

PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO U.S. AND U.K.

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON.

Address by the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Holt



30th June, 1966.

President (Mr. Booth):

Gentlemen, it may interest you to know that at this very hour in Canberra the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, is addressing the Press Club of Canberra.

I would like to introduce the distinguished guests at this table. On my left, His Excellency, Mr. John Keith Waller, the Australian Ambassador.

On my right, our very own, the Honourable Edward Clark, United States Ambassador to Australia.

On my left, Sir John Bunting, Permanent Head of the Prime Minister's Department.

On my right, Sir Lawrence McIntyre, the Deputy Secretary of the Department of External Affairs of Australia.

On my left, the Honourable Robert Furlonger, the Minister of Australia.

On my right, the Honourable John McNaughton, Assistant Secretary of Defence for International Security Affairs.

On my left, a most important man, Mr. Tony Eggleton, the Prime Minister's Press Secretary.

On my right, the Honourable Ray Farrell, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

His job is the one that our distinguished guest used to hold in Australia.

On my left, an old friend, the Honourable Claude Pepper of Florida.

On my right, the Honourable William Battle, former American Ambassador to Australia - now with the State Department.

On my left, a distinguished member of this club, Press Attache to the Australian Embassy, Mr. John Malone.

Gentlemen, the nation, the city, and especially the National Press Club - we are proud to have as our guest of honour a distinguished statesman from down under. His country is a most remarkable one. It is almost the exact size as ours. It has everything going for it that ours has - great cities, vast stretches of farm land, mountains, prairies, and it is all tended and brought to bloom and fruition by fewer than twenty million people.

MR. HOLT - Twelve.

Twelve, I'm told. I was giving them a few. (laughter).

Australia is a land where an American - at least this one - feels more at home than in any other country but his own. Our guest became Prime Minister of Australia last January. He succeeded a veritable legend, Sir Robert Menzies, who was Prime Minister for a generation. And, incidentally, who also spoke from this platform.

Our guest is the leader of the majority Liberal Party in Australia. That is the party to belong to just now. But he knows this country and city well, having participated in many World Bank and other financial meetings here.

But he is not all business by any means. He is a skilful skindiver and spearfisherman, who enjoys water skiing and power boating. He is a familiar figure at the Melbourne race track and he goes the right way with top hat and tails. How good he is at picking the horses his biographers don't say.

He is here today representing his country, the faithful ally of the United States, through thick and thin, good times and bad.

Gentlemen, the distinguished Prime Minister of Australia, the Right Honourable Harold Holt.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. HOLT: Mr. President Booth, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Gentlemen of the National Press Club, and other types not otherwise included:

This all makes me feel very good. In the first place it is, as most of you have discovered, regarded by most of the politicians of the world as something of a status symbol to have the National Press Club. These things are taking a well defined pattern at these times. If you can get your photo in "Time" or "Newsweek" or matters of that sort, well, you are well on your way to recognition. I have only had my photo, I think, twice in "Time". On one occasion I was sitting along side David Rockefeller, who is rather better known here than I am. And on the other occasion I appeared with three of my delightful daughters-in-law in their bikinis. And I got more international recognition from that than in my thirty years in public life. (laughter).

Indeed, as I came across the United States, I was a little chastened because, although I was shown every courtesy and attention at the splendid hotel in San Francisco, they kept addressing me as Mr. Ambassador. When I went up to my room some generous friend had sent along a couple of bottles of hooch but it was addressed correctly to me by name so there was no argument as to the possessor, but it described me as the Prime Minister of Canada. (laughter). Then we got on the aircraft to come across to Washington and we hadn't been off the ground very long when a somewhat worried looking captain of the aircraft came along and he saw me lounging in the front seat with a sweater on, by this stage, and my collar loosened and my tie a bit askew and he said, "I am looking for the Prime Minister of Australia. But unfortunately," he said, "I don't know his name." (laughter). So, gentlemen, my ego needed a bit of building by the time I got to Washington. And thank you very much for asking me here. I see around me a lot of friends. Some I have made at earlier times, some who apparently have just come along for the very nice lunch.

On my right you will see a man who can usually be distinguished by the "Yellow Roses of Texas" in his buttonhole, your distinguished Ambassador to my country, Mr. Edward Clark. Now, I am not without hope that by the time he ends his term of duty with us we will have persuaded him to remain permanently. I think he finds rather larger areas of land to be cultivated there than in Texas. It's a little cheaper and the oil has yet to be found.

And, of course, we have around the room others whose friendship I have valued over the years in which I was engaged in the rather esoteric mysteries of the Secretaryship of Finance.

But today I want to speak principally to you about the sort of view that we have developed from the part of the world in which I live about what has become the major external issue in this country and indeed in other parts of the world - the issue of Viet Nam. And I think it would assist a clearer understanding for us all if we could turn our eyes away for a week or two from the daily episodic reportings to consider the environment, the general situation, the total picture which relates to Viet Nam and its place in Asia generally. Because from much of the criticism that I have been reading, the woods seem to have been lost sight of as people inspect the trees. And if we want to assess the value of our participation in South Viet Nam, then I believe those who criticize must broaden their horizons and see what has been achieved by resistance to communism in South East Asia and study in turn what this will mean to the Asia of tomorrow. The military operations would then fall into place as marking the continuing challenge of communism in Asia. The stakes, gentlemen, are very large, and that is why three successive presidents of this great country, men who should have at their fingertips information, informed advice to an extent and of a quality which very few other people could hope to match, even the best informed of us. And in the exercise of their country's heavy responsibility of free world leadership, they have firmly decided, one succeeding the other, that the military power and economic strength of the mightiest nation in human history must be brought into the scale to preserve<sup>af</sup> freedom and hope and progress in the countries of Asia. There/a billion people - a billion and half people, rather - east of Suez, and their number grows appreciably each year. In India alone the population increases to an extent equivalent to the total population of my country which, Mr. President, despite our best efforts and a very active Immigration programme, has only advanced to about eleven and a half million. My heart lifted for a moment when you said twenty million. (laughter). That is where we hope to get. ....and get with other goals in sight. But, gentlemen, they are people of quality. We are very proud of our Australian people.

But the one and a half billion people east of Suez may have doubled their number by the end of this century. And Asia has become a dynamic theatre of social ferment and revolutionary economic change. In this region - and I contrast it, as I say this, with the continent of Africa - there are countries rich in resources with ancient civilizations, but some have been slow to adapt themselves to the possibilities of modern techniques.

Most of these countries are going through dramatic processes of change, varying greatly in kind. You get, for example, the modern industrialization which has occurred in Japan and, on the other hand, the regimentation of the communist administration in China of the 700 million people of that country. The only major military power on the mainland of Asia is communist China. No country in Asia could feel itself secure from the threat of communist aggression but for the power and resolution of the United States of America. And so we might fairly ask the critics who don't like what is going on in South Viet Nam, do they want a world in which a communist dominated Asia forms a major part? That is a fair question. They may feel that the issue can end in South Viet Nam. None of us who live in that area of the world, and I speak as one who has in the course of this year not only been to South Viet Nam but through several of the countries of Asia. I come to you as one who opened on Monday morning in Canberra the conference of SEATO powers. And on the preceding weekend I was able to have talks there with Michael Stewart, Dean Rusk, and the Foreign Ministers of all these SEATO countries attending that conference.

And they are under no doubt as to the fact that a continuing threat exists. They welcome what have been quite favourable developments in the course of the past twelve years. And there are very hopeful developments emerging in Asia. But without American strength in Asia then we might as well hand it over to communism of the Chinese brand.

We in Australia share the views of your leaders, and I would hope and believe of millions of your fellow Americans, that a critical battle is being fought in South Viet Nam for the future of mankind. This conflict symbolizes the challenge of communism in Asia and is the current major expression of it. We have tried to see all this in the perspective of history. We are inclined in Australia to see things perhaps in direct simple terms. But you are not necessarily more likely to be wrong on that account. I think you can over-complicate the situation to a point where, as I say, you lose sight of the woods because you are concentrating too much on the detail. And there is plenty of detail, of course, to be seen in South Viet Nam, in the complex, difficult situation. And that is why the communists are there, because it is difficult, it is complex. It is not easy to produce national unity which would make the task of defending the country and building it up again so much easier. But we work with the conditions as we find them. And the issue is still clear enough in our eyes. In these simple direct terms we saw our role in world war I and world II. We were a country of only seven million people in those times, and Australia sustained nearly half a million casualties in those two world wars. I think I speak correctly when I say that in the first world war we lost more men killed than the United States itself. And that is how we saw the communist challenge in Berlin and in Cuba. We fought it with you in Korea and we joined with British and other Commonwealth forces in fighting it in Malaya. We see South Viet Nam in the same context, a crucial struggle for human liberty.

Never forget that the United States has not only put troops into Asia, it has also put heart. And I speak for one of the countries in the region which has felt heart, encouragement, and strength from the knowledge that the resistance that could be made would be backed in strength by the United States.

Remember, that as far back as 1954, President Eisenhower decided to extend both economic and military aid to South Viet Nam, to enable the development of a strong, viable state. And during the next five years South Viet Nam made economic and social progress which some observers described as miraculous. And that progress was not halted by the South Vietnamese themselves. It was halted by a campaign of subversion, of terror, of infiltration, and finally of organized military aggression.

Remember also what your country has done to help the economic and social growth of countries such as Korea, Taiwan, and Thailand. It stands ready to assist and support co-operative programmes for economic development in Asia. Your goal and ours is for peace and a better life for all who are willing to live at peace with their neighbours.

The United States is working and building for these objectives. We have heard a lot of discussion and debate about the so-called Domino Theory. Well, those of us who take the view from down under believe that, thanks to the assistance of this country, the Domino Theory is working in reverse.

We believe that because the United States is in Asia, other people are encouraged to stay there and help the emerging young Asian countries to work out their own future without fear and without the persisting menace of a philosophy which Mao Tse-Tung says grows out of the barrel of a gun.

It is in our judgment shortsighted for the industrialized nations of the West to believe that they can contract out of the problems, the troubles and agonies of Asia. The challenge thrown down by communism in Viet Nam is a challenge not only to South Viet Nam, it is a challenge to the whole free world.

Let me say something about peace in Viet Nam. Peace in Asia. Peace all over the world. We have been nauseated by the propaganda which describes the free world as imperialistic and the communist world is benevolent and humanitarian. The converse is demonstrably true. No man has worked harder for peace in Viet Nam than your President, and he is not alone in this. Most of the world supports him. Only Hanoi and Peking will not have peace. What they want is surrender and a victory for totalitarian communism.

We believe in the kind of peace that carries with it the right of small nations to grow and develop in their own way. We believe in a living kind of peace. The communists offer the peace of the grave.

The American decisions I see as turning points in history were the Marshall Aid Programme, which opened a new vista for human welfare, and the other was the decision to give military support and aid to South Korea. Where would we have been had America turned its back at that critical time upon support for South Korea?

There would have been undoubtedly today a Korea entirely dominated by the communists. And forces would have been released at that early stage which would have pressed on the other weak countries south of China itself.

But thanks to the United States' strength, Asia is stirring. We are at the dawning, I believe, of an exciting new phase in human affairs. And I speak as one who has talked in these recent years, and more particularly in recent months, with leaders of countries such as those to be found in Malaysia, in Thailand, in Taiwan, in Korea, in other parts of South East Asia. There is a mood for co-operation. With Japan, for example, a country which has produced the most remarkable industrial expansion of modern times.

Our own trade with Japan today is running at about four and a half times the dimension of the early 1950's. And Australia and Japan are both withholding from consumption more of their gross national product than any other countries to be found in the world - about 28 per cent in the case of Australia, which compares with 17 or 18 per cent in this country and the United Kingdom.

And so we are, we believe, at an exciting phase of development in human history. Here are countries which have never found either the will nor the means to co-operate, except under the force of oppression, down through the earlier centuries.

India, another country which has gone through a significant re-orientation of thinking and movement. In Indonesia, one of the richest countries of the world potentially, a hundred million people which today find themselves in administrative and economic chaos, but with resources so potentially strong that a decade of capable administration and management could make them one of the strong economic powers in Asia of the future. And here is how this great country, and we say it with gratitude and appreciation, because where else do the countries of South East Asia and ultimately of Asia turn, except to the strength and generosity of this country, until enlightenment, perhaps, brings greater support from other countries who would, one would have thought, from the generosity extended to them, when their reconstruction was a matter of necessity in the post-war years, one would have thought that they would have joined gladly in this task of defending liberty and progress in this troubled area of the world.

Well, thanks, I repeat, to the United States, Asia is stirring. And we are ourselves with optimism facing the future ahead of us. What the United States has done is, we believe, of epochal significance. It represents the engagement of the riches and opportunities of the world with the revolution and potential of Asia. It is quite impossible, of course, to assess - let alone overestimate - the value and the sheer magnitude that the service rendered by the American Government and people on behalf of individual liberty, human dignity, and national self-respect throughout the world since the second world war. There has been nothing in history to approach the totality of American generosity and enlightenment as expressed in a unique combination of economic and financial assistance to the needy, military protection to the weak, and dedication to the cause of freedom everywhere.

We need to remind ourselves of all this from time to time. It is all too often forgotten by individuals and beneficiary nations under the passing stresses and irritations of international life. I wonder where Western Europe would stand today had it not been for the Marshall Plan and the American contribution to NATO. And nowhere, perhaps, has there been a better example of American resolution and patience than in Viet Nam.

We are convinced that it has put fresh hope into those Asian countries that are at the same time jealous of their independence and depressed by the harsh realities of living close to communist China.

So far from inviting a mounting chorus of protest, the American example has encouraged some of these countries to come in with military help for the people of South Viet Nam. First the Republic of Korea and now Thailand and the Philippines. I am convinced that others of them, while constrained to preserve a posture of aloofness and even disapproval for public purposes, are privately thankful for what the United States is doing.

The results of all this are to be seen everywhere. The successful holding operation in Viet Nam has brought time for a re-appraisal in Indonesia, as I have mentioned, of the prospect of the harsh and sterile realities of communism, and with it the promise of an end to Indonesia's confrontation of Malaysia.

There has been the recent meeting of free nations in Seoul, the first such meeting held by them, out of which has come a new regional grouping to be known as ASPAC. The Foreign Minister of South Viet Nam was present at our SEATO meeting in Canberra and this meeting was concerned not primarily with matters of defence and security, but with opportunities for political, economic, social, and cultural co-operation, looking towards the future, free from the shadow of aggression and war.

The military forces of all the countries engaged have as a major part of their task the Civic Action and Rural Development Programmes, a totally new concept that military forces have brought to their responsibility in military operations. What better testimony could there be to the fruitfulness of American aid and allied policies and actions in South Viet Nam.

Let me end with a tribute to the steadfastness of the United States' aims and objectives in that country, and to the courage and fortitude of all of those military and civilian alike, who are carrying them through difficult and frustrating conditions. We are grateful for the resolution, clarity of purpose of your President and his Administration.

As I said last night, it is a good thing that this administration has the defence in depth from so many able men, all firmly and resolutely determined to see this thing through. Their efforts have the full support of the Australian Government, of the substantial majority of our people. And I express our appreciation and our gratitude for them.

\*\*\*\*\*

MR. BOOTH: Mr. Prime Minister, you have several hundred sharp newsmen here. They have asked some hard questions and some easy ones. Let me say again that I do not write the questions sir. I merely ask them. And the first question. Sir, we are not used to having our policies so enthusiastically supported. (laughter). (applause).

MR. HOLT: Well, frankly, currently, not is our eyes. And that is not simply a blind acceptance of everything that the United States cares to produce. It is because the Australian people and the American people are inheritors together of a great democratic tradition. We think very much alike on the problems which affect the world. We have great principles held in common. And I believe that we can be appreciative that there is a champion to defend those principles of the strength which you hold.

As we grow in our own strength - and determined we are to go on with our growth - then I hope we shall be making an increasingly strong contribution to our common causes, whether it be in the field of military effort, of international aid, or of co-operation for other useful international purposes. But currently the only problems between us are some rather - some trade problems - the 25 cents a pound on wool and a few other odds and ends like that. (laughter). In the international foreign affairs field we see the situation very closely with your own outlook. (applause).

MR. BOOTH: Sir, what is the nature of the problems which devolve upon Australia because of the changing British stance East of Suez?

MR. HOLT: Well, Mr. Chairman, as explained to me by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, the situation remains unchanged from the understanding which was discussed with us by the Minister for Defence, Mr. Healy, earlier this year in Canberra, and then subsequently forming part of the defence review which he made to the House of Commons.

Mr. Harold Wilson has reaffirmed that position quite recently in public statement and in the text of the speech which he made to his own party members.

Now we are currently concerned, of course, with the end of confrontation situation. But confrontation has not yet ended formally. We hope things will work out satisfactorily. But, of course, there have been in the past times when all that looked promising in Indonesia didn't work out quite the way that we had hoped. We are more optimistic at this time. But we have ahead of us a consideration of where we all stand once that situation has satisfactorily ended.

Now the United Kingdom has made it clear that it will stay on in the military force and presence in Singapore and I would think with other Commonwealth forces in Malaysia for an indefinite time ahead. In what strength remains to be made known, but we are more concerned to have the British presence there as a moderating and stabilizing influence than with the question of just how many people there are.



We pursued, in Australia, in company with the British, both in Australia and the United Kingdom, a study of possible alternative base situations in Australia if a situation developed in which the United Kingdom could not effectively maintain its force in the bases where they at present are stationed.

But we would hope and we would believe that this decision having been made is welcomed by the countries of the area concerned, that Great Britain will, as far ahead as we can see, maintain a presence East of Suez in almost certainly the same areas where they are at present held.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you, sir. In the light of Australia's membership of the recently created ASPAC, would you say that Australia is now going to get closer and more co-operation with its Asian neighbours than was the case in the past?

MR. HOLT: Mr. President, that I believe is undoubtedly so. This was a welcome development for us and no less welcome was the warmth with which Australia and New Zealand were accepted into the company of Asian countries. We have come to know several of them of course, closely, either through our SEATO co-operation or in the case of those outside SEATO, in trade developments of recent time.

And this is a symptom, I believe, of the emerging spirit of co-operation, of hope in Asia. There are potentialities for trade which become quite exciting as new resources are opened up and as better technical trade co-operation, machinery is developed between us. This aspect, emergence, and the earlier meeting of the Education Ministers at Bangkok, the useful meeting of SEATO which has just been held, the Asian Development Bank as a new institution servicing the area, the undertaking which President Johnson has given that there will be a billion-dollar programme of development in the area if co-operation can be successfully developed - all these things are hopeful symptoms.

Hanging over all is the menacing cloud of communism which we must dispel. But subject to that I believe that, the Asia of the next fifty years cannot only make great forward strides, contributing notably to human welfare and progress, but that it can appreciably improve the standards of the people of the world as a consequence of this economic growth.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you. Mr. Prime Minister, <sup>one</sup> of our colleagues asked for your comment on the prospects for increased Australian economic co-operation with Japan in, first, the development of Australian mineral resources and, secondly, the general development of South East Asia.

MR. HOLT: Mr. President, you are being very kind. There must be a tough one or two stuck in that pack that you have there. (laughter).

We, of course, as I indicated earlier, have had a remarkable growth of trade with Japan. It has multiplied by four and a half times, as I have said, since the early fifties. But, even at that, we believe we are really just at the early launching point of the trade between the two countries.

Let me illustrate this for you by what is happening with respect to iron ore. We are at the present time developing great deposits in one part of Western Australia. It has been estimated that there are 15,000 million to 18,000 million - or should I say billion, to make the figures more intelligible - 15 or 18 billion tons of good quality iron ore. And contracts are currently held for somewhere in the neighbourhood of dollars 2.5 billion for the supply of this ore to Japan. That is just one item which is only in the early stages. These are the initial contracts which have been secured.

In some instances we shall require Japanese in association with our own and of that of other investing countries, most notably the United States itself, particularly since some strength has been imposed in the United Kingdom on further investment from there.

But we see, as I described it the other day, Mr. President, the Australia of today is the sort of Pandora's box of mineral wealth. There is hardly a week or a month which passes without some new mineral discovery of consequence coming to our notice. And there are quite responsible people who predict that within a measurable period of years our export income from minerals will exceed our export income from our traditional staple export, wool. Now this should be not only a source of tremendous strength to us but would assist in avoiding the sort of fluctuations in the Australian economy which conditions of drought or lower world prices for our primary product have brought to us.

We face a future in which Japan will figure prominently and there is a very good basis for co-operation developing in the trade field between the two countries.

MR. BOOTH: Mr. Prime Minister, in my introductory remarks I am afraid I gave my American colleagues more credit than they deserved for the increase in population in your country. But there are two questions in that area. To what extent did American servicemen contribute to your population increase? (laughter). And do you favor any changes in your Immigration policy so as to attract additional population from neighbouring Asian countries?

MR. HOLT: Mr. President, so far as I can gather, the American forces were notably active but not notably productive. (laughter). (applause).

MR. BOOTH: The second, I am not sure you need to answer it after that answer, sir. (laughter). But do you favour any changes in your Immigration policies/as to attract additional population from neighbouring Asian countries?

MR. HOLT: Well, Mr. President, the sting was in the tail, of course. We have<sup>an</sup> established Immigration policy but it has been reviewed from time to time. And it is operating, I think, not unsatisfactorily at the present time. I made a few liberalizations myself, of not very extensive kinds, but at least they were moves which I know gave considerable pleasure in the countries of Asia. One was to establish the same period of naturalization for non-Europeans as well as for Europeans. We do admit for a number of purposes people from Asia and those who have had a period of residence of five years or more can apply for naturalization.

Any non-European who marries an Australian spouse, a male or a female, as the case may be, becomes eligible for citizenship of the country and the children of that marriage, of course, enjoy full Australian citizenship.

We have at the present time well over 11,000 Asian students in our various schools and universities. And I know that the governments of the countries from which these students come do not favour any change in our Immigration policy which would have the effect of enabling a considerable proportion of these or some significant number of these to remain in Australia rather than to go back to the country which needs their skilled services so very much.

But these are matters which can be talked over quite calmly and sensibly between us. It is well recognized that the Australian policy is based on the desirability of maintaining a homogeneous population that can integrate one element with another. We are currently, of course, attracting migrants from many countries of Europe and we have quite a task at this period of our history in successfully integrating. And I think we have been doing it successfully and the people from so many other countries who have to develop familiarity with the Australian scene.

But as our position in Asia increases from time to time, no doubt, there will be a desirability to have skilled people. Special projects will call for some presence of executives or even a labour shortage could produce some need for a modification, temporary or otherwise.

These things, I repeat, are all capable of being handled within the ambit of the programme. There is some flexibility given to the department for the permanent admission of people who have special distinctions and skills. And it may interest you to know that the permanent conductor of the Sydney Symphony Orchestra is a very delightful person who is an American negro. And so there it is. We are able in these ways, I think, to administer our programme with humanity and with good sense.

MR. BOOTH. Mr. Prime Minister, there is as much interest in Indonesia - a number of questions. I think I shall ask them all at once so that you can expostulate generally on your feeling about Indonesia because time presses us.

Q. The first is. Please, a word about Indonesian development from the Prime Minister, of a country once fearful of Sukarno's expansionism. And the next one. What is your view of Indonesia's greatest present need? And third. In what way can or should western countries assist economic rehabilitation in Indonesia, especially how should Australia? And fourth. Considering the recent changes in the Indonesian Government, how would you characterize present Indonesian-Australian relations?

MR. HOLT: Mr. President, if I tried to answer in general terms I think it will cover the questions which are raised.

We in Australia have always attached great importance to friendly relations, co-operative relations with our nearest neighbour, Indonesia, which is literally only a matter of minutes - flying time, at least, these days - from the Northern mainland of our country. And even through the period in which Australian troops have been engaging Indonesian troops on the border of Borneo, we have kept a line of friendly contact going with them. Now the extent of the communist purge which has occurred in Indonesia has yet to be either evaluated in numbers or in consequence. I have here estimates which have ranged from low field, 300,000, to high field, about a million, of the figures of those who were liquidated in the communist purge. And I think one can reasonably assume from that there has been a re-orientation of policy in Indonesia.

Now while we may not ourselves approve of the methods, at least if Indonesia is turning towards more co-operative relationships with those of us who are in the free world camp, then I think that can greatly improve the general prospect of stability and progress in South East Asia generally. And the country, as I said earlier, is tremendously rich in resources. I know from discussions I have had with some of the entrepreneurs from your country that provided they could see a period of stability ahead and faithful dealing from the government, then they would be encouraged to make substantial investment of the developmental kind in that country.

The future of Indonesian international policy is not so clearly to be seen. Quite certainly, it wouldn't be linking up with that of communist China. I should think it would probably seek or pursue a nonaligned role. But there has been over recent times such a display of friendship from Indonesia to Thailand, for example, and the talks regarding the ending of confrontation with Malaysia were conducted in such a friendly atmosphere that we are hopeful that at no distant point of time, providing we go ahead with developments like ASPAC for co-operative economic purposes in the region, that Indonesia would find itself attracted to membership of such company.

But it is a hopeful sign and I should have put it on the score earlier of the things which the United States is playing, that its policy in South East Asia has secured. If there had not been a resolute, continuing presence of United States strength in South Viet Nam, we would never, in my judgment, have secured the outcome which has occurred in recent time in Indonesia.

MR. BOOTH: Mr. Prime Minister, we have had these wide-ranging questions of world import. But there are plenty of us in this audience who write for newspapers in towns such as Fargo, North Dakota, in the great plains of Canada, Topeka, Kansas, where wheat is big, sir - do you feel that the world price of wheat is being held down by the operation of the United States export subsidy?

MR. HOLT: Well, I would like to turn that one over to my colleague, Deputy Prime Minister John McEwen, the Leader of the Country Party in the coalition government which I have the honour to lead.

I am sure that John would say that the price of wheat is too low. I don't know how many causes he would ascribe to this, but anything any of you gentlemen can do to assure not only a better price for wheat but for sugar and a few other of these basic primary commodities, will be greatly welcomed by the Holt Government in Australia. (laughter). (applause).

MR. BOOTH: There are many other great questions that I wish we could ask, but we can't because, as you see, time presses us. When I introduced this table I purposely failed to introduce a distinguished member of this club who sits here. We have a little ceremony coming up. Roy Macartney, who is a member of this club, known to most of you out there, greatly admired and loved, is the correspondent of the Melbourne "Age" of Melbourne, Australia. Not only is he a great reporter, he is a great tennis player. And he has just won the National Press Club tennis championship. And I shall ask Mr. Macartney to come to this place and the Prime Minister of Australia will award him the trophy.

Mr. Macartney.

MR. HOLT: Mr. Roy Macartney, I offer congratulations not only from myself, which is purely a personal matter, but from the members of this club for this notable achievement marking yet another Australian triumph in the field of tennis. It couldn't have been more timely, gentlemen, because for the first time in living memory there is no Australian in the quarter finals at Wimbledon. And so, Roy, you have kept the tennis reputation of Australia high. I don't know how you've managed it with all these penetrating dispatches that I have been reading back home from your pen. But it just shows that the versatility of the Australian abroad is something which has to be seen to be believed. I now present to you this trophy. I don't know whether it is - do you have to win it three years too?

MR. BOOTH: No, it is his.

MR. HOLT: Well, here you are. And unless he finds out by some other process the editor of your paper will not discover this rather - this rather uncomfortable secret, as I imagine it to be. Gentlemen, I am sure we all join in applauding a great Australian athlete, I give you Mr. Roy Macartney.

MR. MACARTNEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Prime Minister. It is quite a handsome trophy. It would have been more decorative, perhaps, if it was one of your swimming companions. Thank you very much.

MR. BOOTH: It just shows how smart these Australians are. The Prime Minister anticipated my last question but he may have some notion after having just presented this trophy. Mr. Prime Minister, what is your government doing about getting one of your players into the finals at Wimbledon?

MR. HOLT: Well, I think we will demand a replay or else submit it to the United Nations, something of that sort, Mr. President.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you, sir.

MR. HOLT: Thank you very much.

---