



PRIME MINISTER

"THIS WEEK"

Transcript of Interview with the Prime Minister,
the Rt Hon. William McMahon, CH, MP, on Channel 7

Melbourne

5 MARCH 1972

Interviewers : John Boland
Max Grant

- Q. Prime Minister, this week you will celebrate your first full year as Prime Minister, on Monday, tomorrow, and I want to ask you two things. First of all, has this been the hardest period of your political career, this twelve months? With hindsight, would you have taken the job, knowing what you do know now?
- PM: I think it has been the hardest and most unpredictable year I've known since I've been in politics, or for that matter, anywhere else. And even if I'd known of the difficulties I would have still wanted to take the job when it was offered to me by my Party.
- Q. Well, now, before we discuss as many areas as we possibly can, the question exercising the minds of most Australians is "Where is the nation going in the 70's"?
- PM: It's all up to us. But the prospects are good, providing only we stop looking over our shoulder or looking down at our feet and look at the distant horizons. Because no country has the same kind of opportunity as we have. And if we've got the energy, if we've got the willpower to go forward, of course we will. I can give you all the reasons if you want them. But the simple answer to your questions is - forward, certainly not backward, or marking time.
- Q. Now Prime Minister, the Gallup Poll - and I'm sure you're very conscious of this - last week showed that the Government's popularity was down to something like 40 per cent, and that your own personal popularity was down to 28 per cent, and Mr Whitlam's, of course, was not on a crescendo either. But how do you feel with these Gallup Polls, and the situation as you see it with the polls as they are at the moment?
- PM: It couldn't have been taken at a more unfortunate time for me or for my Party. Because we've had so many crises of a kind over which we've had no control, that people would

PM (Contd.)

naturally be disappointed and they would reflect their disappointment in the ballots. For example, we had all the troubles with the rural industries, which we are slowly overcoming. We had the trouble in the international exchanges. We had the trouble with inflation. We had a dozen and one other kinds of trouble of an unpredictable kind. But I believe we can solve them all and I think when we see, for example, the next figures relating to unemployment, I think they will show we've turned the corner and that we're going forward again. In other words, the ballot was taken at a bad time for us and I think for the future, we'll look forward.

Q. Would you be tempted to add to your answer there "given time" - "solve the problems, given time". And perhaps go further and say, "Well, there's no chance of an early election now"?

PM: It depends what you mean by an early election. What I've ~~never~~ done is fix a date until I've made up my mind what the date is likely to be. But you could say in the immediate future, say, the next one or two months, it's out of the question.

Q. But if you mention the number of crises, as you did, wouldn't you need until November, the normally thought of time for an election?

PM: Maybe. But I don't want to announce a time prematurely. No Prime Minister has ever done it and I don't want to break the rules. Because conditions can change and can change so rapidly. Why commit yourself when it isn't necessary?

Q. But you wouldn't like to go to the polls tomorrow?

PM: No, I would not. You're right there.

Q. When you see a Gallup Poll like that, how does it affect a man personally, and I'm talking about you, the man, rather than the Prime Minister?

PM: At the beginning it worried me, yes, but on this occasion I felt that it would turn out much the way as it has done, so it didn't worry me greatly. What has preoccupied my thinking all the way through is knowing what the conditions were, what I had to do as the Prime Minister in order to change the conditions and in order to make certain that by the time we had held an election they had so much changed, the people would have changed their minds too.

Q. Would you agree that the state of the economy will be the crucial election issue?

PM: Not necessarily the crucial one, but it will be one of the most important of them. And that's why, at the recent Premiers' Conference, we took the very strong measures we did, primarily to reduce unemployment, and two, to ensure that there was strong growth in the economy.

Q. Prime Minister, on the questions of the economy and inflation, is it clearer to the Government now, that last year's Budget strategy was wrong, particularly in view of the large hand-outs that you've just mentioned, at the Premiers' Conference, to stimulate the economy and create employment opportunities, and twice, the lowering of the bond rate as we've seen in recent months?

PM: If you look at the Budget strategy as such, I don't think you could say it was wrong. In fact it was right. But it was predicated on the assumption that demand would grow, particularly in the consumption area, and that assumption didn't turn out to be correct. And hasn't turned out to be correct unless you can look at certain special areas. So you've got to look at it in that way. We are worried that consumption demand hasn't increased sufficiently, but the potential for this kind of demand to increase is pretty great and if it grew too fast, then, of course, we could be in difficulties, particularly if it superimposed itself on what we call cost inflation. So the real problem that we face today - and Sir Henry Bolte made this clear on Thursday - that if people could get a little more confidence and stop worrying, if they could spend their money sensibly, (and they have the money to spend), then we'd have a healthy economy. And we'd get it much quicker than any measures the Government could take. I think it would be better for the country too.

Q. I'm just wondering, though....You've partly answered that question inasmuch as you've said that "Well, we did need to backtrack on our original thoughts with the Budget". Is that a fair assumption, so that there must have been some areas there where you felt you were right, but you've been subsequently proved to be incorrect?

PM: On the basis of the assumption that demand would grow, yes, we have been incorrect. It hasn't grown to the extent that we wanted it to, or we expected it to grow. That is why ever since, well, November/December of last year, we've progressively taken measures in order to give the economy the ability to expand and then to provide funds through which the States could increase their works and local government expenditures, provide more money for the unemployment benefits. Also in the case of rural unemployment, we've provided specific grants there. As well, on the private level, we've now taken three different sets of measures to give an increasing amount of confidence to the manufacturing industries -- the investment allowance, research and development allowance, and now we're just about to establish a training school for industry that we hope will give them a little more confidence and a little more reason to believe that the Government is interested in them, and wants to help them overcome their problems.

Q. But can you get that figure of 130,000 unemployed down, and down quickly, because that is really what the voter, the average voter, looks at - sometimes irrationally, perhaps?

PM: I think you're right, and this is something I've believed all my political life. I've lived for full employment and I'll do everything in my power to ensure it. And that's the approach I will take no matter what the troubles might be or who might differ with me. That's the approach I took during the discussions with the Premiers. I regarded it as a conference relating to unemployment more than anything else.

Q. Compared with overseas, some developing countries, we're still high?

PM: No we are not. There is no country of a comparable kind that has a rate of unemployment that is as low as ours.

Q. West Germany, Japan?

PM: Well, West Germany may be a little different, but you look at the United Kingdom.....

Q. Point seven in West Germany - that's a growth country.

PM: Yes, but every country wants to be a growth country. There are very very few countries that have a record comparable to ours. West Germany is an exceptional case.

Q. Also Japan, I believe 1.3 is the latest figure there.

PM: Well, I can't argue with you there. But what I can argue with you is that the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and comparable types of countries, and if you look at the comparable figures then undoubtedly ours are ever so much better. But where we have been good, and where the economic management of the Government has obviously been good, is that over the long period since Sir Robert Menzies first came into office, our record has been exceptionally good.

Q. Prime Minister, you must have been shocked in your pleas for wages restraints and price increase restraints when BHP increased their steel prices by 5 per cent, and now the doctors want to put their fees up to as high as \$25 for a night visit. Now, there must be something wrong somewhere in your whole concept when these things can go on and you still ask the unions to "hold fast" -- I think that was one of your own expressions.

PM: "Show moderation". But could I put it in two ways. First of all, we don't restrict the unions. We plead with the Arbitration authorities to show moderation in the increase and the rate of increase in wages. But it is not the Arbitration Commission alone that determines salaries and wages. In fact they can have conciliation and arrangements outside the Commission. Or they can have a wages drift by direct negotiation. So there isn't a real limit on wage increases in this country, and the figures show that completely. Insofar as prices are concerned, usually they're the end result. They're the effect rather than the cause. But of course we're worried about both. But the critically important issue that you must understand and everyone must understand, however difficult it might be, is that if you get wages and salary increases in excess of the increases in production, or what they call productivity, then without any doubt at all, you're going to get inflation, as to the difference between the two figures. And as we have production rising at the rate of 2½ per cent, average earnings at 11 per cent, then you've got an inbuilt inflationary factor. Now we can take inflation at the rate of 2½ per cent but when it gets to 7 and 8 per cent, it really works against the best interests of this country.

PM: I am not sure whether we have power to fix prices. I doubt whether we have power to fix wages. But Crown Law officers are looking at this problem for me and they'll advise me on it later on. But I'm one of those who doesn't believe in fixing prices, at least over the long haul. You can do it momentarily and then give it up. Because if you try to fix prices, then, without any doubt at all, you create greater inflationary pressures because you divert resources into the wrong areas of production, you create bottlenecks, and we all know what happened in the immediate post-war years. Twice Governments tried, by referendum to get power to control prices, and twice, rightly, the people decided that they would reject them. I've asked for a paper on this, and I want to produce a White Paper in the House, to see what can be done. But that doesn't end the matter because I believe that what we have to do, even though there are price rises, is to show the people that they are justified or are not justified. In other words, a public relations exercise is needed in the interests of convincing the people themselves. This is the problem we face, and how we overcome it is still in the lap of the gods. But at least I am making the most detailed investigations and enquiries I can make and I want to have this fully debated in the House.

Q. But all the public relations in the world won't cover up a bad economic mistake, if we could put the BHP price rise in that category, politically, from BHP's point of view.....you stated your attitude on it - you can't overcome it can you?

PM: No, you've done rightly when you've said there's a political and an economic problem here. Economically, I think that the BHP Company could have justified their rise, though not at the time they made their decision and announced it. But politically, it could not have been worse, and even if I can put it worse, more foolish. What is needed, as I've said in cases like this, is some kind of method by which we can show that it was justified both in a political and in an economic sense. In the case of BHP, I understand the South Australian Prices Commissioner is looking into this problem, and we'll see what decision he makes about it. But I agree with you. This was a major political decision, it was a major political mistake, and it did great harm to me personally and I believe to my Government, particularly as the decision was made known immediately after a triumph at the Premier's Conference.

Q. Prime Minister, I wonder if we could turn to foreign affairs -- and this is a subject which you've had a lot of personal experience with, having been Foreign Affairs Minister prior to the Prime Ministership -- now, coming on top of the Kibel affair last week, and the success Mr Nixon has had from his visit to China last week, when is Australia going to seriously get down to the recognition of China problem?

...../7

PM: We have been looking at the problem seriously for a long time. In fact, I think we were early in the field. And we took action of a kind to liberalise our trade with them, and we've got no trade restrictions other than on security grounds. We will let our people go there freely, and we let the Chinese come here as freely as they want to, again subject only to security grounds. We want missions to come and missions to go from the two countries. There's little more that we have to offer. But I stated in the early days of being the Foreign Minister that I wanted a dialogue with the Chinese in order to normalise our relationship, our total relationship, with them, whether in trade and cultural relationships or whatever else it might happen to be. And we appeared to be going pretty successfully just prior to the time when China became a member of the United Nations. So we've done a lot, but we've not got very much response - positive and effective response - from them. But we're still pursuing it, and in order to try and get greater access and greater ability to communicate with them, we are establishing a diplomatic mission in Hong Kong, staffed by pretty senior men in the Foreign Office. We think this is a major step forward in trying to achieve our objectives. If I could go further. While I was not prepared to permit Mr Peacock as Minister for the Army to make a private visit, neither I nor anyone else in the Cabinet would, if they were invited, object to a Minister making a Ministerial visit to Peking and to other parts of the state.

Q. Isn't the real key to the whole question - you, the Prime Minister, seeking to go to China? Isn't this the real key to it?

PM: Well, they have never put it to me that it would be the real key to it.

Q. But could you put the initiative to them?

PM: I don't know, but I could certainly let it be known to them, as I'm letting it be known to them now. They appeared to be willing, but they appeared to be willing to have a trade delegation as well, and when they got into the United Nations they let us know that the time was not propitious. But if they gave an indication that they would like a Ministerial visit, of course we would permit a Minister to go. And I would choose one who could properly represent this country, one who would be able, over a very broad spectrum, be able to discuss bilateral relationships between the two countries, and our position in the Asian theatre.

Q. But if they'd like to see you, would you go?

PM: Now, look, don't let's get too hypothetical about these things because I think that when you are dealing with the Chinese in particular, you must deal with them, as I've said, with quiet and cautious diplomacy. Don't give all your cards away at once. We gave all our trade advantages away in one go, and we haven't got a response from them. We don't want to put all the advantages their way. We must play this game as anyone plays the game in diplomatic relationships, by doing it sensibly, wisely, step by step, and knowing that it's going to be to our advantage when we make a decision.

- Q. But if Premier Chou En Lai contacted you tomorrow and said, "We'd like you to come on a visit to China", you'd go?
- PM: I'd give it the most careful consideration. The moment the invitation arrived, of course, I would discuss it with my colleagues, and I'd discuss it without any hard and fast decisions in my mind.
- Q. What's your stand on Taiwan at the moment, Prime Minister?
- PM: Our stand on Taiwan remains the same as it was at the United Nations. We would like this country to have the right to be independent, but we also take the view that the resolution of the problems between Mainland China and Taiwan is one for those two parts of China to be decided by them. In other words, we have to go along with a view, and the view that has been expressed/Chiang Kai Shek on Taiwan claims the Mainland. Peking claims Taiwan. In other words, both parts on either side of the Taiwan Strait recognise that they belong to one China, and we can't deny that, and the Americans haven't denied it either. But nonetheless we do feel that in what is called a de facto way, and according to international law, we feel that Taiwan has a right to be regarded, to be treated, at international law as having jurisdiction over Taiwan. But we can't be hard and fast on this. We've got to be flexible in our approaches to it, and so far as I'm concerned, I'm determined to be flexible too.
- Q. Do you feel we have a need to take a more independent line in Asia, and have a more independent foreign policy, independent from the United States that is?
- PM: I believe we've got to take an independent line based upon our own national interests. If they fit in with the views or the declared policy of the United States, well and good. If they don't, then we'll make up our own mind as to what we should do.
- Q. Prime Minister, I'm wondering if I could put to you...you know, the Kibel affair exercised a lot of publicity during the week throughout Australia. Do you feel that this whole exercise did the nation a lot of harm in its approach to trying to get to know China better?
- PM: Not a bit of harm. The Chinese are businessmen from start to finish, and I don't think they'll take very much notice of this kind of problem although they would make political capital out of it if they could. But they're hard dealers. If they feel that they will have some advantage because of a rapprochement with us, then of course they'd have the rapprochement. But they will be dealing with it in the same way as we want to deal with it - carefully, methodically, and knowing step by step where their best interests lie.

Q. Now, it has been said that the Federal Liberals are bowing to the wishes at the moment --- until I think you took the firm stand with the DLP last week -- to the wishes of two minority parties, namely, the Country Party and the DLP. Now this criticism has come strongly from financial areas, sharebroking areas, particularly on the devaluation of the dollar.....Australia, one of the strongest currencies in the world devalued....and there's been a lot of criticism in the financial world on that. And the time that Cabinet took to come to that decision, and the opportunity lost to revalue the Australian dollar to parity with sterling. Now I'm wondering whether you'd like to put this down in clear terms.

PM: I can put it down in very clear terms. When you have a major decision like this, time doesn't matter. The critically important thing is to make the right decision. And against the dollar we didn't devalue. We appreciated or revalued upwards by, I think, 6.32 per cent. So, against one of the major currencies in the world, we went upwards and not downwards. And the second important thing is that....

Q. But you were already up, in layman's language. Excuse me for interrupting, but in layman's language you were already up above that dollar anyhow, so....

PM: No, no, we were not at the time. At the time the decisions were made there was a little movement yes, but not of the order of 6.32 per cent. So what we have done officially, is we have appreciated against the dollar although we have depreciated against certain other currencies.

Q. But overseas countries are casting eyes on us because of the cheapness of the dollar. Takeovers become more

PM: Now that may be so, and if that is so, then it's up to us to find other measures to control the inflow of capital. But if you felt as I did, after hearing all the arguments, and I made this decision personally that 6.32 per cent was the right place to go, and I didn't change my mind, and it was my decision at the finish, my decision. It was accepted by the rest of Cabinet....

Q. Not Mr Anthony's?

PM: No, well, Mr Anthony agreed with it, yes. He did agree with it. Everyone in Cabinet agreed with it. But I was the person who decided on the 6.32 per cent.

Q. In terms of collective responsibility?

PM: In terms of collective responsibility, yes.

Q. Individually they may have differed?

PM: Well, I wouldn't say differences at the finish, but in a Cabinet as vigorous and healthy and with different kinds of interests to represent, of course there were differences of views expressed. But when it came to the actual decision itself, after listening to all the arguments by Country Party colleagues, and from others around the table, and then at the finish when I said it's 6.32 per cent, it was accepted. And I can give you the reasons why.

Q. Have the takeovers since then worried you, including this latest one by Great Universal Stores of UK for Pattersons, where you've got 80 stores throughout Australia. It's a sizable one. And the Japanese investment houses interest in Australia.

PM: Well, that is an interest, the last one is an interest without any precise decision or definite decision as to a takeover. The other, frankly, I have not had enough time in the first two weeks of the House to interest myself in it. But what I have done is this. I've told the Reserve Bank that I want a complete analysis, in depth, of the problem of capital inflow. I believe this is the right way to look at it, and I'm getting a paper on it, and I hope to be able to introduce a paper in the House, or if I don't the Treasurer will do it, over the course of the next three to four weeks.

Q. But you may have to take strong action to stop some of this capital inflow.

PM: It wouldn't be strong action. I believe some other countries do it. Japan, for example, is doing it now. And I can see no reason why we shouldn't do it. But I'm not committing myself. I've said, and I've made it clear in the House, I want an analysis of the pros and cons. And when we have that, then we can make up our mind what to do. But what I do want to impress on you is this. We will act in our interests as I've said before. The money that is coming in now is fundamentally investment funds going into the development of this country. In other words, it's building up our resources, building up our capacity for increased development, building up our capacity for increased employment. We've got to be careful here, but above all, we've got to make certain that we act in Australia's interests, and we don't let others get too big a hold on Australian assets.

Q. Prime Minister, still on the point of the two minor parties in the Parliament, will Australia now press on with its "get tough" industrial policy in view of the DLP's decision to knock back this legislation in the Senate?

PM: I'd like to explain my position about the DLP because I think that many or most of their major objectives - such as their deep dislike of Communism - it's the same as my own, particularly when it reacts against the interest of this country. Secondly, they want a stronger defence effort, and so do we, and others of their policies are the same as ours. But it is ours, and particularly my responsibility to ensure that when a decision is made, we in the Liberal/Country Party make it. As to the recent decisions relating to amalgamation, I long felt and the DLP knows that I long felt, that we would not stop this amalgamation. We had good reasons

PM (Contd.)

for not doing so. We had no justification for doing it. But that doesn't mean to say that we give up taking action where we think there are improper practices, or where the will of the majority of the members in a trade union is being thwarted, that we won't take action. In fact, if we find the facts show that there has been malpractice, then of course we will take action, and I will be introducing, or the Government will be introducing, measures soon. And that will clearly indicate where we stand.

Q. Even though the DLP may not let them get through the Senate? You are prepared to face that?

PM: Well, it doesn't necessarily mean that there are some measures that the DLP doesn't like. As for example, it might be compulsory unionism. We can think about those, of course, but the measures that we regard as fundamental we will push on with.

Q. It sounds as though you're backing down on that issue?

PM: No. Well, you can put it that way if you want to. But you've got to live in a world of commonsense. And the issues that really matter, and I believe we will make our position on them more than abundantly clear in the next few weeks, we'll push ahead with them.

Q. Did it worry you when the Federal President of the Liberal Party, Mr Southey, said recently that the Liberal Party -- he virtually said that the Liberal Party couldn't be sure of going into the next election and winning it. They wouldn't know as they went into the election what the result would be.

PM: I thought his last statement was a good one. And as you've put it, I couldn't object to it. As you know, we in the Liberal Party are liberal in the true sense in that we don't try and compel people to stick to a rigid party line.

Q. I didn't really ask you whether you objected to it, Sir, but whether it worried you.

PM: No, it didn't worry me because I know him well enough and I've been there long enough to be able to listen to something that's said. And even though I might think, "Oh, I wish he'd put it a little bit differently" or I wish he hadn't said it, in a few moments' time you've forgotten it, and you might even ring and say, "Well, now look, Bob, I'd never put it this way again. Bless your heart and soul, see if you can put it a little more felicitously in the future".

Q. You talked earlier about the need for public relations. What have you got planned to improve your image both with the Party and with the electorate between now and the elections, whenever that may be?

PM: Well, I think my image with the Party is pretty good. Not only within my own Party, the political Party, but between the political and the administrative wings. And we are doing all we can. But as to the public image - public image will depend upon performance and results. We started off in last November - as you know, because you asked me the question about it - but we started off last November in easing up on bank control. We've given them more or less complete liberty. For example, they can lend money for housing in a way that has never before been practicable. At the Premiers' Conference, we took the measures that I've mentioned a few moments ago. And if we found that they were not enough, particularly so far as employment was concerned, which I've told you is an article of faith with me, of course I would make a decision personally that we have to do more.

Q. Can you just be a little more specific and say what figure or what percentage you want to get unemployment down to?

PM: No, I won't. I won't be specific there. But I'd want to get it down to a figure that I regard as acceptable to the Australian people and particularly acceptable to me.

Q: Which would be below 100,000?

PM: Well, don't pin me to a figure. I think my mind and their mind would be identical on this problem. I'd want it down to a figure where people wouldn't be worrying and I wouldn't be worrying either.

Q. Prime Minister, time is running out on us and there are two very important subjects which I would like just to discuss with you as quickly as possible. There's tremendous criticism within the Parliament on both sides of the House on who controls Australia's off-shore and continental shelf..... what distance Australia can rightly control and where the States can fit into this picture. Now Mr Gorton has threatened to vote on the other side of the House this Session if you don't do something about offshore legislation. There is the question of oil, there is the question of fishing rights. Now how seriously do you view something being done about this particular area?

PM: Well, in the course of the last two weeks, I have been discussing with the Leader of the House, and particularly with the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the combined effects of all these problems that you've mentioned. Soon there is to be an international conference on the law of the sea and associated problems, and he will be stating his position before he leaves Australia to discuss them at the international conferences. I believe, too, although I'm not perfectly certain about this because it's a little outside my jurisdiction, and I haven't had the time to cross-examine him completely on this, that he will be discussing it with the States and will then be taking it into my own Party Room. I'm just sorry that I can't give you the answer to this, but I'm not up to date on it. If I'd had the glimmer of a feeling that you might raise this, I would have discussed it with him this morning, but I didn't do so.

Q. Are you conscious, though, that there is need for something to be done, and are you conscious of Mr Gorton's threat? This is the point.

PM: Yes, I'm conscious of both and I know the Foreign Minister and the Leader of the House are both conscious of it, too, and they believe that it can be overcome.

Q. So that all things being equal, we're likely to see legislation in this Session?

PM: I don't know about legislation, but I believe the way in which we are operating, or the way in which they are operating, which they will recommend to Cabinet, will to a considerable extent overcome our problems. But you've got me here, and I have to say this, in an area where I'm not fully briefed, but I hope to become briefed as soon as a submission is presented to us.

Q. The other point I'd like to put to you is the Constitution. The States met last week to discuss at Attorneys-General level, a new Constitution. The present one was described as a horse and buggy Constitution, I think, by the State Attorney-General, Mr Reid, in Victoria. Now does the Commonwealth see a need for a change in the present set-up?

PM: I certainly do. The only trouble I've got is as to the changes that might be made, and the kind of Commission we need or Parliamentary group we need in order to come to a common view about what changes are necessary. But more and more as I've been in the office of the Prime Minister, I've wrung my hands feeling, "Heavens, if ever there's an occasion when we ought to get a change in the Constitution, this is it." For example, in industrial relations, a control of associations and organisations, control of interest rates and overall control of the economy. I believe that we ought to have increased powers, and I think we ought to be able to talk to the States about it. But equally, too, do I believe that there ought to be greater power for the States to administer, to have the funds through which they could administer matters that could be more satisfactorily handled by them than by us. For example, hospitals, schooling, roads and matters of that kind, matters that are very close to the people, because I think they are closer to the people than we are.

Q. You're almost saying taxing powers of some description?

PM: My own view is that we really want some sort of a commission on this before we make up our minds. I think you should know, too, that because there hasn't been quite enough detailed analysis of the problems of State and Commonwealth relationships, I have agreed to the provision of funds so that a school can be established at the National University in order to give us guidance on this problem. It will give us guidance from an objective source rather than keep it in the political area, the political arena, and one that will be a political football.

Q. Mr Prime Minister, what hope do you see for the recovery of the motor car industry?

PM: I couldn't give an immediate forecast, but if people would have a little more confidence, then I think you would find the motor car industry would quickly revive. Above all, I do hope that because of the recent measures we took to ensure that the manufacture of small vehicles took place in Australia -- we want a large Australian content in small vehicles -- then I think you'll find that the production of motor vehicles in Australia would increase pretty quickly, and we'll have a very Australian content, and we'll have much increased employment by Australians - that's the goal I want.

Q. Prime Minister, for "This Week", thank you very much.
