



PRIME MINISTER

TRANSCRIPT: FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS' PRESS CONFERENCE

DATE: FRIDAY 18 MARCH 1983

GORDON DRAKE (RADIO LONDON)

Is there any change of truth to the start of the Royal Tour in view of the floods at Alice Springs?

PM.

Not as I am informed.

GORDON DRAKE

Can I ask you another question about the Constitution? There is a Constitutional Conference going on in Adelaide next month as I understand it. I saw the reconstruction of the events of 1975 last night on television I just felt what you feel on how a Governor-General at the end of the day on that fall over, should feel. What is your feeling about what can happen at the end of the day? Do you feel there is going to be a Governor-General in Canberra?

PM

At the end of the Adelaide Conference, of course.

GORDON DRAKE

At the end of the Parliament?

PM

Yes, I made it quite clear in the campaign that the question of a Republic which you seem in a rather, if I may say in a rather circuitous way, trying to get to that question, the question of a Republic, is something which I think is a long way down the path. I have made it clear that I think Australia will come to that position, something to which they will come gradually, as a result of discussions conducted within our country. I have made it clear that I thought that if there were a Republic tomorrow it wouldn't do one thing to improve the conditions of people in this country who need help and that is what I am concerned about. I have a very acute sense of priorities in these matters.

NEW ZEALAND PRESS ASSOCIATION

Last year with unemployment rising was pressure mounting to restrict the flow of New Zealanders coming to Australia, does your government plan any extra cutbacks on New Zealanders?

PM

The question of the relationship between our two countries in terms of immigration is covered by the firm agreements and nothing would be done precipitately by my government to try and change that situation. I think that we will be having discussions in a number of areas and the question of the movement of people between our countries would obviously be something that Mr Muldoon would want to discuss as much as we would. May I just gratefully add to that answer that as you know I spoke to Mr Muldoon on Wednesday evening to convey to him the decision of our Cabinet to endorse the CER agreement and I would believe that at a reasonably early opportunity we would be having discussions and I think this matter would be one of the items that we would talk about, but there is nothing precipitate going to be done in that area.

NEW ZEALAND PRESS

Is that something that you would like to see happen.

PM

I regard our relations with New Zealand as so important that I wouldn't want to be seeing something happen in any immediate sense which could damage those relations. I repeat, it's one of the issues that I think both sides would want to talk about.

Q:

Your Government covers the United States bases in Australia and indeed the ANZUS treaty.

PM

Well we made it quite clear that in respect of the bases that they will stay. There is some suggestion that we could be looking at the stationing of some person or persons in the United States to give more substance perhaps to the concept of full knowledge and we will be discussing that matter with our United States friends. In respect of the alliance I made quite clear during the campaign, as does our party platform, that our alliance with the United States is fundamental to our stance in the area of international relations and the security and defence of this country. I also made it clear as in fact spokespersons in this country and in the United States going back to the time of the forging of ANZUS that circumstances would change through time. Leading administration and defence spokesmen in the United States have made it clear over the years that it would make sense to look at the alliance and the treaty arrangements to make sure that its terms were most appropriate to the circumstances of the time and of the foreseeable future. Our friends in the United States understand our position absolutely and without equivocation and without any criticism on this point.

Indeed I understand that they share our view that at some appropriate time in the future it would make sense for us to sit down constructively and see, do the provisions of the treaty as they stand serve our mutual interests as most effectively as they can in current circumstances. As I have tried to make clear in previous answers on this point, this is a characteristic which will be evident in the approach of my government, not merely in international relations but in respect of the way in which we handle the Australia domestic economy. The silliest mistake that any government can make here or elsewhere is to assume that the formalised arrangements of the past are necessarily entirely appropriate to the world of today. We've never lived in a time of more dramatic change than we are involved in now and we have shown in the areas of technology, the way we produce goods and services that we have to be prepared to change. Now we have got to have the same intelligent flexibility in all that we do in domestic politics and external politics. Having said all that I reiterate what I said at the beginning, our relationship with the United States is foundational as far as my government is concerned.

CARL ROBINSON (NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE)

The Labor Party and your government are committed to resuming aid to Vietnam. Do you foresee any problems in implementing this policy as far as the United States and the ASEAN countries are concerned.

PM

No. I have already had talks with one of the Ambassadors from the ASEAN countries, the Indonesian Ambassador, and I have got the clear impression from him and of course I am never going to breach the confidentiality of discussions that I have with Ambassadors and representatives of other countries but I think I can broadly say that there is an understanding of our position and I would remind you as you would know yourself from the reading of the reports in the last two or three days that arrangements are in train for discussions between the ASEAN countries and the Government of Vietnam without the presence at those talks by the Heng Samrin Government of Kampuchea or the alternative if we can put it that way which is being sponsored by the ASEAN countries. In other words the point I am making is there looks as though there are going to be direct discussions between ASEAN and the Government of Vietnam. Now I am simply saying ^{that} with that development we do seem to see a position where it may be possible to see the Australian Government moving towards the sort of things you raised in your question without there being any difficulties as far as the ASEAN countries are concerned. I make the point that we will not be unilaterally moving in that area without full discussions with the ASEAN countries and similarly with our allies in the United States. So I conclude by saying that I believe that if we move in that direction then it will be on a basis where we have the understanding of the ASEAN countries and ^{of} the United States. I make the concluding point, which is probably not necessary but it ought to be on the record, that we as a government see no merit for the ASEAN countries, for Australia, or for the United States ⁱⁿ the situation where the only relationship which the Government of Vietnam is likely to be able to have is with the Soviet Union.

PETER O'LOGHLEN (ASSOCIATED PRESS)

The previous government had indicated that it would issue some banking licences to foreign banks in the future. What's your government's position on the entry of foreign banks to Australia?

PM

We do not favour it at the present time.

BORIS BEHSRING (DEUTSCHE PRESSE AGENTUR)

Could you in general outline how you envisage Australia's and your own role in world politics?

PM

These points are to be made at the outset. I have a clear understanding of Australia's dimension in the international scene. We are a small country in terms of population and we will be walking a line, if you like, between the absurdity of trying to strut the stage in stature which is not commensurate with the reality of our size and importance and on the other hand the stupidity of isolationism which ignores the fact that we are part of the global community. Within that framework we obviously will be giving an emphasis, a priority, to our relations with the area of which we are immediately a part. We will be trying to strengthen our relations, our economic, political, and cultural relations with the ASEAN countries. We will certainly be paying particular attention to our relations with Japan which is far and away our major trading partner and gradually a country which is assuming more significance in the political, military relationships with our part of the world. We will be giving more attention to our relations with the Peoples Republic of China, and in that respect I am very pleased that the Chinese Premier will be visiting with us next month and we will be having detailed talks with him here in Canberra. I have already pointed out the foundational aspect of the relationship with the United States. Now those are obviously the areas if you like of primary importance. One area I have excluded. We obviously have a very real concern with the whole area of the South Pacific and I will be ensuring that I and my relevant Ministers develop the embryonic bases of consultation and co-operation which already exist in the South Pacific Forum and so on. I ought to of course, also acknowledge the particular relevance to us of Papua New Guinea because Australia is absolutely unique in the world in having contiguous to it what in the terms of the past would be called an ex-colonial area. Now that poses for us strategic economic, political and social responsibilities, that will be an important part of our consideration of our international relationships. I am very pleased to say that I have a close personal relationship with Michael Somare who was in fact a witness for me in the case which I conducted, the Local Government Officers' case, in New Guinea in 1966-67. Now I have given the areas, the priority and emphasis, this does not of course exclude our concern with the rest of the world. If I may refer to the Middle East. We as a government will have a real concern and intention to play whatever limited role we may be able to in moving towards a peaceful and honourable resolution of an area of problems which has been tragic for the people in the area itself and continuously an area of potential disaster for the rest of the world. Of course we have our relations with the Commonwealth and we will continue to play a meaningful role in the affairs of the Commonwealth. We will be attending the C.H.O.G.M. Conference in New Delhi in November of this year. Our trading relationships with Western Europe have been an area of concern particularly for our rural industries where we have residually suffered from the implementation of their agricultural policies and so we will resolutely be continuing discussions with the E.E.C. to try and ensure as far as we are able to that Australian interests are not adversely affected.

In what is necessarily, and I don't apologise for it, a rather lengthy answer because you asked an omnibus question, in a sense that has

left out the eastern block countries. Let me make it clear in respect of our relations with that part of the world that as I said during the campaign, ours will be an approach which is at the same time constructive and cautious. I have had enough personal dealings with the Soviet Union to know that it would be unwise to think that simply to approach the Soviet on the assumption that all is sweet reasonableness, is just not realistic. But at the same time I have throughout my public life and we will in this government, accept and understand the reality of the position of the Soviet Union. I don't embrace and never would, the philosophy which is enshrined within that system but they are in place and the peace of the world, which is a fundamental concern of my government, cannot be talked about in any meaningful way in terms of not attempting to have sensible and constructive relationships with that area. And on that basis we will so attempt to conduct ourselves. Now as I say I make no apology for the length of this answer because if you are going to ask a question like that I have got to try and address myself to every part of the world.

Q. (inaudible)

.... What the attitude of the government is to Latin America. Is your government likely to place more significance on Latin American refugees as did the previous Labor government?

PM

Let me go to the general part of your question and then the specific. In respect of our relations generally with Latin America, I would be asking my Ministers to adopt an approach of trying to improve the relations we have in that area. Quite clearly there are regimes in that area, the nature of which we don't welcome. I put my answer in terms of what I said at the beginning of the previous answer to that longer question. I don't assume, nor will my government be assuming, that it is our role or within our capacity to change the characters of regimes, either in that part of the world or elsewhere. We will try and conduct decent relationships with the governments of that area because our concern is with the people of the countries of Latin America. In respect of the latter specific part of your question - refugees - I simply say that our immigration program will have as a component part of it an acceptance of our obligation as a country to accept refugees and the normal tests and criteria applying in the area of immigration to refugees, that is that people have legitimate status as refugees as internationally accepted, will be applied.

FISHER (AP DOW-JONES)

The 10% devaluation ... was blamed on capital output. Do you have any plans to (inaudible) ...

PM

We've already done it. We've got back more than was lost, and that's because the international as well as the domestic community realised and accepted the correctness, firmness and the decisiveness of our action and, as I anticipated, what has happened is that the exchange under the mechanism which I kept in place, of the crawling peg - which always fascinates me as description of an economic mechanism - has operated to bring back devaluation to the order of about 7½%, which is what I anticipated would happen.

NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN (MR MIKIO OSAWA)

Will your government make any different approach to Japan, compared with the former Fraser government. Japanese business and industry, for example, some of them are very anxious about whether your

government would take various strict policies especially in resource development and export. May I ask your view of that?

PM

Well, the foundational element to the answer to that question is that which I have already given and that is that Japan is our major trading partner, both in terms of the proportion of our exports which it takes and in terms of the source of imports. Figures being relatively I think about 28 and 20%. Now that means that we have to give a special attention to the relationship with Japan and therefore the change of government will not mean any difference in terms of the importance that we attach to the relationship. I think I may say two or three things however which will characterise my government as in some measure different from the approach of the previous government. We will be prepared as a government to give all assistance that we can to our exporters of our major elements of export which are clearly in the iron and coal area, to try and ensure that we get the best possible deal. I say with great respect and admiration for the Japanese Government that they have always regarded as important for government to be involved in the way in which your economy develops. You may have noticed that during the campaign I often called upon the example of Japan to indicate the way in which governments do have a responsibility to try and ensure optimal economic and social development. In Japan your government has involved itself with Industry and the Trade Unions and with academics in trying to work out what is the best way of using the limited material resources and the vast potential you have in terms of your capacity of your labour force, and that has paid off. It has been a remarkable economic performance in the whole of the post-war period. Now it is not surprising, given that philosophy, that the government has applied it in terms of the way in which it conducts trading relationships. You don't leave your trading relations simply to the unco-ordinated activities of your enterprises in Japan, and you're very sensible not to success you have achieved. I think we will be somewhat more assiduous than the previous government in performing in ... to Japan. We will also be trying to make Japanese importers and your government understand it is always sensible in trade negotiations to have a longer view. At the moment we are in a depressed local economic context and there will be, I imagine, some temptation on the part of Japanese importers to seek to take as much advantage as they can in negotiations in the circumstances. Our government will be gently suggesting it is wise to have a longer term view in these matters but we will be moving into a period of economic upturn and that it will be in all our interests that we have these long term relations. May I go to one specific matter which our government would be different from the previous one, in the way it would be very much to the advantage of Japan, and that is that while as I said publicly speeches I think representatives of your country have overstated for trading purposes their perceptions of industrial relations problems in the country, and that's a fair enough bargain I guess. Nevertheless there has been a reality of problems and difficulties in trade between our two countries resulting from industrial disputation on the waterfront and in the maritime industry. Now I just say two things about that. Firstly that it is certain that as a result of the constructive co-operative approach which our government is adopting and which is already receiving the co-operation of the people's community and trade unions that there will be a better industrial relations environment in this country in general and that will be to our mutual benefit. Most specifically I will be looking, and asking my Ministers to look at the question of whether in the area of the maritime industry we may not be able to get a better system of industrial relations

in that area so that trade between our country and other countries doesn't suffer the degree of disruption as the past resulting from that would.

Q: (inaudible)

PM

Yes, there will be a greater degree of consistency between what we say and do on the world stage and what we in fact do internally. I don't think in the past it has been remarkably edifying for Australia to be seen as the spokesman for lowering of protective barriers around the world and then not acting in precisely that way when we get back to the nuts and bolts here. There will be a consistency between what we say and what we do. In respect of the position in this country, my government really if you like, takes the view of the Crawford Committee of Inquiry, which is not altogether surprising seeing as I was a member of that Committee of Inquiry. Now it was a very lengthy inquiry into voluminous reports but if I can reduce the essence of the Crawford Report down in these terms it was along these lines: We concluded that through time the welfare of this country and the criterion of our relations with other countries were at one in requiring a gradual reduction in the levels of protection. Secondly we said that it was politically and economically unreal to talk about moving towards that goal in periods when your human and material resources were significantly under-employed and in which there was no clear indication that further resources released by lowering protection would simply be added to the economic scrap heap of current recess situation. Therefore what we said was that you couldn't in general terms sensibly move towards lowering protection levels until you had succeeded in reducing levels of unemployment and getting the economy moving upwards. Now that was Crawford, if you like, and that is essentially the position of my government and indeed, in the current circumstances of very high and unacceptable levels of unemployment, we would not be moving to further reduce levels of protection but we would have the commitment to getting our economy moving to reducing the levels of employment because that is intrinsically what's necessary and it also is what is required to create the environment within which the desirable goal of moving towards reduced protection can be achieved.

Q:

Given that answer, why then did you agree to sign the CER agreement which lowers protection?

PM

As there is a special relationship between New Zealand and Australia and because the processes involved in that were precisely the sorts of processes which we had talked about in Crawford, and far from it being inconsistent with the Crawford approach, it was totally consistent with it, because what we said in Crawford was that if you are going to have changes then they should come as a result of full co-operation and consultation with those who may be effected. Now in the Closer Economic Relations negotiations with Australian industry, the Australian trade union movement was involved. The ACTU accepted the heads of agreement. They have been involved in the discussions and it was because the conceptual approach of Crawford was reflected in what had happened there that my government had no difficulty, and saw virtue at our first Cabinet meeting this week in endorsing the agreement without change.

Q:

Prime Minister, will there be a peace treaty with the Aborigines and what are your views on suggestions that there should be an Aboriginal sort of state within Australia?

PM

In regard to the latter part of your question, I personally reject the concept of an Aboriginal state and I don't believe that the Aboriginal people round Australia want that or regard it as in any way feasible. I have a total commitment personally, and so does my government, to acting responsibly and consultatively in a way which is going to improve the condition, the quality of life of our Aboriginal people. It still remains, in my judgment a disgrace to our nation that as we come towards the end of the twentieth century, our Aboriginal people are still living in conditions in so many areas which neither do justice to them, nor enable us, I believe, to hold our heads up with pride while those conditions exist. The Australian people were asked in the 1960's in a referendum to say whether the Australian Parliament, the Australian Government, should have responsibility in regard to the Aboriginal people. By an overwhelming majority they answered in the affirmative. I think it unfortunate that not all States have responded to, nor have there been sufficient pressures from this last government in this area. My government will first follow the processes of constructive consultation with the State governments to try and ensure that basic standards are reached in this area. I made it clear during the campaign, and I make it clear now, that I hope that those processes will produce positive results. If they do not the powers of the Australian people deliberately go to the Australian government will be invoked to ensure that the intention of the Australian people in this regard is achieved.

Q: (inaudible)

PM

I say in regard to the peace treaty that that is something I will be asking Mr Holding, the Minister, to look at and discuss. I have an open mind about it, it seems to me that it may be one of the implements if you like of reaching decent decisions in respect of the Aboriginal people. I am one who tends to believe that in these areas not just when you are talking about the aboriginal people but when you are talking about the conditions of people generally, that more important than words are actions. But I say that if nevertheless there is a feeling that the concept of the treaty is something which will provide a framework for more constructive action then it is something that should be looked at. But as I said before I am more interested in action than words.

Q:

Could you give us your views on what Australia's relations with South Africa will be? Whether you support totally the previous government's position, particularly the decision not to issue visas to cricketers if they desire?

PM

Well I really do wish you would get your time perspectives better in place when you're talking about what has happened in the past. There is an assumption in your question that Australia's position in regard to South Africa arose out of the decisions of the Fraser government. (Inaudible comment from questioner.) Well, there is a

tendency if you look at your question, to come to that conclusion. Now of course the realities are that it was the Whitlam Labor Government between 1972-75 who reshaped Australia's attitude towards South Africa. Now I can say with great authority that that is the case because in my capacity as President of the ACTU before the Whitlam Labor Government came to power I pleaded with the previous government, McMahon Government, to adopt sensible attitudes in regard to visits of sporting teams from South Africa. They refused to do so and we were told that this was ridiculous and that you had to allow completely open doors in this matter. I was reviled for the lead which I took in this matter by the previous conservative government. Of course we were right and the position that I espoused then on behalf of the total Labor Movement when they were in opposition came to be the conventional wisdom from the conservatives after 1975, so I go to that point so that the whole time scale in perspective can be put right. When my government acts now in respect of South Africa it will not be simply continuing what Mr Fraser did, we will be picking up what Labor did as far as it could in industrial opposition in pre-1972 and what we did in government during 1972-75. And therefore against that background I applaud the fact that Mr Fraser did come to realise that we were right and continued our policies, and we will essentially be continuing what we started and what he embraced. And we will be doing that as far as Australia is concerned and in the international forums of the world we will be co-operating with all decent-minded governments and doing what we can do co-operatively with other nations to see that the obscenity of apartheid is brought as quickly and as peaceably to an end as is possible.

PHIL BRADSHAW (REUTER)

There is a report in the Sydney Morning Herald suggesting you might be embarrassed by the ALP stance on East Timor. Is that the case?

PM

It may as well be understood now that I will not be commenting in any detail upon discussions that I have with the representatives of other countries, discussions which as far as I am concerned are conducted in confidence, and I will not be going to those details. But let me say this in broad terms because I talked about this issue during the campaign, that I believe that Australia has got to have constructive and friendly relations with its immediate neighbours. It is just out of the question that Australia can move into a position of not having good relations with a country on its immediate doorstep, a country of vast population, economically significant, strategically significant. And what we will be doing will be moving to try and place our relations with Indonesia on such a friendly and constructive basis. I have made it clear that the events of the past cannot be obliterated. It's an exercise in futility to say that an incoming government can command the Australian people to forget what's happened. You can't do that. What we have got to try and do is to recognise what has happened and in our negotiations with Indonesia try and move to a position where we can have relations which they will respect, and that we will respect, and I simply want to say that without going into any further detail at this stage, Bill Hayden and I, I believe, are at one in the views that I have expressed. We will be undertaking measures to try and bring about the sort of relationship in the context of our remembrance of the past that I have talked about. I hope that in the relatively near future in those terms Mr Hayden will be able to visit Indonesia and I would also hope that I would be able to do the same thing some time later this year. I have also, I may say, extended an invitation to President Suharto to visit this country.

Q:

Following the Russian invasion of Afghanistan your predecessor took quite a hard line out front of everyone else, sort of line on that issue which included banning visits by Russian cruise ships and cancelling visas and so on. Do you plan to move away from that policy and allow in normal cultural exchange groups and so on?

PM

For an allegedly strong and determined and inflexible Prime Minister in government there was an almost incalculable flexibility, in fact, in what they did, in lack of consistency in what they did. While they banned athletes they didn't in fact ban their own wool and wool products from going. But I don't want to create any more problems for Mr Fraser than he has at the moment. I am the soul of charity in these matters, but your question demands that I just referred to the malleability that they had in these matters and indeed there has since that time been some relaxation in regard to the visits of Soviet scientists and so on. No, our position will be clear and it will not be hypocritical. We will be specific in our condemnation of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. It cannot be justified on grounds of strategic considerations, morality, economics or any other ground. It was an invasion of the sovereign territory of another country, which is totally unacceptable. In respect of our relations with the Soviet Union on that matter, my government will make it quite clear to the Soviet Union what we think of their intervention and our belief that they should withdraw. We will not use it for confected political purposes, as did the previous government, and we will not put ourselves into the hypocritical position as I say, of barring athletes, some scientists, some cultural relationships that trade away as busily as you can. Trade will go on but so will other relations. We will convey our disturbance at what has happened in what are sensible diplomatic terms and not expose ourselves as the previous government inevitably did to the charges of blatant hypocrisy.

Q:

You made it clear earlier that becoming a Republic was not a priority of the government.

PM

Yes.

Q:

Could you foresee a referendum being introduced on the issue in this term of Parliament?

PM

Certainly not.

Q:

Are you cautious about the future Japanese ... (inaudible)?

PM

I wrote about the question of the likelihood of Japan increasing its military role several years ago. I thought it was inevitable as a result of three factors. (1) the attitude of European nations that Japan has had a relevantly free ride economically because of the small amount of its resources which it devotes to its defence; (2) the same attitude in the United States; and (3) what I perceive would be some growing pressures within Japan for moves in this area as the economies of other countries developed and put more pressures

upon some of the developed Japanese industries. And that a combination of these three factors, and I wrote this in 1979, was likely to produce a situation where there was a gradual increase in the proportion of the resources of your country which were devoted to military purposes. I wrote that not in terms of enormous apprehension but it just seemed to me that it was appropriate that Australia and countries of this area should bear in mind that on any rational analysis of events that that was likely to happen. Certainly what I wrote in 1979 has proved to be accurate. Now I don't have a feeling that we will have to suddenly get terribly apprehensive but it seems to me sensible that there should be an understanding of the move that has taken place and the fact that it is possible for reasons that I have referred to that it will increase somewhat. What becomes important then is that Australia in its discussions with Japan and the United States and other countries in this region have that element taken into account in the discussions which we have and the conclusions to which we come, and certainly that in our discussions with the Japanese Government we should seek from them complete frankness as to what their intentions are in this area. I don't think it is necessary to say more than that. In respect of the second part of the question, the visits of American ships, nuclear-powered ships and so on, Japan will handle that in its way, we will handle it in ours, and we will handle it in a way which won't endanger our relationship with the United States.

P:

I am told you don't think very much of Mrs Thatcher's Economic Policies, but aren't you in some sort of sense in an economic situation with a spending deficit you inherited? Now how are you going to make the economy move?

PM

I made it quite clear that while in a campaign I would make observations about what you may be pleased to call Thatcherism or Reaganomics or whatever you like, once I had been elected Prime Minister of this country I take it as quite improper for me to make comments about the internal affairs of those countries, unless of course you are in a position of fundamental principle as we are in regard to apartheid in South Africa. And I am not as Prime Minister of this country going to intrude my observations in regard to what is being done or not done either in the United Kingdom or the United States or anywhere else. The problems that I have inherited are the problems of Fraserism not of Thatcherism, and I will deal with them accordingly.

Q: (inaudible)

PM

That is for others to determine.

Q: (Japan)

Are you going to Japan on your way back from the United States?

PM

No I am not. There is no plan to do that. But as I say I am hoping that Mr Nakasone will visit Australia. I have indeed issued an invitation to him and as I understand it, in addition to what I would hope would be his normal desires to visit Australia, he has vested interests of having a daughter living in Melbourne. So I hope that a combination of these factors will bring him here.

Q:

Your attitudes towards American investment in this country. Are you planning on further controls, or to remove control?

PM

No. Our position, Peter, as you know, is that we believe that Australia needs foreign investment. I've made it quite clear, the Party makes that quite clear. We will attempt to ensure that such investment meets the guidelines that there be a majority of Australian equity and control. I will be going to the United States, I think, in June. The details have to be finalised but I have made it clear before that that is likely to happen, and when I am there I will be having discussions not only with the administration but with business leaders, and I have total confidence that they will not only understand but will welcome the clarity of the position of our government. I think that they will see that as our economy is going to get moving there is a place for foreign investment, but investment which will be, as I repeat, in circumstances where the control of our economic destiny is overwhelmingly going to be in the hands of Australians. But we welcome the assistance in getting this country going. It will be available from a number of countries including the United States.