

~~1007~~

PRIME MINISTER: ....at 11.00 o'clock and I wanted to see this century old market at Castlemaine, following on Mr Justice Oakes Committee on the National Estate report ~~wh~~ we are going to restore ~~the~~ to the cost of 46,000. ~~x~~ I also have of course ~~a~~ a dutiable because my ~~grand~~ grandfather Henry Hugh Gough Whitlam was born here, in 1856. I am the most Victorian of all ~~the~~ political leaders in our nation. Are there any questions you would like to ask me gentlemen.

*Food Prices*

QUESTION: Mr Anthony has now said that it wouldn't be possible to freeze food prices, Mr Snedden says he is going to. Do you have any opinion on whether or not that it is possible

PRIME MINISTER: I'm ~~tried~~ of trying to reconcile Mr Snedden and Mr Anthony. My own view is that one cannot realistically freeze the price of foods stuffs such as meat because as Mr Snedden himself confessed if one tries to do that, then graziers and sheep men will keep their cattle and sheep from the abitors. I don't regard it as any solution to follow Mr Snedden's idea that in that case one could import meat. Meat hasn't been imported into Australia as I said at the Sydney Opera House yesterday, since Bennelong was a ~~boy~~ boy, since Governor Philipp planted the Union Jack at Circular Quay. My govt took this attitude when the Parliamentary Committee on Prices made a recommendation about meat, the govt rejected the recommendation, believed it wasn't a realistic one. I agree with Mr Anthony on this, I think Mr Snedden was just thrashing about on this ~~the~~ matter ~~as~~ as he has on all his last minute proposals for income and prices freezes.

*Income & Prices freezes*

QUESTION: I noticed that the Mr Snedden said that the Liberal Govt would spend ~~\$200~~ \$200 ~~million~~ million less on education....

PRIME MINISTER: I thought t he said \$300 million less...

*Education*

QUESTION: You may be right....

PRIME MINISTER: I was going on the Sun-Pic which said \$300 million less.

QUESTION: Would that amount be important, would there be many schools suffer.

PRIME MINISTER: He doesn't specify in ~~what~~ what field of education he would reduce the prospective...what field or fields of education he would reduce the prospective expenditure. It may be at the tertiary level, the universities, colleges of advanced education and both Government and non-Government teachers colleges for which my Government has made commitments. Presumably however, the reduction in expenditure would mainly be at the expense of the secondary and primary schools. I suppose technical colleges are partly secondary and partly tertiary. He doesn't specify where the reduction will be. It will be appreciated that the ~~expend~~ expenditure that my Government has undertaken in education has in every case been on the advice of expert committees. For primary and secondary schools it was on the recommendation of the Karmel Committee; the interim committee for the Schools Commission. On behalf of universities, it's been on the recommendation of the Universities Commission under Professor Karmel. In the colleges of advanced education it's been on the recommendation of the commission on advanced education under Swanson. Now so...And then the prospective expenditure that we will make on technical and further education will be on the basis<sup>o</sup> of the recommendations of the ~~Kangon~~ <sup>KANGAN KAWON</sup> Committee which was tabled just -before the Parliament was dissolved. *Education*

It may be that there will be some expenditures which would relate to education on the recommendation of the Cochran<sup>o</sup> Committee on training adult training and re-training and also of this inter-departmental committee which has reported on its findings concerning re-training *Cochran Committee*

schemes in comparable countries. We haven't yet undertaken, we haven't yet as a government yet collectively endorsed the recommendations or haven't ~~seen~~ received the recommendations of the ~~Chair~~ Cohrane Committee and we haven't considered the recommendations of the Inter-departmental committee. The Kangaroo Committees report we have accepted in principle. David Kennedy whose interest in education matters you'll all remember from his 3½ years in the House of Representatives reminds me that there are on top of this, commitments concerning fees being abolished and also living allowances being increased in number and amount. I mention all these matters they are all subjects of reports which we have received and we have also ~~not~~ accepted the recommendations of reports in the educational field and I have no doubt that we will accept~~x~~ for the coming budget that means for the scholarsatic and ~~academic~~ academic year 1975 and subsequent~~x~~ years the recommendations of these expert. After all they have been ~~unanimous~~ unanimous recommendations from widely representative committees and nobody ~~has~~ criticised them. Now I don't know which of these expenditures Mr Snedden is threatening to cut I ~~do~~ never heard him specify what recommendations of these committees he rejects, in fact I don't remember him speaking on education matters at all in the Parliament.

QUESTION: Prime Minister, yesterday Mr Fairbairn challenged you to give a undertaking that your govt wouldn't increase the price of petrol, (unclear) he said that because of the (unclear) increases on petrol (unclear) petrol prices?

PRIME MINISTER: Well about the prices ~~of~~ for Australian crude oil. We will not allow that price to be increased before the agreement expires in Sept next year. I would think it most unlikely that thereafter we would agree to any increase in the prices crude oil coming from deposits already discovered and

Education  
 Reports  
 Implementation

Petrol  
 Prices

oil

operating. I believe that Mr Fairbairn has been too naive in accepting the propoganda of the oil companies in the Bassy Strait case its an overseas oil company ESSO, there is not a shred of evidence to show that oil exploration in Australia is more expensive or that discoveries are less profitable than is the case in any other country, its true that the price of crude oil since the September War last year has increased in most oil producing countries it has increased not because of any increase in the cost of exploration or extraction for transport, its not been caused by any increase in the rake-off which the oil companies exact, its because of the increase in the taxes and royalties imposed by the countries where the oil is found. ~~And~~ There is nothing to ~~show~~ show that oil exploration in Australia is more expensive or less profitable than in other country. Our attitude to oil exploration is shown very clearly from our proposed legislation of the Petroleum and Minierals Authority, we believe that the proper way for a country to discover oil, one of the proven methods, of discovering oil in any country is for some ~~govt~~ governmental instrumentality in that country to take part in the search and the development and that means that the govt of the country becomes a party to the information ~~the~~ the geoglogical formations and prospects, it also is able to share in the ownership of any deposits that are found as well as share, as well as share in the knowledge which is gained. This is the method <sup>which</sup> that the French use, its the method <sup>which</sup> that the Italians <sup>use</sup>, its the method which the Canadians are now adopting and Brazil and there are a great number of these countries have set up corporations of this character. Australia would I think, <sup>would</sup> be the only country ~~where~~ the only industrialise country, or the only country where it is ~~sought~~ sought where their are any indications of oil ~~and~~ or natural gas that there is not a governmental instrumentality taking part in the search and the development of the oil and natural gas ~~deposits~~ deposits.

*Oil  
Exploration*

*Oil*  
*Petroleum*  
*Minerals*  
*Authority*  
*Bill*

The one that we have been basing ourselves on for the last ten years in our thoughts has been any. In Italy the ~~na~~ internationale edro cabori and as in Italy and France, Canada to take the cases where we are most familiar with the operations, it's not a Government monopoly. The instrumentality as you know the <sup>he's</sup> bill sets out/~~xx~~ authorised enter into consortia or arrangements of any kind for discovery and development and processing and marketing with individuals or with companies and these companies can be overseas companies or Australian companies or with State Governments or with a combination of all of them. It's no secret about this because the bill has been twice passed by the House of Representatives and twice rejected by the Senate and it's one of the ~~xx~~ six bills upon which the Governmr-General granted us a dissolution of both houses.

QUESTION: Is there a possibility of a two-teered policy for prices and incomes?

PRIME MINISTER: That is a system which has been used in many other countries. The price remains constant for the existing discoveries. The price is negotiable to new discoveries. That is obviously a method which one could consider in Australia. If you have an instrumentality in the field such as petroleum and minerals authority, you have the ~~xx~~ knowledge of what the costs are and this is one of the reasons of ~~xxxx~~ course why we want to get into the tanker trade as well so that one's able to discover the cost of transporting. If Menzies hadn't sold out the Commonwealth Oil Refineries, we would have been in a very much better position in all these respects as to regards search, transport and refining and distribution.

QUESTION: Sir, could I ask you your reaction to Mr Snedden's

(unclear)

indirect tax

(unclear)

Direct  
Indirect  
Taxation

PRIME MINISTER: I've been asked the questions before on this and I think I need only repeat the answers I've given previously. I see no reason why taxes direct, or indirect, need to be increased in order to pay for any of our continuing commitments, the continuation of programs we've already introduced or for the introduction of programs for which we've already introduced legislation but which the Senate has rejected or for programs which I have undertaken in greater detail in my policy speech for this election. In particular I undertook two new commitments. One is to have a complete...to introduce a complete availability of care and education for children under 5 everywhere in Australia, city and country, new suburbs, old suburbs. That will cost an additional 130 million dollars in the coming financial year. It's mainly current expenditure. I'd emphasise it's not a capital intensive program at all. It's not like a program for schools or tertiary institutions. It's a program based on people operating ~~in~~ in existing community facilities or in fact in their own homes or their own streets. The other proposal is to exempt the matrimonial home during the lifetime of the survivor of a marriage and the Treasury has worked that out as involving 10 million a year. There was another proposal I made to exempt .. well to allow people to deduct from their ...for taxation purposes the amount when they paid for the support of dependants even if those dependants are not in Australia. Treasury said there would be no cost to the revenue involved. Now I read Mr Snedden's statement yesterday and he makes no specific costings at all. The new programs that I've pronounced, I have just gone over now and I have told you what the estimates of costs are. I put them in the policy speech. It's not necessary to increase direct or indirect taxes to pay for any of them. I issued costing of those items which we cut and which Mr Snedden says that he would restore.

Child  
care  
education

I didn't purport to go through the whole of his policy speech because it seemed to me it was deliberately...it was vague. Now that was either because of her was deliberately vague or because he is constitutionally vague. But I did specify the cost of those subsidies & concessions, loopholes and lurks which we had ended and which he said he'd restore.

*Govt Expenditure*

QUESTION: Prime Minister, Mr Fraser says that all the Treasury predictions has to make, Government would have to -- Government expenditure would have to rise by 5,000 million in 74/75 to make way for its programs. He goes on to say that Mr Hayden told him that the Treasury estimates had been published and believed that they had gone to Cabinet or a Cabinet Committee. Is this true?

*SYNTEC*

PRIME MINISTER: There has been no submission to Cabinet, there has been no document prepared by Treasury. Mr Fraser bases his allegations on a newsletter ~~xxxxxxx~~ produced by some body called Syntec. Mr Fraser has made several statements. I believe he is the most prolific author of all the members of the Opposition and most of them are based on Syntec. I think I heard him...Yes I did. I heard this and I saw this debate between Mr Fraser and Sir Charles Court and Mr Hayden and Mr Dunstan on Mike Willesee's show on Sunday and Mr Fraser mentioned Syntec as the basis of this allegation. Mr Hayden said that there have been no collation of departmental claims. That most of the claims are not in. I can verify that ~~in~~ my own Department claims, for instance in the Arts and so on are not in. It's the practice for departments to make all their claims by the end of April. That's because a budget usually comes in in the middle of August. The claims have been deferred this year because as happened in 1951 & last time there was a double dissolution, the budget will not come in until ~~before~~ September. And accordingly, the claims will not even come in till the end of this month or even

into June and then the Cabinet will not be considering the various claims until late in July or even August. It depends when the first session of the Parliament take s place.

QUESTION: On behalf of Patrick Whiteman and myself, it's got to do with your statement on public lending rights whether it's 50 cents a year or it's 50 cents per volume . Is it an annual or a lump sum?

PRIME MINISTER: I'll have to find out.

QUESTION: k(unclear)

PRIME MINISTER: I don't know. I think your volumes are selling very well. I do what I can to advertise them. I forget it may be it's only for each volume that goes into a library and I would think that the run there is on your works that they would have to be replaced in ..more frequently than yearly.

QUESTION: (unclear)

PRIME MINISTER: Well that's becaguse they're bound in HongKong. I'm not sure if I'm right there but the authors get it but the only publishers that get it are those who are Australians. Authors will get them even if they're even if they're overseas but Australian. Publishers that is the printer - the publishers won't unless he's Australian. I think there's one other one isn't there

QUESTION: But it would have to be annually?

PRIME MINISTER: I suppose so but that's only slow moving line. Laurie would be wise to ask it for each volume.

QUESTION: Mine will only be slow moving and I need it.

PRIME MINISTER: Look I'll give you a copy - we can give you a copy of the report. I don't think there's enought copies to give all round but there's no secret about it. You'll be in Canberra tomorrow and I'll show it to you.

QUESTION: The other question - you were quoted in the Sydney Telegraph on Monday - I don't know where they got it from - it was some interview - but government expenditure is going to

*Public Lending  
Rights to Authors*



increase by 20% next year rather than 50% ~~by~~ suggested by Mr Snedden. Can you give us details of that or verify it?

*Increase in Govt expenditure*

PRIME MINISTER: I stated this on Frost so it will come out tomorrow night and it would therefore be embargoed until tomorrow night. I know you wouldn't have broken the embargo. You were in the studio at the time but you must have seen it in writing ~~at~~ somewhere. I'm not suggesting that you<sup>d</sup>ask a question which hadn't been in print already which somebody else hadn't broken the embargo on but I was asked on the basis of Malcolm Fraser's quotation from Syntec. I think it was that things would go up 40% and I said that that had never been suggested. There were no documents to that effect. And he said where would it be. I said I think it would be somewhere midway. And that is purely ~~at~~ a hunch. I point out that expenditure in the Government's sector in fact is rising more slowly than in the private sector. This is not only in current expenditure but still more in capital expenditure. The latest statistics - the statisticians latest bulletin shows I think ~~at~~ I suppose you can look it up - I'm going from memory that the increased capital expenditure by industries is respectively 40% whereas we have quite deliberately kept down capital expenditure except where it would be cheaper than hiring private premises. But I did say on Frost that ~~at~~ I thought it would be about 20 which is rather less than the estimates the private enterprise is giving.

QUESTION: Would that be 20% across the board, Prime Minister?

PRIME MINISTER: The average of the lot. It's obviously I would think expenditure on public housing this coming year wouldn't go up as much as - the coming year wouldn't go up as much as the year just ending because it's been shown that the money can't be spent and there are many items which are continuing ones where

the expenditure would be less but I would expect that there would be some items in the cities field, urban and regional development which would be greater in the coming year than in the year just expired because the expenditure we allocated in last budget hasn't been all taken up by the States. As you know in transport and land development alone there must be - I'll have the figures precisely for tomorrow night at Bankstown - but there must be over 40 million available for the New South Wales Government in Mr Crean's last budget which wasn't taken up. Well we would be making it available in the next budget. Clearly the increase in expenditure would show up as a considerable expenditure in the next budget but it wouldn't be such a large increase over the expenditure allowed for ~~x~~ in the last budget.

QUESTION: I think Mr Fraser is basing his....

PRIME MINISTER: On Syntec

QUESTION: yes ~~x~~ on what has been said about <sup>forward</sup> ~~xxxx~~ estimates...

PRIME MIISTER: Well there aren't... Forward estimates are not yet in. They may be for some departments but Mr Fraser's been a Minister. He knows that every department ~~x~~ puts in much more than it expects to get. The estimates which we got from departments last July were at least halved. And if we hadn't been able to cut ~~x~~ <sup>a lot</sup> of these inherited lurks exposed by the Cooms Task Force, they would have ~~x~~ had to be cut further still. Some of the Coombs Task Force recommendations will have their full impact in the new year. The superphosphate for instance will only be half effective. It's meant no saving at all in 73/74. It will only make a half saving in 74/75 because the Act doesn't expire until the end of December. 75/76 will be a complete saving.

\*\*\*\*\*

*superphosphate  
Sentry*

*Budget*