



PRIME MINISTER

TRANSCRIPT OF INTERVIEW, RADIO 8DN TALKBACK, DARWIN, COL KROHN-16/10/84

CK: Welcome, the PM isn't with us yet etc.... He's on the campaign trail, and I gather from what we've been told that it will be a very difficult job to win the seats in the Territory across to the ALP. The popularity of the Chief Minister, of course, running against Mr Reeves down there in Canberra. You may like to ask the PM questions on that subject, in fact Mr Hawke has just walked into the studio so we'll be with him very shortly. A few other questions, of course. Mr Geoff Stone, the previous Secretary to the Treasury, in an address yesterday said that a likely range of new taxes may well be introduced and possibly a mini-budget immediately after the election providing the Labor Party wins the election. Defence another question, that has been raised in the last week, specifically that Australia is not geared to meet even a low level threat, and of course the ANZUS situation with the NZ Government, Mr Lange, and education another one. I understand the PM has recently indicated that he is concerned with the standard of education across the nation. These subjects something you can think about, and we will be back with the PM shortly.

CK: Welcome back. A very good afternoon to the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr Bob Hawke.

BH: Good afternoon.

CK: Well I guess ~~no-one~~ ^{no-one} could say that it'd ^{be} ideal for politicians, particularly Prime Ministers, to be one-eyed, but you went a little far, didn't you?

BH: (chuckle, chuckle) Yeah. I was going along so nicely. I had 28 elegant runs under my belt and then I was told there were five overs left, it was a limited over match, so I thought every ball had to be dispatched for a boundary, so I went for a hook shot and didn't play it well at all.

CK: Well that's very apt because last night on local TV they opened the series Bodyline. It's almost as if it was arranged.

CK: Just before we take our first call, the question of the likelihood of Labor winning or maintaining the House of Representatives seat. The Chief Minister, of course, Mr Paul Everingham, very popular, the evidence of that with the devastating win of the CLP in the last NT election. How hopeful are you that you can retain this particular seat?

BH: I'm confident. John Reeves will retain his seat, Col. There are a number of reasons for that. Firstly, John Reeves has been an outstanding member for the Northern Territory - I can say this with absolute integrity to all your listeners. He has been ceaseless in representations to us about the needs of the Territory. It's obviously much easier for the interests of the Northern Territory to be represented by a Government member: He has access to us, he's on our hammer the whole time. A member of the Opposition can't do that. And Mr Everingham has made it quite clear, he's made public statements, that not only will my Government be returned, but it will be returned with an increased majority. I believe that the people of the Northern Territory are intelligent, I believe they will see that they're most likely to have their interest better represented by a member of the Government. And certainly, there are many things that we've done in the Territory that have been done because of the persistence of John Reeves. So in saying all those things I'm not involved in any personal attacks on Mr Everingham. He has his views about the interests of the Territory and as Chief Minister he's tried to do certain things. But he wouldn't - and it's hypothetical because I don't think he'll get there - but as a member of the Opposition - of a decreased Opposition - he simply would not be able to do the job for the Northern Territory that John Reeves could as a member of the Government.

CK: OK. We'll take as many callers as we can this afternoon. Please keep your calls brief. And Mr Hawke's on the line now. First caller Eddie. You're through to the Prime Minister, Eddie.

Caller: My question is simple but it has vast implications: Will the American constitution trigger the nuclear holocaust?

BH: No, the American constitution wouldn't trigger it, Eddie. Whether the (Eddie interjects)

Caller: I can give you some reasons: Firstly, he is an autocrat, he has the power of veto over his Parliament, he's efficient to his ministers who are not responsible to Parliament, he can veto any Bill or simply let it lay on the table for the three months until it lapses, and he's also the head of the army, navy and airforce.

CK: Can you let the PM answer now Eddie?

BH: Well, Eddie you seem to think that the world has gotta fear a nuclear holocaust from the democracy of the United States, as though this takes

one to tango. It takes two to tango. And I say to you quite unequivocally that as far as I'm concerned, I don't attribute to the US under whatever President, the great threat to the peace of the world. We have the other super power which is a communist dictatorship, and I'm not here to engage in some attack upon the Soviet Union, you know that's not my caper to attack other countries, but the fact is that you have no democracy in the Soviet Union. You have the military industrial complex there, very much in charge of things, the evidence of the expansion of the Soviet Union into Afghanistan....(Eddie interjects)

Caller: I'm not ringing for the Soviet Union, Bob, I'm ringing for mankind.

BH: You are. You say you're talking for mankind, but you do that by launching an attack on the US and its President. All I'm saying is that what we've got to do as concerned human beings is not to go around attacking President Reagan or attacking the Soviet Union. We've gotta be positive and constructive and say that the two superpowers have gotta sit down together. It's no good standing on dignity. They've gotta sit down together, Eddie, and talk through. They've gotta realise that the nuclear stockpiles that they've got now are more than enough to wipe out the world hundreds of times over and what they've gotta do is to sit down and realise that the future welfare of every man woman and child in the world depends on them sitting down constructively and talking together. We're not going to help that process by attacking one rather than the other.

Caller: I'm not attacking one rather than the other, I'm attacking one for his actions. Now he's just given the Jews a terrific lot of money and in response they're gonna move out a Lebanon, possibly in six months. Now he has the game sewn up then as a peacemaker.off Israel that they vacate the West Bank and cut out the master race business.

CK: Eddie, I'm sorry. We've given you enough time. We do have other callers (cut off). And please folks, one question. There are many, many folk wating to talk to the PM. Our next caller John, you're through to the Prime Minister, go ahead John.

Caller: Hello Robert.

BH: G'day John.

Caller: Curley, mate.

BH: Oh! G'day Curley.

Caller: Listen, mate, I dunno whether you get the copies of the local papers up here down there.

BH: No, I don't.

Caller: You probably don't. Well every time something goes wrong up here you people down there get the blame for it.

BH: Yeah?

Caller: Now this is the question. Do you or do you not get a budget submitted from the Northern Territory? Or let's put it in common language. Do you not or do you get bitten for a bite to cover funding of the Northern Territory for 12 months?

BH: Yes, we get bites for a whole range of things.

Caller: Do they present a budget to you and say 'this is the money we want'?

BH: Well, it's not put in a total budget form Curley, but what we do get is a range of demands from the Northern Territory for the elements which go to make up their total budgetary program, and the fact is Curley that we provide 86% of their budget. That's the factual situation, and may I just throw in one statistic which would give you some idea Curley of how well the Territory does. In this budget, 84/85, the tax-sharing grant to the Territory increased by 12% whereas the average for the states was 6%. So, they've done, under our government and the representations of John Reeves, they've done extremely well indeed.

Caller: Well I agree with that. You give 'em a good cook, but you didn't answer my question.

BH: Well I did answer your question, Curley. I'm saying that they don't present a formal budget and say 'here is our budget'. What they do is present a series of demands saying 'well we need this amount of money for this purpose, we need this amount of money for another purpose' and then they get an indication from us as to what the tax-sharing money is that they're going to get. Then they have to make some other decisions in regard to their own fiscal program as to what they're going to do, and it's very interesting that in this most recent period as a result of their decision in regard to the Casino where they're foregoing revenue from the Casino by their expropriation of private property, they've imposed

very significant increases on the people of the Territory in regard to liquor and cigarettes. If they hadn't engaged in this unparalleled expropriation of private property of Federal Hotels, the people of the Northern Territory wouldn't have had to pay those additional incosts which have been put upon them.

CK: We must move on (Ad break). Helen, you're through to Mr Hawke, go ahead.

Caller: Hello. Um, I'd like to ask you about the train. Will there ever be a train service going to Darwin?

BH: Well, if you say 'ever' it's a very long time, Helen. But I would think not in the foreseeable future. When we came to government, Helen, we found that we had a 3.6 billion dollar greater deficit we'd inherited than Mr Fraser and Mr Peacock and Mr Howard had told us about, so we had to review a program that we'd been looking at, so we had an independent inquiry, conducted by Mr Hill, and it was put to us quite clearly after a long inquiry in which everyone was able to put their point of view, that that would be an uneconomic use of resources. So what we did then was to say, and here Mr Reeves - the local member - was very helpful to us, we looked at what we could do to improve the existing means of communication. We did a number of things, we made about 2½ million dollars available to improve the rail facilities to Alice Springs. That will involve the purchase of high speed rolling stock and improving the piggy-back loading facilities there, and then from Alice Springs up to Darwin we've made in addition to the very significant amount of money that was already allocated, we're putting about another \$27 million through to 1987/88 to improve the Stuart highway to make it an all-weather, all-purpose road and starting off with \$2.7 million this year so that in that way, according to the best advice we've got, we will use taxpayer funds more economically to provide you with a service that you need. Now I know some people would like to see a train, just because it's a train. But what a government has to do is to use its taxpayers money in the most efficient way, and we think that in this way we will more economically provide you with the transport services that you need.

CK: Thanks very much Helen. Just before we take our next caller, Mr Hawke, on that question of the railway. I understand the Canadian Pacific investigation, if you like, found it economically viable for a north-south rail link, and strategic studies by the ANU found it to be almost essential for defence and support. Now we're investing in a very expensive defence

base in Tindal. Would it be the only major defence base in the world without a rail head or at least a railway?

BH: Oh no, it wouldn't. But let's just get this sorted out. You talk about the Canadian Pacific inquiry. A very different inquiry to the Hill inquiry. The Hill Inquiry was open. Everyone who wanted to make submissions to it could in an open fashion. A very different sort of thing has come up with this Canadian...and I'm not attacking the integrity of Canadian Pacific, but it was a much less open and full inquiry than was the Hill Inquiry and it says 'break-even' at the very best. It doesn't suggest it is a sensible use of economic resources. Now I'm not prepared to accept that, but even if one were to, it's a less economic use of resources than the alternative that we're doing. Now as far as defence is concerned, the position is quite clear. The Australian Defence Department and Defence chiefs were asked about this and they made it quite clear that in terms of the limited resources available to the Defence Forces of this country where they had the responsibility of saying 'these are our priorities for allocating scarce resources for the defence of Australia -- this is not a top priority'. Now that's the defence chiefs, your Defence Department. And that cannot be gain-sayed (?) and I am not going to as Prime Minister be undertaking some flash program because someone says 'oh yeah, that'd be a good idea from a defence point of view' when your defence advisors and your Defence Department say that would not be the best way of using resources.

CK: How valid is the situation with defence on the...across the nation in view of the reports during the week that we can't even meet a low-level threat?

BH: Well, that's not an accurate summary of it. Let me say firstly this: since 1949, for 35 years, 30 of them have been in terms of Federal Government, under the conservative parties. And if there is anything wrong with the state of our defence preparedness which, of course, as you know involves years and years of lead time, then you know where to point the finger -- it's not at us, it's at the conservative party of this country. Thirty years out of the last 35 they've had the responsibility for preparing the defence of this country and if there is any inadequacy, that's where the finger should be pointed. But, having said that, I believe that we are in a position where as we go ahead now with the increase in defence expenditure under this government - and I remind you that in our two years we've had an average of 3.7% increase in real terms in our two budgets which is higher than the increases in defence expenditure under the Liberal

and National parties. 3.7% real terms per annum under us.

CK: Do you believe it's enough?

BH: Well all I can say is that it's more than the Conservatives in the last seven years. Ours is a higher rate of real increase in defence expenditure than under them.

CK: Does that necessarily mean that it's enough?

BH: No, but it does mean as between alternatives that we're doing better than they did. And that's what you've got to choose between. We're doing more than they did. Now of course, I would like to be able to spend more but you've got to say that you've got claims upon you in the fields of education, in the area of social security, and what you spend in one area you can't spend in others. Now all I can say is that I think we've got reasons to be proud of our defence forces. Yesterday I spent with the Navy out on HMAS Adelaide. I saw them go through their paces, and they are a highly dedicated, competent and efficient service. We've just made the decision to provide...to go into the purchase of the Sea Hawk helicopters which, when provided on our destroyers, will mean that they will have a very significant anti-submarine warfare capacity which I think is very important. We are now, tomorrow going to start the building of the Tindal air base which will locate out of Katherine a very significant deterrent capacity in the north-west of Australia, and we are doing our very best to ensure that both in terms of equipment and in other respects our defence forces will be equipped to meet what conceivable challenges there may be to Australia. Of course, when you're talking about defence you're not only talking about what you've gotta do in spending money on your defence forces, it's also very important that you keep your alliances in good shape and I'm very proud to be able to say that now, after some 2 years in government, the relationship of Australia with the United States is in better shape than it's ever been before. And we also have very good relations with the countries in our region. So, all that this government is doing is directed towards the security of this country.

CK: We'll take a break (ADS). Vincent, you're through to the PM, go ahead.

Caller: Good afternoon Prime Minister, I'd like to welcome you to the Northern Territory. My name's Vincent. I'm ringing up about our concerns

and our Land Rights legislation here in the Northern Territory. ...Land Rights working. We have \$500 million uranium mine developments on our land such as Ranger and Jabiru, we've got \$500 million more developments on the Mereenie and Amadeus oil/gas fields in the Central Australia, and we've also cleared a line for the phantom railway line to come up to Darwin on Sacred Sites and all this type of thing, and also we have gold developments in our country. Also we bring into the Territory's economy over \$200 million and getting a little bit higher, in the tourist industry with Ayers Rock, on Aboriginal land, Kakadu on Aboriginal land and Stanley Chasm on Aboriginal land. Also the fishing industry uses out land for development. I'd just like to say that we are worried about our veto, the Federal Government was brought to power on social reform and one question I'd like to ask you is: What is the m two unexploded atomic bombs in our coutry - down in the South Australian area?

BH: Well, if I can come to the last one. I'm not aware of two unexploded atomic bombs down South, Vincent. If you have some details about unexploded atomic bombs I hope you'll let me know because if they're there no one else knows about it and no one has told me. And I would have thought it they knew about it, they would have brought it to the attention of the Government and the Prime Minister, so if you've got any information about it, please let me know. In regard to the first part of your question, I had a press conference earlier, Vincent, and this question about Land Rights was raised and I wonder if you'd just let me make a few general observations about this and I think listeners generally would be interested. What my Government has been doing in this area is to say that we don't want to rush into a sensitive area in a way which is going to have some apparent short term advantages for people without having to do it in a way which is going to ensure that through time the whole of the Australian people are going to be satisfied with what's done. Let me remind you that it was in 1967 and by an overwhelming majority that the Australian people decided that the Commonwealth Parliament should have responsibilities and powers in this area. Now that's nearly 20 years ago and I think that what the people expect now of this government is that we will go through the processes of consultation with the Aboriginal people, with miners, with farmers, with the state and Territory government to try and ensure that that power and responsibility which the people of Australia gave to the Federal Government nearly 20 years ago, is exercised in a way which will bring benefits to the Aboriginal people. That's what the great majority of Australians want. They want it done in a way which they can go along with and accept and which will mean that it will stick into the future.

Now that's what Mr Holding and I have therefore been doing. We've been having negotiations with the Aboriginal Steering Committee, with the Australian Mining Industry Council, with the National Farmers Federation, and with the states. We're gonna keep on doing that, and it's my belief that if we keep on doing that we can reach a position where the legitimate rights and aspirations of the Aboriginal people will be recognised and given effect to and it will be done in a way which the Australian people will recongise, accept and be proud of. Now, that's what we're about, we're committed to it and that's what will happen.

Caller: Um, well the Aboriginal people, we own cattle stations in the Territory here, we've restructured our cattle industry where....the industry here in the Territory and we have taken the lead role in the BTB eradication program, so there is no need to be afraid of Aboriginal people. There's be fear built up in the community of not understanding....

BH: Yeah, Vincent we are not afraid of the Aboriginal people and I don't think the great majority of Australians are. Unfortunately, I think there's a fair bit of prejudice, the talk has been developed in some quarters I think for very narrow political advantage - or percieved advantage - but what my government is about is to try and dissipate fear and prejudice, to get people talking together and to get people talking in WA at the present time, you're seeing the advantages emerging of discussions between the various groups. There'll be significant developments there for the Aboriginal people. I'm going to be seeing Mr Burke, the Premier of WA, later on this week, and I think you'll see that there in a context which will be accepted by the community as a whole including the farmers, miners, you're going to see some announcements on friday in WA which will be of significant advantage to the Aboriginal people, and in a way which will have broad community acceptance. And that's the sort of thing that we've got to try and do.

CK: We must move on. Sarah, you're through to the PM, go ahead.

Caller: Good afternoon Mr Hawke, it's a pleasure to talk to you. Mr Hawke I'd like to say first of all that I think you're the greatest Prime Minister Australia's ever had. But what I'm concerned about is the John Reeves and him image up here as compared with perhaps I could say the rather bombastic style of Mr Everingham. I don't know exactly where the problem lies, but I've been a Labor supporter for many, many years and I feel that what John Reeves has been doing down in Canberra just hasn't

been coming back to Territorians and I'm just interested in your comments as to how Labor can get the word around when Labor's up against such a strong personality as Paul Everingham.

BG: Yeah, well thank you very much Sarah for your observations and your question. Let me say these things. It's inevitable in an area like the Territory which has a small population of about 140,000 people, that the Chief Minister of the Government is going to get a lot of exposure and I'm not complaining about that, it's inevitable, it's going to be the case and so Mr Everingham is going to be able to get that exposure, publicity and certainly I pay him credit, he's very, very good - very good - at getting that exposure. I pay him unqualified tribute for his capacity in that respect. Now with John, of course, he's down there in Canberra and the sort of things he has consistently been doing in the interest of the Territory just don't, in the nature of things, get that daily exposure. But let me say this to you, that John Reeves, since he's been in there and since we've been in Government from March of last year, has been incessant in his approaches to me and to the relevant ministers saying day after day 'these are the real needs of the Territory, these are the things that you ought to do'. Just let me give you an example. We had this question about whether there was going to be the rail link between Alice Springs and Darwin. Now, I had to re-consider that in the light of the \$3.6 billion additional deficit which we inherited. So we had a look at it, had the independent inquiry. Now Mr Everingham just said in the discussion - I had discussions with him in my office in Canberra and in Sydney - I said 'well look, if the independent inquiry is to come out and say no it's not appropriate, what will we do additionally to spend money on upgrading the Stuart Highway'. Now the Chief Minister said 'No, the Stuart Highway is all right, we don't need to spend any more money on that. That's all right, there's no problem'. Now that was the Chief Minister trying to get his headlines, it had to be the railway line or nothing. Now John Reeves quietly and effectively said 'all right, well, if it does come out that way that the railway can't go ahead, of course the Stuart Highway should have more money spent on it. It should be upgraded into an all-purpose all-weather road'. And as a result of his quiet and effective and undemonstrative representation, we've moved to the position where in addition to the money which has already been allocated, we'll be spending an additional \$27 million during the rest of this decade, up until about 1988, starting with \$2.7 million in this year to bring up that Stuart Highway to an improved standard which will help to meet the Transport needs of the Territory. Now, Sarah, you see that's the sort of contrast. Effective, quiet representation which produces the goods, and in the nature of things you don't get the same publicity about that. Now I just happen

to think, Sarah, that people of the Territory are intelligent people who will understand the difference, as I said earlier. They will see that their interests are much better served by having that effective John Reeves down there as a member of the Government - because Mr Everingham has said himself that he expects my Government to be returned and probably with an increased majority - the people of the Northern Territory are going to be much better off having John Reeves, a government member there, continuing to do the job he done for them.

CK: AND we must move on. (Ads). Penny, you're through, go ahead.

Caller: Good afternoon, Mr Hawke. Like many other ALF voters, I applauded the government when you rebutted the racist misinformation over Asian immigration. However I've been profoundly disappointed by the almost total lack of defence over Aboriginal Land Rights in the face of the massive propaganda campaign by the mining industry and pastoralists. The Government passivity, I believe, has allowed the campaign to take hold and there is now a community backlash. Now when you said to an earlier caller that you'll do what's acceptable to the Australian people, aren't you really saying that Land Rights are now negotiable? That's my first question, and secondly I want to know why don't you lend your considerably popularity to the defence of Australia's most disadvantaged people?

BH: Well Penny let me go into the first question by answering the second one first. But I must say that I don't accept that criticism. I will put my record up in regard to the Aboriginal people against anyone in this country and it goes back - it's not a matter of this month, last month, it goes back over a twenty years or more in public life. It hasn't been just words, it's action. And I haven't changed in that respect. What I'm saying is to you, and the people of Australia, that if we are going to make our contribution to the Aboriginal people of this country stick and not something that's just going to be a transient show, then we have to make sure that the Australian people are going along with what's done. Now I believe that we can do that. I believe that it is legitimate in talking about how we're going to move in regard to Aboriginal Land Rights, that we do have consultation with the states and the Territory Government with the mining industry, with the farmers and with other interested organisations. So that we can shape the understanding of this issue in Australia. It's not going to be any good simply saying 'look I've got the numbers in the Federal Parliament' wham, bang, here it goes, if in doing it that way you're going to create in the Australian community generally some fairly solid opposition. It's much better to move through consultation

with the Aboriginal people and others so that what comes onto the Statute books of this country through the Federal Government and through state governments is a lasting, durable, constructive reform. Now that's what we're going to do, and I haven't seen any indication in my discussions with the Aboriginal people that they question our integrity. They might have some doubts about the wisdom of certain things that are said here and there, but they don't question our integrity.

CK: We must move on (this is a recording) and our next caller, Corralee.

BH: Good afternoon Bob. Like to welcome you to the Territory. I should think being an important figurehead as what you are, it seems to bring about a lot of quick condemnation and negative criticism from other politicians and the media. It's not very often up here in the Territory that we hear of any positive criticism or encouragement, so I'd just like to say to you that considering the economic situation that this country was in with the former Prime Minister, in my opinion, you are doing a wonderful job and I'd just like to say thank you.

BH: Well Corralee that's very kind of you and I certainly appreciate it. It does seem to be the case that the majority of Australian people share your view, perhaps they're not all as thoughtful as you are to come out and say openly and directly that. But I simply want to say this briefly, Corralee, that during the last Federal election, at the beginning of last year, February, March, I made one basic promise to the people of Australia and that was that I would try and bring an end to the confrontation and the divisiveness in this country and I said that if we can do that, then everything else will flow from it, we can have economic recovery and reconstruction if we can have national reconciliation. We started on that in our national summit in April of last year, we brought Australia together and in the event we've changed things from economic stagnation to having the fastest growing economy in the world now. Now those things are not just the result of my government or the decisions I've taken, they're really the result of the Australian people - all of us, working together in the way I wanted us to. So if there are bouquets to go to me, there really are bouquets to go to all of us.

CK: We must take a break and we'll be back (ADS)...Our next caller Zel.

Caller: Good afternoon Mr Hawke. I'd like to speak to you on the two airline policies. It appears that under a Liberal Government we couldn't get the break out of it, and with your government now been in this length

of time we've heard nothing that they intend doing anything. And I feel Australia needs it very badly. All Australians, and particularly us here in the Territory. What is your view on it?

BH: Well Zel the fact is that the two airlines' agreement was negotiated in the period of the previous government and goes through til later in the 1980s and it's not something that if we wish to - I don't go to the merits of it - but it is there and it goes to, I think - this is subject to correction - to 1986. It's negotiated, it's in place. And there is nothing that can be done to un-negotiate that if you wanted to. But in the area of aviation generally, I think what's recognised is that this government has now done more than any government to develop new initiatives in this area. That's applied not only from the activities of my Minister for Civil Aviation, Mr Beazley, but for Sport, Recreation and Tourism, Mr Brown, has also been responsible for many new initiatives there which have been calculated to make travel within Australia cheaper under particular circumstances.

Calller: I'm sorry, would you like to see more airlines travelling within Australia?

BH: Well, it's a very complex issue, this, because what you find is if you de-regulate the airline industry and sort of give almost open slather it is very, very much more difficult, Zel, to have your safety regulations operating efficiently. Now one of...you may say rightly that there are certain limitations involved with having the two airline agreement, but i would point out to you that one feature of the existence of the two airline agreement has been that we have in Australia probably the best airline safety record of any country in the world. And if I can sort of use paradoxical language, it's no accident that you've had the co-incidence of a two airline policy and the world's best safety record. And I think therefore when you're talking about what sort of airline policy we're going to have in this country you've got to take all these factors into account.

CK: We must leave it there, folk. If you're calling from Alice Springs, please remember to turn your radio down because we get a massive feedback problem. (Ads)

CK: Before we take the next caller, I understand, Mr Prime Minister, you want to clarify an issue.

BH: Yeah, I was talking to that last caller, Zel, about the two airlines agreement and I observed that I said subject to correction about the life of the two airline agreement, I mentioned 1986. That's not when it ends. It's at the end of '86 or the very beginning of '87 that notice can be given - 3 years' notice can be given - about review. But the agreement goes through until 1990. And it's the end of '86 or the beginning of '87 that you can give the notice of reievw. In fact the Minister, Mr Beazley, will be initiating the beginning of that review next year and through 85/86.

CK: We'll take our next caller - Ron, you're through to Mr Hawke, go ahead.

Caller: Hello Mr Hawke. The question I want to ask is...I'm a Labor voter from way back, but what I want to ask you is that earlier on you said that you regarded the Territorian electorate as quite intelligent, the thing is that I remember when you came up here last time you made quite an effective case of why you couldn't afford to fund the railway up here. And the result was that in the local election up here that the result was, in the local eleciton up here, was a landslide to the CLP. Now I just can't see how you can reconcile those two facts.

BH: Well, there are two things...I was talking specifically, Ron, as you'll appreciate, as to what...I was asked what did I think the Territorians would do in regard to the decision they have to take in this Federal election. And I made the point that I think they will see that John Reeves has been an excellent member for them and, you get down to this bottom line, I think, Ron, and I think which is why I believe that they are intelligent and will make the sensible decision. Mr Everingham has said...it's not me saying it...Mr Everingham has said that the Hawke Labor Government will be returned at this election and he thinks with an increased majority. And I'm simply saying, Ron, that I think that the majority of Territorians will say that it's much more sensible for us in Federal politics to have a Labor member there so that he has direct access to the GOvernment and can represent the interests of Territorians. Now there are other considerations which obviously came into play in regard to the election for the NT Government. They made judgements, obviously, as to who they preferred to Labor and

non-Labor there. There were a different set of considerations. I would have hoped, of course, that they would have supported Labor. They didn't. But I'm certain that they will see that their best interests are served by having John Reeves, a Labor member, in the Hawke Labor Government.

CK: OK we'll move along. Paul, go ahead.

Caller: Hello Mr Hawke. First I'd like to say that I admire your courage in allowing yourself to be questioned by the people like this.

BH: Oh, it's a pleasure.

Caller: I'm a blue collar worker and a member of the local trade union and I'd like to say that I'm quite dismayed about the way that your Government has continued the Fraser Government's policy of triple-dipping into the pockets of the average workers for your tax revenues.

BH: Yeah, what's that triple dipping, Paul?

Caller: Well, first we have to pay for the privilege of producing by income tax. Then we have to pay more by heavy petrol taxes to get back and forth to work. And to top it all off we have to pay a very heavy tax for our beer at the end of the work day.

BH: Ah ha.

Caller: If you could answer this question. Will you ask the voters for a mandate to introduce an equitable capital gains tax? I mean that's one that takes inflation over the years that the capital is held into account.

BH: Well Paul, let me go to the first part of your observations and then I'll go to the latter part and I'll try to do it quickly. You referred to income tax, petrol tax and beer tax. Well, some people have observed over the years that there are only two things that are certain in life and that's taxes and death. Well, I guess in some senses that's right. It's funny, you know, Paul, when people talk about taxes and they don't like to pay taxes, they never say that they don't want the Government to spend money on defence, they never say that they don't want them to spend money on roads, they never say they don't want government to spend money on hospitals on pensions, unemployment benefits. There's never any suggestion

that Government should stop spending on the things that people need and want. Now it's a simple, certain fact of life that if governments are going to provide what the citizens require, and that only governments can provide in terms of defence and so on and these sorts of things, then governments have to have revenue. Now the secret, Paul, is to try and have a tax system which satisfies the two requirements of efficiency and equity and that's what we're about. Now, you talk about a capital gains tax. It's the Liberals who have said that a capital gains tax is an inevitable part of the reformed tax system. If you look at what their economic committee said in NSW, they said that you'd have to have a capital gains tax. We haven't said that, we've said that we will have a reivev of the tax system and we will do what we've done since we've been in government. The reason why we've had such a successful economic policy is that we didn't impose decisions from Canberra. We talked to the trade unions, we talked to the business community, we talked to the welfare organisations, and out of that approach we developed successful economic policies. We'll do the same with regard with regard to tax. We will sit down and talk with the community and try and out of that process get a system which is fair and equitable. We're not going to preempt that discussion by sying we'll do this or we won't do that.

CK: We must move on (ADS). Our next caller through to Mr Hawke, Thomas. Go ahead Thomas.

Caller: Good afternoon, Bob. My situation is that alot of staunch ALP voters, including myself, were absolutely shattered by the way your party adopted the abortion virtually on demand as part of the platform of the last conference. And I don't udnerstand how your party could even purport to grant as a right an even more extensive (?) licence to kill, which is basically what the party is doing. The question I've got is would you undertake to rescind, or revoke or repeal or whatever the word is the provisions of that platform of fertility control and abortion - to delete that phrase 'and abortion' from the policy statement.

BK: Thomas, what you've got to recognise and I'm sure you do, is that you're taling about an issue on which there are very, very deep feelings. I recognise and respect yours. There are others who, with equal integrity to you and I hope that you will recognise that....you're obviously a Christian believer and I think you'll recognise that part of the Christian faith is that the Good Lord, if you believe in the Good Lord, hasn't given wisdom and proof to one group only. That you've got to recognise integrity in other people as well as in yourself. And if we don't start from that basis that you recognise integrity in others as well as yourself, then

we are in a very sterile and barren society. Now I accept the integrity of yourself, I accept the integrity of people who have a different view to yourself. Speaking for myself, I would not be in favour of creating a society in which there was just an unlimited freedom in this area, but I do believe that ultimately it is the right of individuals to make their own choice in this situation. And I have said in respect to my own party that I would never be party to abrigating (?) the conscience vote in this are. And I made that quite clear in the conference of the party. I have no right as an individual to determine what the policy of the party will be, but I will certainly fight as hard as I can to fight off those within my party who would try and take away the freedom of conscience vote in this matter because I think that if you got to the stage where members of the Parliamentary Party didn't have the right of conscience vote in this situation, then that would be totally unacceptable. So, Thomas, I could easily just to satisfy you, say yes I will try to tip this over and have the policy that you agree with. But it wouldn't be honest if I said it, so I'm not going to say that.

CK: Mr Hawke, we have run out of time. I'd like to thank you very much for being guest on the program, and no doubt we can look forward to you coming through again in the near future.

BH: Yes, I hope so, too, Col. Thank you very much to you personally and to your listeners. It was very worthwhile, thank you.

-ends -

Y A Y ! ! !