilian alternative. The party room itself was very strongly against it on the grounds that I put forward that it did not provide for submission to discipline in the way that going into the Army did; people could get home for weekends and people wouldn't have to have leave and people would in fact be living a civilian life instead of an Army life.

Q. Yes, but when Cabinet put this, was it satisfied that it was a suitable alternative?

PM. Well, we were satisfied that we could put to the party room for its views a possible alternative.

- Q. Barry Wain from "The Australian" : On the subject of conscription, regardless of what you say, the impression is still coming across that in the case of the Victorian Executive, perhaps no action will be taken there simply because of the numbers involved - as you pointed out, it is difficult to prosecute all the members of a political party whereas in the case of the very few 20-year-olds who are refusing to register, refusing to answer the call-up, they will be prosecuted.
- PM. Yes, well, if they were members of the Victorian Executive and 20-year-olds who refused to answer the call-up, they would be prosecuted too. Don't get the two things mixed up. One is refusing to accept an obligation imposed by law. The other is, particularly in the case of the Victorian ALP, a significant section of the ALP, I think quite clearly an attempt to grandstand, an attempt to pose as martyrs, an attempt to get us to be in a position where we could be claimed to be attacking a whole political party, and this is a matter which is, I think, quite different.
- Q. You are not being intimidated by the fact that they are members of a political party?
- PM. I think we would be playing into their hands.
- Q. Wouldn't a better solution be to change that part of the Crimes Act that says "to incite" and transform it into action?
- PM. Well I am bound to say that my inclination is that if you have a law either you apply it or you don't have it.
- Q. Prime Minister, in this case whether the laws are different, the fact is that various people have broken the law. There have been cases in both Sydney and Melbourne completely outside the ALP Executive. Are you saying that one law is one that should be applied and that this other law should only be applied if you don't think it is going to lead to some political disadvantage to yourself?
- PM. I am saying one offence is quite different from another offence. I am saying that if it is an offence for a youth to refuse to answer the call-up, and you don't apply the law to that offence, then you don't have National Service. I am saying that in the other case, the offence has a different result.
- Q. Sir, the Deputy Prime Minister said the Senate election will be in November. Can you confirm that?
- PM. No I don't know he said it and I can't confirm it. Did he say it?

Q. Yes. When will be the date Sir?

PM. Towards the end of the year....at present **thinking**.

Q. Ted Barker - "The West Australian" : Will the Federal Government continue its subsidy to the gold mining industry after the present subsidy expires on June 30?

PM. There is a paper before Cabinet on this at the moment. '

Q. Stewart Harris, "London Times" : I was just going to suggest if you talk about the duty of obeying the law, and it is your duty as a government, Sir, if there is a law which you are not enforcing, to repeal that law. Otherwise the law generally cannot be respected.

PM. Is that a question or a statement?

Q. It is a question because I would like to hear your view on it?
It is a statement and a question. Don't you agree with it?

PM. In general, yes.
