

WASHINGTON, NOVEMBER 3, 1971.

71/97E

Today before we turn to our questions I want to talk about some of the problems that we face. First of all yesterday I did have the great privilege of having a long talk with President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger. I can assure you that those talks could not have been more intimate and I could not have wished that The President would have taken me into his confidence to a greater degree than he did. Little was left unsaid and he did convince me that he is on the right track in trying to get a rapprochement in world affairs and to try and get a reduction in tensions so that we can divert our attention to the good life and better opportunities for our citizens than to devoting so much of our time and so much of our effort to the impediment of war. Now I've welcomed my discussions too with Mr. Laird and Mr. Packard who will shortly go to Australia. I've welcomed the discussions I've had with Secretary of State Rogers, who I think I can claim is a personal friend and a man very well known to me. In Australia we are building one society and I want to emphasize this. We want one society united in mutual loyalty but richly diverse in ethnic, religion and cultural backgrounds and influences. As to our national development and the state of the economy, I see ahead for Australia a remarkable prospect. We have by good fortune, and I think too by good management, created all the basic conditions that are the ingredient for success. I don't know of any country that I have visited in recent years - and I've visited a great number of them - but I don't know of any country that offers quite the same prospects as we do. So if any of you feel you would like to become immigrants to my country just slip a note up to Mr. President. Let me know your name and address and

I'll hand it on to one of my officials and see if you're worthy of becoming a member of my own press corps, particularly if I feel that you're indulgent towards myself. Now as to the basic ingredients for success. Our population is growing, our economy is soundly based. It has diversity and strength and our national resources are not only immense, but they're growing day by day. If you open the paper and don't find some new discovery that is likely to add to our wealth it's a strange day for the press I can assure you. We are too developing all those skills that the technological age demands and through the combination of all these qualities and virtues we are becoming a middle power. I think we have a significance in the Pacific theatre that is out of all proportion to the wealth that is being produced in my country. I believe we are getting into this position of trust, a position where people consult us because they know that over the years we have been a completely trustworthy and reliable ally. They know that in terms of the aid programmes - civil aid programmes on an official basis - that we do at least as well as any other country. And when the numbers go up I can assure you that you will see that our name in terms of performance per head of population is regarded as remarkably good. As I came along one of your avenues today, Independence Avenue, I couldn't help but ask myself the simple question "Why is it that we don't parade this virtue of independence and inter-dependence in the same ways you do here. We have the same lusty vitality, the same desire to feel that we can express our opinions and our views. We know too that in a world that's becoming increasingly complex, in a world where you never know what is likely to happen in the forty-eight hours that are to come, we also have to have friends and allies. Consequently we want friends and allies who are just

as trustworthy and reliable as we are ourselves. There are certain factors in the Australian economy that we have had to give some considerable attention to in recent years, particularly over the last twelve months. Not that these problems are singular to Australia. I can assure you they are not, but we do face the problem in exactly the same way as you do. But we have cost *Inflation* inflation and we have to a minor degree the appearance of a small degree of unemployment that we feel that we have to overcome as quickly as we can. We have certain other economic problems too that are not so much the direct consequence of internal problems but are problems that arise as the result of our relationship with other countries and the changes that occur in our trade, particularly lately the changes that have occurred in our international currency situation. May I now turn to one of your problems - the one relating to the currency crisis. First of all might I say that of course we understand your *Finance* position. For long the United States has, as it were, sheltered more than a fair proportion of the burden of the world. Not only in the way in which it has provided security for so many countries but also because it has been a reserve currency able to provide the additional international currency that it has provided the free exchange of goods and services. We understood therefore it was necessary not only that you should reduce the burden of your defence effort but also that you should have the opportunity to get a better balance in your payment system. All that we had to decide was the amount of the turn round that was necessary - somewhere

near eight thousand billion dollars per year, but the ways and means that turn round was to be achieved. But I go on further to say this: that so far as we are concerned we are not in a position where we can be explicit about what our own intentions will be because we are not a member of the group of ten. We don't belong to working party three of the OECD. Consequently until decisions are made by the countries that have the decisive influence in world finance, it is not sensible or prudent for us to be making up our minds the way we'll go. On the contrary it seems sensible that we keep all our options open. When the major decisions are made, particularly on the DM and the yen, we'll be able to make up our minds what we are to do. What we do hope is that there is an early re-alignment of currencies, and we hope, even more importantly, that before that occurs that your imports surcharge is removed and that trade will be freer. This way people will have the stars by which they can guide their economic fortunes, rather than the mysteries of today that are confusing everyone. If the difficulties remain for much longer then I think you can have action by other countries in retaliation and a hardening of ideas into dogmas that I think can do damage to all of us. So I do hope therefore that we will have changes and I hope that those changes take place fairly quickly. I can assure you that in my conversations with various members of your Administration I learnt that they share exactly the same view as we do in Australia.

The next economic issue is Britain's entry into the European community. For our part we have always accepted the right of the United Kingdom's Government to make up its own mind what it thought was in its best interests. Nevertheless, what we felt was that Britain, with whom we have had so many years satisfactory and reasonable trading relationships, would represent our interests in the European community and try

E E C

and protect our exports into the Community countries, particularly the primary imports to the maximum of our capacity. But now we do find that there are these growing trade barriers probably as much as \$350 million worth of our goods. We regard it as of critical importance to us all that not only does Britain do its best to represent our point of view and attempt to protect our interests, but that we ourselves discuss with all the European Community countries our problems, to enlist support to see that there is a greater interchange of commodities in the world. And that far from being isolationist and internal-looking that they will be outward-looking. And that the principles of the Kennedy round of negotiations will once again be respected in the world and that freedom of trade will become the catch-phrase rather than the alternative.

May I now turn to our foreign policy and defence.

Because as I said last night at the dinner that was given to me by the President: we believe in Australia and I am sure you believe it to be true too that profound changes are taking place in the policies and relationships of the super and middle powers. The Peoples Republic of China *China* has now entered the United Nations and ever since February of last year, continuing right through to March and until representation was achieved a few days ago, we have persisted with the policy that first of all the Peoples Republic of China should have the permanent seat on the Security Council. At the same time, because we believe in the principles of the Charter itself and we believe in the Charter of universality, *Taiwan* we wanted Taiwan also to remain a member but a member of the General Assmely. We too look at the Soviet Union *Russia* with its increasing power and the knowledge that it is a world power as well. It has begun starting to exercise that power in a part of our world - the Indian Ocean. Up to the present moment it has to be confessed that they have not had large fleets

there. Up to twenty vessels might be there at any one time. They have pretty considerable afloat capacity and they have some access to port facilities and to airfield facilities. We understand just as well as anyone else the reasons why they want this present. In some way to counteract the influence of China, in some ways to balance the influence of the U.S., to protect their own trade interests, and we also believe to be able to make some political influence on the littoral states if they feel that the opportunity arises. For our part, and on behalf of the U.K. we are watching this position very carefully. Your Government has decided to put in a signal station in the Diego Garcia, - I think I could take it for granted, although I have not been given any concrete assurances about it that you yourself will have a counter balancing force there from time to time. Not necessarily permanently based, but I believe you will have a counter balancing force that will show to the littoral states and show to the world that the U.S. is prepared to live up to its obligations in the Indian Ocean as well as it accepts the international burdens of being the greatest of the western powers and the greatest of the super powers as well. We are building a naval base in south western Western Australia - at Cockburn Sound and a first class airfield at Learmouth. We do hope the United States will be able to join with us in the use of these facilities when elements of their fleets might visit our shores. So too the United Kingdom that has its small interests in South Africa and has also agreed to take part with the United States in the signal station in Diego Garcia. So you can therefore see that we are there - the three of us are there - not because we believe that we have any offensive operations in mind, but purely for defensive purposes. To show the rest of the world that we are determined to support the cause of freedom and make our contribution to freedom whenever the opportunity should arise. What I do say to you is this: that we hope that in time our Asian

and Pacific neighbours will come to form a close-knit community that will have a political weight and an importance of its own. By that I mean that I do believe that we have a degree of importance in the South-East Asian countries that is out of all proportion to our own industrial strength and our military capabilities. But I believe that they think this way because of their trust in us, but much more importantly believe in it because they know that we feel that by creating an Asian identity, by creating the feeling that in cooperation we can be a deterrent to aggressive action by insurgency and by other kinds of subversive operations. By that means we can ward off attack and we can devote increasing quantities of our assets to developments in the future, particularly developments for those who today suffer from hunger and the privations of a primitive community.

Might I come to the next and probably the last point that I want to mention before questions are asked. I want to again emphasise because it becomes an article of faith with my own people that whenever we are faced with a problem, whether it is in security area cultural relations, trade or finance, we do make up our own minds what is in our interest. But I like to use the word "independence" at the same time as I use the word interdependence. It indicates the kind of attitude we have to the world in which we live as well as the world with which we have to associate.

8

What we were doing provides a framework for cooperation amongst several of the countries of Southeast Asia. In particular, only a few days ago we have signed or initialled a five part agreement with Malaysia, Singapore, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and ourselves. And what we hope is that in time our Asian and Pacific neighbours will come to form the same kind of close knit community which will be similar to the five power arrangements we have with the countries I've mentioned and that will have political weight and importance of their own. As we see it this will not be a military alliance or bloc but a grouping of like minded countries engaged in close cooperation for their mutual welfare and development whose collective voice will count for something in the world. None of this involves any weakening of our alliance with the United States which remains, and I emphasise this as I emphasise it again and again the sheet anchor of our security. Indeed we would not be able to play our part in the security of our own region without the support for our own defence efforts which the ANZUS treaty provides. Yesterday, the President himself gave his assurance in the clearest terms that the treaty was there to stay and has continuing vitality. Our relationship with the United States has been tested in conflict. Australia and the United States have fought side by side in world wars, in Korea and in Viet-Nam. We have worked closely together for the development and welfare of Southeast Asia and we enjoy the closest cooperation and consultation in the day to day conduct of our international relationships as my present visit has underlined. Of course we make our own independent assessments of particular situations and problems. We vigorously defend and pursue our own national interests in the international scene



and in your bi-lateral relations. At times there are of course differences between Australian and American assessments and between particular Australian and American interests but the sum of the differences that may arise between us is small compared with the interests we have in common, the ideals and objectives which we share. We see ourselves as a partner with the United States in efforts to produce a durable world order and a balance in which the medium sized and smaller powers will be able to consolidate their independence and live in peace. The support we offer is the support of a significant and independent country in the Asian and Pacific regions. A country growing in strength and influence. In short Mr President, we see our relationships not as an echo, not as a satellite but as a partner in the Pacific.

I also emphasise the very close and cordial relationships that exist between your country and ours. At times, of course, there are differences of opinion between us, but they are not very great. It is the common interest we have and common ideals we have that I think are much more important than the differences of opinion wherever they have occurred. In the discussions that I have had with your Administration I have found a very strong disposition to come to terms with us whenever I have raised some difficulty that I think it would be better if we solved. And I think as a result of the discussions I have had in the last few days we will be able to talk on a more frank and, I believe, more sensible basis with Mr. Packard and Mr. Stans and others when they come to Australia than we would have been able to do just a few weeks ago.

Question: Mr. Prime Minister. Is Australia worried about deteriorating relations between the United States and Japan and the resulting effects on security in the Pacific?

Prime Minister: Yes. We were worried about the ostensible deterioration in relationships between Japan and the United States because we think that there are five powers that must take place in a general rearrangement of equilibrium in the world if we are to ensure the basic conditions of success both in peace and in future developments and we know that Japan has to play a particularly important part in the Pacific theatre. I think that when the first visit of Mr. Kissinger took place to Peking there was, I think, a feeling not only of disappointment but almost of despair in the case of Japan. And since the currency crisis and the ten per cent surcharge has been imposed I think that the worries of Japan have become increasingly great. Now it is our view that unless these problems of the currency crisis and a freer exchange of goods and services take place then you are likely to have a period of retaliation and you are likely to find, as I said in the body of my speech, that the views that are held temporarily can easily turn

into dogmas. I have discussed this with the President; I have discussed it with other members of the Administration; they understand the position equally as much as I do, and I think I can assure you they know the necessity for a quick solution. But they also point out and I think it's wise that I should point this out to you too that the answer doesn't fall exclusively in the minds and the hearts and in the intelligence of the American and the Japanese people. The EEC countries and particularly France are involved and consequently it is wise that we try and get a general realignment, a general rearrangement of parities as well as getting the import surcharge taken off at the earliest moment. But it will not be of great advantage to any of us if we find that some countries in the Group of Ten, not Australia, because we are not a member of it, but if some countries in the Group of Ten refuse to play their part, particularly refuse to play their part in ensuring that there is a turn round of something of the order of eight billion dollars in the balance of payments as between the United States and the rest of the world.

Question: What do you see as the future defence alliances in South East Asia in the light of the United Nations vote and President Nixon's revised China policy.

Prime Minister: I don't think that there will be any general realignment of security or military alignments in S.E. Asia because the truth of the matter is there is not one country there that is on its own or in combination with one of its allies capable of defending itself against a major attack by one of the super powers or one of the very great powers. The second point is that I don't think the Nixon doctrine itself has undergone any change whatsoever as a result of the new China policies or the meeting of the President with the hierarchy in Moscow. I believe that this policy still holds good and it is a policy identical with our own. Primary responsibility for defence must reside basically with the country concerned but if in the case of insurgency or subversion it becomes beyond their capacity it becomes an area

responsibility. After that I believe that is protection against attack by a nuclear power, whether by nuclear weapons or otherwise, that the United States will live up to its treaty obligations and its defence obligations. Consequently I can't see the necessity for any great realignment in the defence or security sense. I believe the position remains much the same as it was before these general security realignments took place.

Question: Mr. Prime Minister. If Uncle Sam is moving into a balance of power with Red China where does this leave Australia?

Prime Minister: First of all I don't think that this means that there could be an alliance between the Peoples Republic and the United States. In my view the motive, in fact the sole motive behind the actions of the President, is to try to get a balancing of power in order to ensure that countries can look forward to the future free from the dangers of an imminent war and can consequently devote more of their efforts to developing projects and to be able to provide the under-developed countries of the world with better opportunities for better living. In other words I don't think for one moment the U.S. wants to change its relationship with Japan. So far as we are concerned I have received unqualified assurances from the President as well as the Secretary of State that the ANZUS Treaty remains as valid today as it did on the date on which it was signed. So I just want to, if I can, dismiss the idea of any alignment of the U.S. or ganging up by the U.S. with the Peoples Republic of China or Russia. On the contrary what he wants to ensure is that there is a reduction in tensions and the countries, of course, that must make the major, if not the sole contributions towards the reduction of tensions is the U.S.S.R. and in particular too China as it moves into the nuclear age.

Question: Will you please expand on your reference to the dialogue with China. How soon will relations be established?

Prime Minister: Our own?

Questioner: Yes.

Prime Minister: This again is one of those questions that is extremely difficult to answer. As long ago as February/March last year I did ask my Department, I was then the External Minister, and later on I became the Foreign Minister too, to develop a series of position papers relating to China, that is the Peoples Republic to the U.S.S.R. and to Japan. We then decided not only did we want representation of China in the United Nations but that steadily we should move toward bilateral improvement in our bilateral relationships between China and ourselves. You will notice that I don't use the word *China* "recognition" because I think that would be moving a little too quickly for some sections of public opinion in Australia itself. I have also been reminded by many people that when you are dealing with the Chinese they take their time so you don't want to be in too great a hurry. For example one country reminded us that it took sixteen years for them from the date they started till the date recognition or the formalities of recognition were completed. So far as we in Australia are concerned we permit our own citizens to move freely subject to security requirements. We have got a very liberal trade attitude. Apart from strategic goods of a war-like character we permit them to sell to us and for us to sell to them. In cultural and scientific relationships there are no bars whatsoever. So far as we are concerned, leaving defence and security out of it, there is complete freedom of movement and restrictions are very very few. We do have some problems on trade. And at once I think I should make it clear that if China has the opportunity to play politics of course it will do so, but equally too if it believes it can get advantage out of trade or other relationships with Australia or some advantage to China, there might be greater advantages to ourselves, of course, it will deal with it in a matter of fact and businesslike fashion. So we are there

we have been negotiating with them in various countries and particularly in Hong Kong. We haven't got very far in the improvement in our relationships but the matter is in their hands if they indicate shortly that they would like a trade mission to go to China or they would like officials of our own Government to be associated with a trade mission we would take action, but we are in no hurry. At every step we will consider our own interests, our own best interests, and what we should do in our best interests. We certainly are not going to be creating the impression with the Peoples Republic of China or the Government of the Peoples Republic of a great anxiety at any time to have better relationships with them. We will do what we can but we will be just as patient as they are and above all we will be continually considering Australia's major interests.

Question: Would Australia favour a U.S. military presence in South East Asia after Vietnam and also what do you consider the prospects for peace will be in Indo-China after the American withdrawal?

Prime Minister: The first part of the question is very easy to answer. But it is a question that should be directed to the United States Administration and not to me, because in a country where I am a guest I think it is a little imprudent to be offering suggestions to the government of that country as to its conduct of either diplomatic or military affairs. I believe in the Bandung principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries, but speaking as it were at a press conference where I suppose everything will be kept relatively secret, of course we want the American presence to remain there just as long as it can and of course we want them even when ground combat troops have been withdrawn. We would like them to maintain residual air and naval forces providing the people of the United States feel that it is proper and in the best interests of the Indo-Chinese people. As to the question of the viability of Indo-China, or the four states of Indo-China, from all that I have heard during the course of the last few days, and I

have been briefed at very senior levels, I think that both aspects of Vietnamisation are turning out to be successful. First of all on the military level your own advisers informed me that the people of South Vietnam are increasingly able to look after themselves, and the United States Administration is determined on an aid programme that will give them the opportunity for development programmes that in a civil sense permit them to remain viable. As to our own efforts we have a very large civil aid programme of the order of twenty five million dollars and we have now under consideration proposals for agreement in cooperation with New Zealand and the United States proposals to establish or to participate in, training centres both for advisers and for military training personnel. We will do this in South Vietnam not only for the South Vietnamese but for the Cambodians; in other words what I do say is this; that whereas five or six years ago it looked as though it was impossible for South Vietnam and Cambodia should remain independent and free. The prospects are much greater today and with a little good fortune and a little good luck and provided we are able to give the civil aid programme what they need in a residual capacity in terms of military effort, then I think the prospects of success are ever so much brighter than they were two three or four years ago.

Question: Senator Muskie a likely Presidential candidate says that it is only a matter of time before South Vietnam goes communist. Do you agree?

Prime Minister: If you express an opinion like that frankly it's one of the occasions when I'm driven to despair. It would be a tragedy for this world if after so much American blood and effort had been spilled, after so much life has been lost, and such a tremendous effort has been devoted to the cause of South Vietnam, of the right of the South Vietnamese people to determine their own future, we should be so despairing as to think that all we have done will turn out to be valueless and that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong

will overrun South Vietnam and probably too Cambodia. I hope it doesn't occur. I don't know on what grounds Senator Muskie has made his views known other than of course he is an aspirant for Presidential honours. But if I can take note of what was said yesterday by men I believe to be ever so much better informed than he is, then in their views the prospects of survival are pretty good. I would be inclined to take their views ever so much more than I take the views of Senator Muskie.



Question: Would Australia, and New Zealand and the free nations of South East Asia feel more secure if the U.S. kept a permanent naval force in the Indian Ocean to counter Soviet influence in that area?

Prime Minister: Not only can I give the most emphatic yes to this but it would be a constant source of delight to me and as one who is given to turbulence in the middle of the night I can assure you it would make my life ever so much happier and my evenings ever so much more enjoyable.

Question: Do you have any reservations at all about <sup>Investment</sup> foreign investment in Australia. If so, could you tell us what they are. Do you have any preference between sources of capital inflow?

Prime Minister: We haven't any strong preferences for where capital comes from. But what I can say about capital coming from North America is that they, I believe more than most other countries, want to live up to the basic principles of overseas investment in Australia. First, we want increasing Australian equity participation in corporative activities. Second, we want Australians to be able to participate in management and administration. For that reason we welcome American participation. We also welcome their technological knowhow and the contributions they have made particularly in the development of our vast mineral deposits in the west and our Bass Strait oil deposits. I can't in a question like this go right into the details, but American investment in Australia is welcome to us providing only the provisions I mentioned a few moments ago are observed. We do want greater Australian participation. We do want greater Australian participation in management, but at the same time we welcome American contributions to our future.

Question: One of your predecessors once said here regarding Vietnam "all the way with LBJ". Would you now subscribe to the 1968 political assertion that "Nixon's the one?"

Prime Minister: I think it would be indelicate of me and a kind of plagiarism if I was either to copy or appear to be copying what was said by my predecessors. And I don't know which one of my predecessors you're referring to in the last part of what you said. I think prudence demands that I keep my own counsel. I coin my own phrases and if before the next question is asked I can think of something even better but less provocative I will tell what it is.

Question: In view of Australia's strong protest to the French over its pacific nuclear testing programme do you propose to make similar protests to the U.S. over its controversial underground test this weekend?

Prime Minister: I think you can take it that our attitude has been made clear in the agreements we have made. So far as nuclear testing in the atmosphere is concerned we have protested no matter what country carries out nuclear tests in the atmosphere. So far as underground tests are concerned we have no agreement and consequently we do not think that we are in a position legitimately or according to international law, to make a protest. But we have also been assured that these underground tests do not have the dangers or anywhere near the dangers that can be carried out either in terms of pollution or danger to life or limb that you have from atmospheric tests. Consequently no protest will be made by us. We certainly anxiously enquire as to what the prospects of pollution, what the prospects of danger might be, not only to Australia but to the people of other countries as well.

Question: Has the all-white Immigration policy of Australia changed?

Prime Minister: I don't know that there ever was an "all-white" policy in Australia but I think I could say this to you, and it is worth while repeating. I believe that in my own country there is less of a feeling about racism than in any other country I have visited. In short while there can be a lot of discussion in the media and there can be a lot of provocative talk about it, Australians do accept people of other races and other colours and they are an

extremely tolerant people. Tolerance probably isn't the right word. They just happen to accept people and particularly they accept the people of South East Asia. Now our policy is a quite clear one. We want one Australian people. We want those who come there to live permanently to be Australians. We don't want little enclaves that can be a source of irritation or a source of difficulty for us. Secondly we do permit non-Europeans to come in providing and providing only three qualifications are complied with. The first one is that they have the skills that we need, the second one is that they will make a contribution to our development. The third is that they are capable of intergrating and in fact do become integrated with us so that in time, particularly in the case of their children, it is impossible either to discern the origins of their parents or that they have any other loyalty than loyalty to the country in which they reside and in which they find their welfare. So I just have to say this about any so-called particular Australian policy: it is one that I think is wise and prudent. It is one that is not based upon racism, it is one that I believe that anyone who has been to the country will recognise that the people are not given to racism but to welcoming people for what they are and what they are capable of contributing rather than the origins of their parents.

Question: Prime Minister. The Sydney Opera House has been called Australia's Fl11. Which will get off the ground first? And also how does it compare with the Kennedy Centre?

Prime Minister: Fortunately the opera house is on the ground and as yet we haven't been able to get the 111 off it so I can't in precise terms answer your question. As to the Kennedy Centre and the opera house I don't think you can compare them. The opera house, our opera house, is something completely novel and astonishingly beautiful. You have got to see it; it is not built in accordance with what I would regard as the Washington model. You see a building that is rectangular, however beautiful it might be, but nonetheless it conforms

to classical Greek or Roman tradition. The opera house is entirely novel and I wouldn't therefore like to make a comparison. But to each and everyone of you who are here and you wouldn't be here if you weren't interested in Australia the opening will be in 1973. I hope you will be able to have some little investment in the future of Australia and by 1973 you will be able to have sold your investment and out of the profits attend the opening concert when it appears. Because I hope by that time not only will we have a good orchestra but the best singers we are capable of taking from the United States.

Question: As England joins the Common Market won't this bring Australia and New Zealand closer together?

Prime Minister: We are pretty close and the only time we ever seem to, or we appear to be disagreeable, is when it is suggested that New Zealand should become the seventh State. But without saying it so that it can be heard in New Zealand, we still look at them as the seventh State, but I don't think the relationship between the two countries is capable of very much improvement today.

Question: There are easy questions also. Will there be war between Pakistan and India?

Prime Minister: I don't think that either the Government of India or the Government of Pakistan want war. The real danger arises from the fact that the people of East Pakistan are being trained in guerilla warfare and by accident it could so happen that armed attack might occur either from the Pakistan army or the freedom fighters in East Pakistan itself. No one, I believe, can tell you what the prospects are likely to be. What we must all do, and I will certainly be playing my part, I will have the good fortune to talk to Mrs. Gandhi tomorrow is to press with her and to press with the President <sup>Yahya</sup> ~~Yahya~~ Khan that war must not take place. It can't benefit India, it can't benefit Pakistan and

above all it cannot benefit any of the people of these two countries. Those of us who feel we can play a part, however humble it might be, have got to bring home to everyone the lesson that war will benefit no one. The sooner we can persuade the Pakistanis to permit democracy or democratic regime to be established under the Awami League in East Pakistan as part of a total Pakistan solution, the better it will be. He has made his promise. I only hope he will be able to live up to it.

Question: The final question: what impelled you to buy the dress Mrs. McMahon wore at the White House last night?

Prime Minister: I know her better than anyone. I like the shape of her legs, I like the look of her face, I like the fact that she chose me for her husband at the same time I chose her to be my wife. When I happened to be walking past a shop in Double Bay and saw a dress in black I then said to her I thought she should buy it. That was six weeks ago, before the President had asked me to come here, and before I knew the President was giving a State Dinner in our honour. When I heard of the dinner I gave instructions - not that they matter very much in my household - but I gave instructions that she was to go down and have the dress, not in black because I thought that there was nothing to mourn about, but in white because this was something we could acclaim. And above all as immediately before I had the good fortune to become the Leader of the Liberal Party in Australia, one of the assets I was supposed to have was a photograph of my wife with one leg projecting unnecessarily from a maxi shirt. I felt, well, if you can have one split on the maxi side, well why couldn't she have two sides - it might be twice as good for me - so there's the answer. I wish, Sir, that I had known you were going to ask this question because as I chose the dress, I practically designed the colour and insisted on the two splits up the side, I think I could have ensured she wore it here today even though it isn't the kind of dress that you would wear on an occasion similar to this.