

Remarks at Business Roundtable Breakfast

PRIME MINISTER:

Thank you Alexander, and thank you all for being here this morning.

Thank you for your commitment to Australia, for your investments in Australia.

Thank you Sanjeev Gupta for your decision to acquire Arrium. You're going down to Australia tonight for ten days, and we look forward to you completing that acquisition and providing the investment support and security for the people of Whyalla and the steelmaking operations there which are so important.

I want to thank you all, as Alexander said, for your investment and partnership with Australia. The Australia-UK relationship of course is so close. There is no more trusted relationship at every level than we have with the UK. Whether it is at the level of family – most Australians have some ancestors in the UK and about five per cent of Australians were born in the UK – and of course our security ties. I'm sitting next to the former head of MI5. There were days when your predecessors wouldn't have liked to have been with me, I think.

[Laughter]

I hope all is forgiven. All is forgiven, of course it is. Well I spent, with Alexander, part of yesterday in the Cobra Briefing Room deep underneath Whitehall with the Joint Intelligence Committee. It did occur to me that 30 years ago, if I had found my way into a basement under Whitehall, I mightn't have been let out.

[Laughter]

So it is good, I do feel as though all is forgiven. That issue of trust, shared values, shared interest is so important. As Alexander said, we are committed to driving strong economic growth. At the election campaign, one of our slogans was jobs and growth; it's not just a slogan, it's an outcome, we've seen very strong jobs growth. We've had some terrific, just today – there's always some new statistics – very strong business confidence figures out today published by the NAB. The economy is growing. We are recovering, and strongly, from the inevitable downturn of the mining investment boom. We had a huge increase in commodity prices, as you know, beginning about a decade ago. As Jan du Plessis from Rio knows very well. So massive investment and of course, it employed a lot of people, brought a lot of capital into the country when those big projects were built. Obviously the production continues, but the stimulus from the construction boom comes to an end.

Many people said we'd have a hard landing. Many distinguished economists said

we would have a very hard landing. But in fact the resilience of the Australian economy, because of our commitment to free trade and open markets, enabled us to continue powering ahead.

Our growth, our economy, is much more diverse than it's ever been. It is very much driven by our access to the big Asian markets, not just in exporting commodities, but services, agricultural products, food products. The economic growth in Tasmania for example, which has had tough economic times for a long time, is entirely driven by the export opportunities we've created.

That's why when I was with Theresa May, the British Prime Minister yesterday, I was expressing great optimism for what she is going to be able to achieve in the post-Brexit environment because she is committed to Britain being an open trading economy, open to the world, recognizing just as we do that the more opportunities we have for our businesses to get out there and grow, the more opportunities for other businesses to come and invest with us and partner with us, the stronger we'll be.

So I look forward to having a good discussion with you all and again, thank you for being here. Thank you for your confidence in Australia, because I can assure you it's entirely reciprocated.

[ENDS]

[Press Conference with The Rt Hon Theresa May MP, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom](#)

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

Good afternoon.

I am pleased to be hosting Prime Minister Turnbull – whom I have known for many years – on his first visit to Downing Street.

This morning, we visited the site of last month's brutal terror attack at Borough Market, where eight people tragically lost their lives, among them two Australians.

We paid tribute to the professionalism and bravery of the police and emergency services who undoubtedly prevented further loss of life, and the heroism of local business owners who shielded people from the terrorists.

I am deeply grateful to Prime Minister Turnbull and the Australian people for the solidarity and support they have shown the UK. At times such as this we

are reminded of the importance of the strong ties that have bound our two nations together for over a hundred years.

And we will continue to stand together as close allies and firm friends against those who want to destroy our precious values and our way of life.

As the UK leaves the EU and forges a new role in the world, I am clear we should take the opportunity to strengthen our close partnership with Australia.

So today we have talked about how we can step up our cooperation in a range of areas, including security and defence, trade and investment, and on the world stage.

Let me take each of these in turn.

For over a century our soldiers have served together to preserve the fundamental values of freedom and democracy that we share. They stood shoulder to shoulder in two World Wars, in Iraq and in Afghanistan.

And this month, as we commemorate a hundred years since the Battle of Passchendaele, we again remember their service and their sacrifice.

Today we are leading partners in the Counter-Daesh Coalition, and as the fight moves from the battlefield to the internet we will work together to tackle the spread of Daesh's hateful ideology online.

We have also discussed how we can address the challenge of end-to-end encryption which creates a safe haven for terrorists to communicate.

Alongside this, our national cyber security centres cooperate closely to crack down on malicious cyber activity. Our law enforcement agencies work together to tackle serious and organised crime – particularly the illegal financial flows that fund criminal gangs and terrorists.

And our intelligence-sharing partnership under the Five Eyes alliance is central to our efforts to address the shared threats we face.

Later this month our Defence and Foreign Ministers will meet in Sydney for their annual ministerial dialogue, to look at how we can deepen our security and defence co-operation to protect our shared interests and project our values around the world.

The UK and Australia are major trading partners and investors in each other's economic success. Our strong and growing trade relationship is worth close to £14 billion.

We have both made clear our intention to continue to deepen our trade and investment relationship as the UK leaves the EU.

Our Brexit negotiations have started well. And I made clear to Prime Minister Turnbull that an ambitious and comprehensive bilateral trade deal with Australia remains a priority for the UK.

Australia was the first country with whom the UK established a Trade Working Group following the vote to leave the EU, and we are keeping up a regular and productive dialogue on the future of our free trading relationship.

We will continue to work together to push for greater global trade liberalisation and reform.

And I'm pleased to confirm that International Trade Secretary Liam Fox intends to travel to Australia in the coming months as part of these ongoing talks, and ahead of a further meeting of the Working Group later this year.

The UK and Australia remain close partners on the international stage. We work alongside each other through the Commonwealth, United Nations and G20 to address the shared global challenges we face.

Last week's missile test in North Korea showed yet again the danger the regime poses to our friends and allies. We are united in our condemnation of their continued nuclear weapons and ballistic missile tests, which are in flagrant breach of the UN Security Council resolutions.

And at the G20, the Prime Minister and I discussed with our partners how we can step up international efforts to increase pressure on Pyongyang, and find a peaceful solution to the ongoing threat North Korea poses to global security.

Australia and Britain are also proud members of the Commonwealth, and its unique, vibrant and diverse alliance of nations. And I am delighted that the UK will host the 2018 Commonwealth Summit in London and Windsor next April, just after the Commonwealth Games take place on the Gold Coast.

The Prime Minister and I are united in our commitment to work together to support the renewal of the Commonwealth. We agreed that the Summit offers a platform to re-energise and revitalise the network, to cement its relevance to this and future generations.

So thank you Prime Minister, thank you Malcolm, for visiting us today, and for the excellent discussions we have had.

It's always a pleasure to welcome our Australian friends to London, even more so when we have just beaten them at cricket. That's women's cricket, of course.

The ties between our countries have endured for generations, and I look forward to working closely with you to strengthen those bonds in the years ahead.

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

Well thank you very much Theresa. We're not really debating today but the last time we debated was at the Oxford Union. Theresa Brasier and Malcolm Turnbull were both on the notice paper and the President was Philip May. So now all we need is President May here to oversee the debate.

So look Theresa, it's wonderful to be here.

Australians feel at home in the United Kingdom and Britons feel at home in Australia. Most Australians have some of their ancestry at least from the United Kingdom and five per cent of Australians were actually born in the United Kingdom.

The culture, the laws the traditions of Britain were brought to Australia with the European settlement, British settlement that were brought as part of the heritage of the men and women, including my forebears, that founded what we know today as modern Australia. The most successful multicultural society in the world.

Built on the foundations of the most ancient human civilizations and cultures in the world, the first Australians. But also built on a foundation of British history, of British law, of a British conception of democracy and Parliamentary democracy in particular.

So when your institutions are attacked we feel that ours are too. When Britain is attacked by terrorism, we feel we are attacked as well.

The attack on Westminster Bridge, the assault, the cruel assault of young children in the Manchester Arena, the attack at London Bridge and the Borough Market, these were felt by the Australian people as keenly as the attacks we have suffered at home in Australia. We stand shoulder to shoulder now as we always have in freedom's cause today, defying and defeating the Islamist terrorists that seek to do us harm, that seek to destroy our way of life and prevent us from living our way of life, living as we always have.

Now, down at London Bridge and the Borough Market, we were there today and we thanked the first responders. We thanked the police – unarmed police in the first instance – that rushed to the aid of the people that had been injured, including two officers who performed CPR on one of the two Australian women that were killed, Sara Zelenak.

We saw where Kirsty Boden, a brave Australian nurse, rushed out into harm's way to help those who had been injured. Who heard there was an accident and, being a nurse, rushed out to help. We saw where she was killed.

And we thank those police, and we thank the ambulance workers, we thank the National Health Service workers, we thank them for the extraordinary service.

And Prime Minister, Theresa I should say, we were so proud, I was so proud to be with you and Cressida Dick, the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police and thank her for the extraordinary, rapid, effective, decisive action by the tactical response crew who got to the scene within eight minutes and killed the terrorists before they could do even more harm than they did.

So whether it is here, help cooperating on intelligence – and we had a very good meeting earlier today with Cressida Dick and of course with your Joint Intelligence Committee in your COBR briefing room – our cooperation is very intense and that is because it is built on trust. There are no two nations in the world that trust each other more than the United Kingdom and Australia.

We are family in a historical sense. We're family in a genetic sense. But we are so close and that trust is getting stronger all the time.

It is vital to defeat terrorism at home, in the Middle East, right around the world. We talked today about the activities of Daesh or ISIL in the Philippines. This is a global threat and we cooperate and collaborate everywhere. Intelligence is absolutely the key. Now we've touched on, Theresa, cybersecurity and this was a big topic as we know at the G20, where we worked together to ensure that we had a strong communiqué after G20 on counter-terrorism and the need for more cooperation. And indeed, the need to ensure that the rule of law prevails online just as it does offline.

We cannot allow the internet to be used a means to create dark places where terrorists cannot be found.

And so the leaders of the 20 largest economies agreed there, and Theresa and I made this case very strongly to our colleagues, agreed there that we are calling on those big internet companies not simply to assist in taking down poisonous propaganda from the internet but also to ensure that lawful rights of access to information needed to keep our people secure are able to be enforced online just as they are offline. This is vitally important.

We talked about the very dangerous situation on the Korean Peninsula and Theresa and I are both of one mind on this. The North Korean regime must stop its dangerous and reckless conduct, it's escalating dangerous conduct, and we've called on all the parties to do more, but in particular China which has the greatest leverage, and hence the greatest ability to bring that reckless regime to its senses.

We've talked about the economic challenges that we face and we recognise that as Britain moves to completing its exit from the European Union, we stand ready to enter into a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom as soon as the UK is able to do so.

So once that Brexit has been achieved, then we look forward to speedily concluding a free trade agreement with Australia and as you said, I think we were the first on the phone to offer our support and assistance in that regard.

At the same time I should say we are looking forward to the early conclusion of a free trade agreement with the European Union.

My government's position is very simply this, economic prosperity has been demonstrated to be delivered by free trade and open markets. That is one of the major reasons Australia has had 26 years of uninterrupted economic growth.

And so we will seek to open up every door to every market that we can.

Whatever our differences may be on particular sporting contests or another, or our determination to triumph and regain the ashes, can I say that we believe that the bigger, the wider the field that Australians can run onto, the more success they will have.

And I know that you share that vision for Britain. Your vision for Britain, a post-Brexit Britain, is one filled with optimism, it's not a council of despair as some people have said. I know Theresa, that you believe passionately that the British people can do anything, can achieve anything, and that your post-Brexit Britain will be a Britain with big horizons, big opportunities, free trade, open markets. You're right, that is the future. That is where our prosperity has been delivered and I know that is where your prosperity in the future will come.

So thank you very much for your hospitality, we're inspired by some of your reforms – and particularly your reduction in company tax. You're already at 19 per cent, you said, and heading to 17. We've made some progress in that direction but we've got a way to catch up.

And finally, can I say that it was a very kind thought for you to invite the Australian chef, 30-year resident of London, Skye Gyngell to cook us lunch. Skye's father Bruce Gyngell, as all the Australians here know, was a great television executive. In fact, he was the first face on Australian television, in a tiny little studio in Sydney, when it began in 1956.

And Bruce was a great mentor of mine, a really really good friend, a very dear friend. And he always used to say to me when I was a kid, he said "Malcolm, one day, you'll be Prime Minister" and the idea that as Prime Minister I'm your guest at lunch here at Number 10, and his daughter has cooked us the lunch, is very, very special. So thank you for that too.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

And a very good lunch it was.

(Laughter)

Thank you – we'll now take some questions.

JOURNALIST:

Thank you Prime Minister, both of you. Prime Minister – what the opposition to contributes as well as to criticize, you're expected to say tomorrow, what do you say to your own critiques though including in your own party who say it's you that needs to change? And might a new way of doing business include maybe easing up the pressure on the public sector? Perhaps increasing public sector pay, getting rid of the pay cap?

Prime Minister Turnbull – you say that you're very keen to get on with a UK-Australia trade deal but you also want an early agreement with the EU and those talks are already ongoing. How quickly do you think you could get a deal with Britain done once we leave?

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

As soon as possible. We move quickly. Australians are fleet of foot. We don't muck around. We are very simple. We will move as quickly as the UK will move and we'll move as soon as Britain is lawfully able to enter into a free trade

agreement.

But we are very keen, we are working very fast and hard to get a free trade agreement with EU and ideally, as we discussed, as I discussed with Donald Tusk and Jean-Claude Juncker and indeed with Chancellor Merkel and President Macron and other European leaders, we'd like to get moving with that and get that done before Britain actually leaves the EU.

You know, I just want to be very clear about this. We are absolutely signed up for free trade, open markets. It has been the key to our continued run of economic success.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

And just on that point as well, just to say that while we remain a member of the EU, we are continuing to press for these trade deals with other countries like Australia and indeed with Japan, a deal which we reached a political agreement just a few days ago. We are continuing to press the EU to get on with their own deals in place as well.

Now on the first question that you asked Laura, the Government's got an ambitious agenda. It is an ambitious agenda which is there to address the big challenges that the country faces. Of course, one of those is getting the Brexit negotiations right but there are other challenges that we face as a country too. And I think the public will rightly want us to get the broadest possible consensus in looking at those issues and this is something I've done before. I did it as Home Secretary on counter-terrorism measures like the Investigative Powers Act, working with other political parties to ensure that we got that legislation right. I did it on the [inaudible] Act, working with other parties to ensure that that went on to the Statute Book.

And if you look at some of the issues that we're addressing in the future, the report that's coming out tomorrow, Matthew Taylor's report – of course, I asked him to do that not that long after becoming Prime Minister, to look at the gig economy, to look at the changing face of the world of work here in the UK, to ensure we've got those workers' protections right.

And who would not want to work to ensure that workers had the best possible rights and protections in the workplace as it changes?

Who would not want to work with us to ensure that we've got the right counter-terrorism powers and capabilities in place?

Then there's another issue that, as you know, has come up recently through the general election, which is this whole question of the abuse and bullying and harassment that people suffered through the general election – a number of MPs have clearly identified that that happened to them. Yvette Cooper has been cleared – that's something we need to address. I think we should be working together to find a way to ensure that that sort of behaviour – which was, of course, targeted not just at candidates, but at others during the election – makes sure that the message goes out very clearly that that has no role in our democracy.

JOURNALIST:

My question to you both – both Australia and the United Kingdom were involved in the invasion of Iraq in 2003 on the grounds there were weapons of mass destruction. There weren't, but we've now got a very real threat of weapons of mass destruction when it comes to North Korea but it seems, at the moment at least, very little is having much effect.

Now, I understand both of your positions – that China is the one that needs to do more – but again, there's no sign that it is taking any further steps putting any more pressure on Pyongyang.

My question is – are either of you willing to accept a nuclear-armed North Korea?

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

No. Absolutely not.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

We want to see denuclearisation of North Korea.

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

Let me add a little bit to that. I hope that wasn't too short an answer for you. Would be the first time anyone's complained about one of my answers being short.

(LAUGHTER)

Look, the reality is that the Chinese, in practical terms, David, are the only country that has the ability to bring the North Korean regime to its senses without some form of military intervention. I mean, they have the potential, they've got the ability to impose huge economic pressure on North Korea, and they should do so. And we've encouraged them to do so and I've encouraged them to do so in every discussion I've had with Chinese leaders on this matter for a long time.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

We have the same approach to this. As we say, we don't want to see North Korea with nuclear weapons, and that China is the country that has the greatest possible leverage on North Korea. And that's a message that I gave to President Xi, and I think that Prime Minister Turnbull has been giving to the Chinese, as he says, as well.

JOURNALIST:

It's a red line?

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

What we want at the moment, what we want to do at the moment is to ensure

that we can see the denuclearisation of North Korea.

The pressure that needs to be put on at the moment is from China.

Obviously there's been talk about further sanctions, but I think China has the greatest leverage. That's why this is an issue that we both take up with the Chinese President.

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister, the great repeal bills are being introduced this week. Are the areas of compromise for you, in terms of getting help from the Labour Party – does that include Brexit? If I may, does it concern you that Jeremy Corbyn has failed to condemn the actions of some of his supporters in the time since the election and all of these accounts of abuse have come out?

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

First of all, you're right – the repeal bill is being introduced.

That's obviously a key part of legislation for delivering Brexit because it will repeal the European Communities Act and set the scene for other pieces of legislation that will need to be brought in as we've highlighted in the Queen's Speech and afterwards.

And we said at the time of the Queen's Speech that we want to see the broadest possible consensus.

This is a huge decision that was taken by the British people last year.

We want to ensure that the deal we get is the right deal for Britain and we want to make a success of it.

As Malcolm Turnbull has said, in his remarks, I want to see Britain coming out of that relationship with the EU and into a new global Britain trading our way around the world with old friends and new allies alike, and standing tall and confident in the world.

We will work to ensure that we get the right deal for the United Kingdom as we leave the European Union.

On the issue of the bullying and harassment that has taken place of candidates and MPs, I call on all party leaders to condemn that. There is no place at all for that in our democracy. I am surprised at any party leader who is not willing to condemn that.

Frankly, we should stand together on this and say there is no place for this in our democracy. People should be able to stand for election, we should be able to conduct elections, without people fearing as to what's going to happen to them as a result of that.

JOURNALIST:

Mr Turnbull, to you first. Your Government at home at the moment is considering a change to the bureaucracy regarding security apparatus. Some speculation has been around adopting a British-style Home Office. I'm just wondering, in your discussions here, is that feeding into your decision-making in that process?

And to both of you, on an issue of grave mutual concern to both our countries – there is a real there may not be an Ashes Series this year because of the players' strike in Australia. I am just wondering whether either of you would like to reflect on the likelihood of that not happening? And do you have advice for the negotiating parties in Australia?

(LAUGHTER)

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

Well, I'll answer the question about the Home Office, and then I think Theresa should go first on the cricket, and I'll conclude on the cricket.

The UK has an integrated Home Office – in fact, Theresa was the Home Secretary – in which they have all of their domestic security agencies – MI5, police and border protection, immigration – is all part of that. That's been the case for a very long time. Obviously, we're very always interested in learning about the British experience.

As far as administrative arrangements in Australia with respect to national security, I'd just repeat what I've said many times that this is no place for set-and-forget. We have to be dynamic, agile, constantly asking can we improve the way our agencies are keeping Australians safe? And we will always continue to seek improve them.

And I've demonstrated that with the cyber-security strategy already, and some of the matters I've raised. I've demonstrated that with the laws that we've changed – domestic counter-terrorism laws. As you know, as Australians know, we've passed laws that will enable a court to – the decision of a court, on the application of a court – for a person who is in jail for a terrorist offence to be kept in jail after the expiry of their sentence if they are judged to be a continuing threat. A tough law. No doubt about that. But it's an example of the changes that I've made.

Also, we've made changes to our criminal code so that our troops in the field, in the Middle East, are able to target and kill terrorists whether they are active combatants with a gun, a bomb or a knife in their hand, or whether they're in the back office planning or doing logistics or something else.

We will always seek to improve our national security arrangements to keep Australians safe. This is no place for set-and-forget.

So, cricket?

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

Just to reiterate, though, from the UK's point of view, in terms of counter-terrorism, we also look and we are doing, after the number of attacks that we have seen here in the UK – of course, four terrorism attacks in just around three months – but five other attacks foiled by our security services, and police during that same time frame. So as we see terrorism breeding terrorism – as we see people using the crudest means to conduct these terrorist attacks, we need to look at whether our powers and capabilities are the right ones for being able to deal with this threat. That's what we're doing at the moment.

But we're also working internationally, of course, indeed, with the online threat, which we've both referred to and, crucially, at the G20 – a very good discussion about how we deal with terrorist financing, which is another important element that we need to address.

Look, we always welcome every opportunity to play the Australians at cricket and show them a thing or two! As our women have just done! And I hope we can hear it for the women's cricket, actually, which is an excellent standard.

PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA:

Well, thank you, Phil. Look, your question – really for the first time in both of our careers – has made me feel young again. Normally your questions make me feel the pressure of office and the pressure of the years but you know, 40 years ago, I was working for Kerry Packer setting up World Series Cricket. So there is a sort of a players' administrators' conflict that's got a certain ring about it, a resonance about it, for me.

But, look, Australians want their team on the field beating the Poms.

(LAUGHTER)

I encourage both sides, both sides to settle it as quickly as possible.

Thank you all very much.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

Thank you.

[ENDS]

**Remarks at bilateral meeting with the
Right Honourable Theresa May MP, Prime**

Minister of the United Kingdom

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

Welcome. It is great to be here and to welcome you here to Number 10.

We've obviously just had a very moving visit to Borough Market and seen the terrible firsthand that sadly two Australians lost their lives and Australians were injured. I hope you've seen the fantastic response of our police and our emergency services.

And that security issues were of course ones in which we work very well with Australia and that there are many of those that we will be discussing today. I am looking forward to building our relationship.

As we discussed previously, particularly in areas like trade, I think there is much more we can do. Our links go way back and we have, as we saw today, with some of those first responders many Australians here in the UK, and many from the UK who have chosen Australia as their home. But we have those historical links but also work very well together as two countries and I think who are facing similar challenges but with great understanding between us.

I look forward to our talks.

PRIME MINISTER:

Yes, thank you Theresa.

It was a very moving visit to the Borough Markets and I'd like to say how much we admire the outstanding response of the police arriving on the scene so quickly, heeding to the terrorists so effectively and decisively. And the way in which they responded with the other first responders in the Metropolitan Police of London, the London Police and those from the ambulance service. They responded so quickly to look after those who'd been injured. They ran towards the danger while others were fleeing. Courageous people.

Outside the church we met two police officers, Clint Wallace and Richard Norton, Metropolitan Police Officers, unarmed police officers who had rushed to the scene and that started giving CPR to Sara Zelenak, one of the Australian women that was killed not far from where Kirsty Boden was murdered. It was very moving to meet them. The three of us did our best not to burst into tears. They are very brave men, very brave men and women.

I just want to you on behalf of all Australians for the way your first responders and the way the owners of the businesses in the market, how they talked about throwing bottles at the terrorists, barricading their restaurants, protecting their customers, protecting passers by and the resilience, Theresa, the resilience of that community who like ours in the face of terror when we say to these killers, to these terrorists that seek to change the way we live we will not be cowed. We won't change the way we live.

We won't stop going out at night. We won't stop enjoying ourselves. We will defy you and defeat you.

And I was very pleased to stand with you and your Police Commissioner, Cressida Dick and her team at the spot where your officers killed those terrorists. They acted so effectively and so decisively. It was a great effort, a magnificent effort to deal with that terrorist attack and I know that as we work so closely together, as close as any two nations could be, we will continue to defeat them in the field, at home, around the world, here in London, in Sydney, in Melbourne, in Manchester and in cyber-space itself.

We have a lot to talk about.

PRIME MINISTER OF THE UNITED KINGDOM:

We do have a lot to talk about.

Can I also welcome, because you talk about bravery of those who were there enjoying the night out and that includes Kirsty who of course, a nurse who rushed to the scene to help others when she saw people who had been attacked and sadly lost her life as a result.

We should thank her and the others who as you say didn't think of themselves but went to help those who they saw in need. It was an amazing response and I think as we've just seen, as you say the resilience of Borough Market is fantastic and the resilience of the British people but all those people who are here in the UK who recognized that we are going to stand up against these terrorists and we are as you say going to defeat them and they will not destroy our way of life and our values will prevail.

PRIME MINISTER:

They will because they are right.

Thank you.

[ENDS]

[Disraeli Prize Speech: In Defence of a Free Society](#)

Benjamin Disraeli is a giant of our shared parliamentary tradition.

So I am both grateful and humbled to receive the Disraeli Prize tonight.

Thank you to Dean Godson and the Policy Exchange.

Disraeli entered Parliament in 1837 after four unsuccessful attempts and spent three-quarters of his 44-year parliamentary career in opposition.

We look back at that era through a flickering sepia screen of sentimental memory and compare its apparent elegance to the unruly political times in which we live.

And yet the invective hurled at, and by, Disraeli would be more shocking today, than it was then.

He took no quarter and asked for none. He scrambled to the top of what he called the greasy pole despite being a Jew in an age when anti-semitism was the norm, and despite making his living as a novelist at a time when a Prime Minister's qualification almost invariably came from their ancestors' broad acres or, less often, from the law.

Of course as you look around the table at the G20 there are more than a few leaders – myself included – whose prospects of success seemed unlikely not so long ago.

As Disraeli's contemporary, Mark Twain, observed – only fiction has to be credible.

The tenor of our times is change and at a pace and scale utterly unprecedented in human history.

And in such times what price political labels.

Is every boy and every gal that's born into the world alive still a little liberal or a little conservative?

Is it conservative to support free trade and open markets as Theresa May and I did today (I think it is!) – or call for more protection as many on both the self styled "liberal left" and "conservative right" in the US do today.

The truth is that the labels have lost almost all meaning in the furious outrage cycle of social media politics, long cast adrift to be appropriated, often cynically, by one politician or another as it suits their purpose.

And at the heart of our political tradition, whether we describe it as Conservative or Liberal is respect for humanity not in the mass, as the Left like to see us, but as individuals and families, Burke's small platoons, Menzies "forgotten people".

So what we admire about our distinguished predecessors, from Churchill to Thatcher, from Menzies to Howard, is not their label but their dogged devotion to the principles of a free society under the law.

Sovereignty. Law. Security. Liberty.

In 1944 Menzies went to great pains not to call his new political party, consolidating the centre right of Australian politics, "conservative" – but rather the Liberal Party which he firmly anchored in the centre of Australian

politics.

He wanted to stand apart from the big money, business establishment politics of traditional “conservative” parties of the right, as well as from the socialist tradition of the Australian Labor Party – the political wing of the union movement. Menzies said:

“We took the name ‘Liberal’ because we were determined to be a progressive party, willing to make experiments, in no sense reactionary but believing in the individual, his right and his enterprise, and rejecting the socialist panacea.”

It is important to remember the context of Menzies’ new Liberal Party. In 1944 our nations were still fighting a war against fascism. There had been plenty of local admirers of Mussolini and even Hitler before the War but, by this point, the authoritarian right had no appeal. The Soviet Union was still an ally in the war against Hitler, but the authoritarian Left had no appeal to most Australians either.

At the same time, laissez faire capitalism had not had a good run. The Great Depression had convinced many that the Government needed to play a much bigger role in the economy than the leaders of the Edwardian era would have ever imagined. So classical liberalism was out of fashion too.

The sensible centre, to use Tony Abbott’s phrase, was the place to be and It remains the place to be now.

I mention this only to remind that when we quote Menzies, Disraeli, or any other political leader, we need to consider the historical context. Menzies sought a lesser role for Government in citizens’ lives than Labor did, but by our 21st century standards he was hardly an economic liberal. He believed in a highly regulated economy with high tariffs, a fixed exchange rate, centralised wage fixing and generally much more Government involvement in the economy than we would be comfortable with.

Of course he was not alone – his UK and even American counterparts had similar views.

It was a different age.

But a strong thread of principle, of value, connects our party to that of Menzies – one that combines both the liberal and conservative traditions – John Howard’s broad church.

And it is best summed up in this way.

From its foundation more than sixty years ago, the Liberal Party has stood for freedom.

Nothing is more fundamental to our philosophy than a deep commitment to individual freedom and enterprise. The Liberal Party stands for freedom or it stands for nothing.

We in the Liberal Party believe Government's role is to enable citizens to do their best – and that commitment to freedom is based in a deep, instinctive respect for the dignity and the worth of every individual. We respect each other when we say: you are free to chart your own course, to make your own choices, and strive to realise your own dreams.

Our opponents on the Left believe that Government actually knows best.

So in the balance between the individual and the State, our side of politics leans heavily in favour of freedom and the individual – preferring choice over prescription and freedom over regulation, always sceptical about the wisdom and interference of governments.

The area where we must most carefully scrutinise the relationship between individual freedoms and Government intervention is national security.

Security and freedom are frequently presented as binary opposites – as if there exists a universe in which you could have one without the other.

But these two principles – prioritising public safety and maintaining individual freedoms – are not mutually exclusive. They can be – in fact, they must be – mutually reinforcing.

The question is not what freedoms to forgo for security. It is what security is required to enable our freedom.

The fundamental tenet of liberalism – going back to the classic work of John Stuart Mill – is that people should be free to pursue their own ideas provided their actions do not impede the rights of others to do the same.

This foundational principle of liberalism took on an even greater significance in the twentieth century when threatened by the modern totalitarian state.

The march of both fascism and communism led Karl Popper, to examine what he called “the paradox of freedom”.

In his words:

“Freedom... defeats itself if it is unlimited. Unlimited freedom means that a strong man is free to bully one who is weak and to rob him of his freedom. This is why we demand that the state should limit freedom to a certain extent, so that everyone's freedom is protected by law. Nobody should be at the mercy of others, but all should have a right to be protected by the state.”

And this of course is what we mean when we talk about democracy under the rule of law this constrains the majority as it enables it.

Or as Churchill said “Democracy is no harlot to be picked up in the street by a man with a tommy gun.”

Karl Popper's paradox of freedom was not the rationalisation of a dictator

crushing his enemies. To the contrary, Karl Popper was fighting to defend what he called "The Open Society" of freedom, rationality and peaceful debate.

And this is what we in this room are fighting to defend today.

To defend the Open Society – to defend freedom – we cannot give free reign to its enemies.

And those enemies are resurgent.

Terrorism is the starkest and most urgent enemy of freedom. Terrorists seek to disrupt our freedoms and disable our trust-based societies through fear. They seek to create a society in which people are neither free nor secure.

It is in the very pursuit of freedom that we seek a stronger role for the State in protecting citizens against the terrorist threat. By fighting terrorism – with proportionate means – we are defending liberal values.

In order to be free a person must first be safe.

The reality is that individual freedom, liberty, the rule of law, and indeed national sovereignty, are currently under threat.

In a world of rapid change, we must constantly review and improve the policies and laws that will best keep our people safe. To set and forget would be easy, but it would not be right.

When a government abdicates its national security responsibilities the consequences can be fatal – and sometimes catastrophic.

Strong Borders the Foundation of a Free Society

Australia is the most successful multicultural society in the world. 26% of our people were born overseas, in my own city of Sydney the percentage is 37%, and half the population have at least one parent born outside Australia.

Our migration nation is also very diverse with people drawn from every party of the world, the second most commonly spoken language at home in Sydney is Chinese, the third is Arabic.

And yet in an age of increasing uncertainty and friction we live together, citizens of a free society, in relative harmony.

This freedom is enabled by strong national security.

In particular our strong border protection policies have ensured that Australians know once again, as they did in John Howard's day, that it is only their Government which determines who comes to Australia and on what terms they can stay.

Howard's strong policies were dropped by Labor when they were elected in 2007 and over six years there were 50,000 unlawful arrivals and at least 1200

deaths at sea.

More than 14,500 refugees waiting in UN camps were denied a place under our offshore humanitarian program – the places going instead to those arriving illegally by boat.

Taxpayers paid over A\$10 billion for managing these arrivals – money that could have been spent on hospitals or schools.

It's a record that utterly vindicates the Coalition's border protection policies.

As Europe grapples today with unsustainable inflows of migrants and asylum seekers, the Australian experience offers both a cautionary tale and the seeds of a potential solution.

The lesson is clear: weak borders fragment social cohesion, drain public revenue, raise community concerns about national security, and ultimately undermine the consensus required to sustain high levels of immigration and multiculturalism.

Ultimately, division.

In contrast, strong borders and retention of our sovereignty allow government to maintain public trust in community safety, respect for diversity and support for our immigration and humanitarian programs.

Unity. Security. Opportunity. Freedom.

Australia continues to welcome around 200,000 migrants each year; we have issued an additional 12,000 visas for people displaced by conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and we have increased our broader humanitarian intake by 35 per cent. This could not have happened if we did not restore order at the border, maintain strict security vetting and earn the Australian people's trust that it is the Government that controls who enters Australia and for which purposes, not the criminal people smugglers.

I say to critics of our border protection policies: Are these not precisely the outcomes that every just and decent society should seek?

And it's this foundation that will allow us to effectively deal with the most pressing security challenge of our age – Islamist extremism.

While small in number, its adherents are resolute in murderous purpose.

They have already eroded a measure of public trust in our pluralism and cast doubt on the ability of our governments to protect their own people.

So we must answer: Will we cower before their barbarism? Or will we defeat them?

In our response, we draw strength from the finest political tradition ever devised.

The values of Westminster are those of openness, mutual respect and the rule of law.

We believe that a good society is one that welcomes all peoples who commit to these core values. We believe that contending religions and philosophies should have to make their case in a marketplace of ideas. By comparison, the extremists are morally and intellectually bereft. They can offer nothing in life, so they promise glory in death.

It's easy to scoff at the paucity of their vision; many have made the mistake of trivialising the threat they pose.

But as Disraeli once observed, "something unpleasant is coming when men are anxious to tell the truth".

In the fight ahead, there is no space for the mush of moral relativism.

There is no justification for the mass murder of children at a concert in Manchester, or the killing of innocent people on London Bridge and at Borough Market – including Australians Kirsty Boden and Sara Zelenak.

We must acknowledge, as so many Muslims acknowledge, that Islamist extremism is a disease within the body of Islam itself.

Equally we must recognise that Muslim leaders who stand for mutual respect and democracy whether at home or, like President Widodo, on the world stage are our best allies in the war against Daesh.

And we must also recognise that those who seek to tag all Muslims for the crimes of a tiny minority are doing precisely what the terrorists want them to do.

After all, their pitch to Australian Muslims is "you don't belong here, they don't want you, this is not your home."

The last thing we should do is confirm their poisonous propaganda.

The genius of Australia is that we define our national identity not by race or religion or ethnicity but rather by a commitment to shared political values of freedom, democracy, the rule of law – values accessible to all.

So we must never take a backward step from our values – let's face it, a bad idea does not become valid, let alone good, simply because someone claims it was divinely inspired.

Religion and tradition should be acknowledged, but the values that prevail in our society are our values, the laws that prevail in our society are our laws – and no others.

As we honour our law enforcement and security services – who rush towards danger when others flee – we must ensure that they have the powers and resources to stay ahead of the threat.

As our adversaries' methods and tactics evolve, so must ours.

The privacy of a terrorist can never be more important than the safety of the public. The information security of a terrorist or child abuser must not be protected above the personal security of our children, communities, values.

A government that gets this upside down would be abdicating responsibility; its duty of care to citizens. It certainly would not be helping the cause of freedom.

This is where Mill's view on liberty is so important – we must not allow harm to be done to individuals and communities where we can act.

This must be the case online as it is off.

Now the question of Internet freedom is an important one. There is no institution or infrastructure more important to the future prosperity and freedom of our global community than the Internet. There has never been a more transformative democratising technology; it has broken down national boundaries and distance. Not so long ago only States and large corporations had megaphones powerful enough to address a nation – now a tweet or YouTube video can reach millions, if not billions, and do so in seconds.

But these remarkable technologies that are designed to unite us are also being used by those who seek to do us harm.

We have seen how terrorists have used, trained in and developed operations from, ungoverned places around the world. This is why Australia and the UK are part of the international coalition to defeat the Islamist terrorism of Daesh at its source in Syria and Iraq.

But as the so called Caliphate collapses, the terrorists will continue to sue the Internet for recruitment, planning and advocacy.

We cannot allow ungoverned spaces, whether offline or online, to be exploited by those who would do us harm.

The Internet must remain free and secure. But it cannot be ungoverned. Laws offline must apply online. Otherwise, freedom and security will both be lost.

To ensure terrorists are unable to operate with impunity in the ungoverned digital space, I set up a task force last month to drive action on our capability and response to cyber threats.

And just three days ago, in an unprecedented show of solidarity, the G20 agreed to work with industry in the pursuit of public safety and together fight terrorists and organised criminals.

We agreed we would collaborate “with industry to provide lawful and non-arbitrary access to available information where access is necessary for the protection of national security against terrorist threats. We affirm that the rule of law applies online as well as it does offline.”

I will refer to two areas where we need to do more.

First we need to secure swifter and more effective action by the owners of the big online services, like Facebook, Google and Twitter, to take down extremist material as soon as it appears. By and large I am confident that we can do more in this regard.

Second we need to address the problem of encryption. Now encryption is vitally important to protect our security online. But just as a locked bank vault or filing cabinet cannot resist a Court order to produce a document, why should the owners of encrypted messaging platforms like Whatsapp or Telegram or Signal be able to establish end to end encryption in such a way that nobody, not the owners and not the courts have the ability to find out what is being communicated.

The G20 communique is not talking about giving Governments a backdoor to access messaging, nor is it seeking access to the source code that some countries are demanding of companies for the pleasure of doing business in their jurisdiction.

Rather it is saying to Silicon Valley and its emulators – the ball is in your court. You have created messaging applications which are encrypted end to end, they are being used by terrorists and criminals to hide their murderous plans.

You must ensure that these dark places can be illuminated by the law so that the freedoms you hold dear will not be stripped away by criminals your technologies have made undetectable.

This will be a difficult conversation in many places, and especially in the USA, where there is a strong, anti government libertarian tradition on both the left and the right.

But here is the bottom line: the best defence against terrorists' plans is good intelligence. We have in the last few years disrupted twelve major terrorists plots, including several that would have resulted in large mass casualty attacks. How many more can we disrupt if every communication, by every conspirator, is encrypted end to end and cannot be read despite every lawful right, indeed duty, so to do?

I conclude tonight by thanking you again, ladies and gentlemen, for the honour of the Disraeli Prize.

[ENDS]

Doorstop – Paris, France

PRIME MINISTER:

I want to thank again on behalf of myself and Lucy, President Macron and his wife Brigitte for their extraordinary warmth and hospitality and friendship they showed us yesterday and last night at the Élysée Palace.

It really was a great opportunity to spend a lot of time with the President and his wife and to discuss his agenda. He is of course the youngest President of the French Republic. He's come through the centre of politics. You could say he stands in the sensible centre of French politics and has won a remarkable victory, both in the Presidential election and of course in the parliamentary elections just concluded.

It was great to have a very extended opportunity to talk with him on the plane. He gave us a lift as you know from Hamburg to Paris and then last night at the Élysée Palace.

I'd say the relationship between France and Australia has never been stronger and of course we'll be going down to Cherbourg in a moment to officially open the Future Submarine Project office where the design work is underway for our regionally superior submarines that we're building with the French based on their latest submarine.

This is a massive national enterprise, a multi-generational project that is going to knit the relationship between France and Australia together even more closely. And of course as the President noted last night, I thought in a very gracious and touching way, we're doing all of this 100 years on from when Australian Diggers and French Poileau were fighting side-by-side to keep France free in the trenches of the First World War.

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister, how confident are you that jobs or work can start on the submarines in 2022?

PRIME MINISTER:

I was just actually speaking to one of my officials a moment ago and that is precisely the date, that 2021-2022 is when they expect construction to be able to begin.

JOURNALIST:

How many jobs would there be at that point do you think?

PRIME MINISTER:

There will be thousands of jobs associated with the project. It is a massive project as you know. And of course it's at the cutting edge of technology and

this is one of the important things – it is not just a matter of acquiring the defence capabilities and naval capabilities that we need to defend Australia. It's also at the most advanced level of manufacturing, of design and manufacturing and that has enormous spillover benefits for the rest of Australian industry.

So it is a job creator in terms of the project but this is a great national enterprise which will have big spill-over benefits across the economy.

JOURNALIST:

Is the plan still to have every one of the submarines built in South Australia? And is there a danger in doing that about capability gaps?

PRIME MINISTER:

No, the plan is to build, the commitment is to build them all in Australia. This is a part of my commitment to ensure that Australia has a sovereign defence industry, a sovereign naval shipbuilding industry. Of course it goes beyond submarines, as you know. But this is a key part of the economic security that my government is building for Australians now and for generations to come.

JOURNALIST:

Just reflecting on the G20 – the conclusion of the Summit has failed to reach consensus on North Korea and on climate. Are you concerned that issues of such consequence, there hasn't been global leadership shown by the G20?

PRIME MINISTER:

Dealing with climate, I spent some time shortly before the G20 concluded, in fact with President Macron and President Trump ensuring that we had a consensus on the language in the communique and Prime Minister Theresa May was with us as well. There was quite a lot of work done by leaders to ensure that the language was agreed to and committed to. But of course the United States has decided to pull out of the Paris Agreement and that was recognised in the communique. But I think rather than focusing on the recognition of that decision by the United States which we regret, but nonetheless they've made that decision – it was well flagged in advance. President Trump campaigned on it. It was hardly a surprise. But apart from that I think there is considerable, consensus in agreement on the climate and energy issue.

As far as North Korea is concerned, the Chair of the G20 Chancellor Merkel made the point that the G20 has been historically largely an economic conference although of course we did secure a really historic statement about terrorism, counter-terrorism which again Australia played a leading role in delivering.

In terms of North Korea, there is unanimous condemnation of the conduct of the North Korean regime but my sense was based on what the Chancellor said to us was that it was a little late to achieve a consensus among all the nations on a particular statement to go into the communique.

JOURNALIST:

Was that disappointing?

PRIME MINISTER:

I would have preferred to have seen a unanimous statement but it was not able to be achieved. But look, there is nobody, I just want to be very clear about this, nobody around that table was defending the North Koreans in terms of their conduct.

The Chinese of course as I've said before have the greatest leverage and hence the greatest responsibility are very forthright in their condemnation of North Korea's conduct and indeed supporting the sanctions that have been imposed by the Security Council.

JOURNALIST:

President Trump has left this Summit isolated on climate change, on trade and failing to help steer through some kind of strong statement on North Korea. How significant is it for the world and for Australia, and I guess for the global rules based order that the US power, so clearly is in decline at summits like this?

PRIME MINISTER:

You've just run through a summary of an editorial that you're composing.

Just speaking for myself I am there as the Prime Minister of Australia defending Australia's national interests. We wanted to get a strong statement on counter-terrorism. We wanted to get a strong statement about the rule of law applying in the digital world, in the cyber-space. We secured that.

We were able to join with other nations – I've mentioned Presidents Macron and Trump in particular – to ensure that we got consensus on the language on climate.

And look, generally I think it was a good outcome but plainly there are some differences of opinion around the table but you know, you can have a good conference and a good outcome without having complete unanimity on every point.

JOURNALIST:

Just on a domestic issue, a renewed push at home on same-sex marriage led by Dean Smith. Are you disappointed that this is happening despite your words only a couple of weeks ago on this to try and calm this down?

PRIME MINISTER:

On that matter all I can say is that the Government's policy is very clear. We support a plebiscite where all Australians will be given a vote on the matter and that remains our policy. So, that's really all I can say about it.

It is critical that all Australians be given a say and the only reason they haven't been given that say is because of Bill Shorten playing politics with the issue.

JOURNALIST:

But are you urging Dean Smith to do this? Are you urging him to not do this or are you staying out of it?

PRIME MINISTER:

Well our policy is very clear. If Members want to raise – I mean Dean crossed the floor against the plebiscite bill in the Senate, you know, so he's got a long standing view about it – but we, in our party, in our party room, Members are entitled to raise whatever issues they like.

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister, can I just take you back to the United States – we understand that you can't necessarily criticise the President directly but can you tell us why you think it is important the United States be a global leader and be seen to be a global leader?

PRIME MINISTER:

The United States is a global leader. And it is plainly, I mean it is the largest economy, it is the number one super power. It provides global leadership and the President's presence there in Hamburg was demonstration of that.

But again, that doesn't mean that everybody has to agree on every single point. I think there is a remarkable amount of consensus that came out of the G20 statement and again, look at what we were able to achieve on terrorism, on the statement on counter-terrorism – how important it is for all of the nations around that table to speak with one voice and in particular to address the challenges in the cyber sphere which as one of the leaders I heard saying at the G20 it is an issue that has been talked about for many years but this is the first time that you've got very clear language and a very clear focus on what needs to be done and that's good. And I'm glad that Australia's been able to have a considerable influence in that.

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister, there was a report that Christopher Pyne was meant to come to Cherbourg today and then was yanked after his same-sex marriage comment. Is there any truth to that?

PRIME MINISTER:

I am quite capable of opening the project office myself I can assure you.

JOURNALIST:

You don't need Mr Pyne?

(Laughter)

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister, Barnaby Joyce has said today that with President Trump you've got to separate what President Trump does, and what President Trump says. Do you agree?

PRIME MINISTER:

Again, I'm not here to commentate David. We have a very warm and constructive relationship with the Trump Administration both at a head of government level between myself and President Trump and with my ministers and officials. It is a very deep and engaged relationship and very constructive and effective. We spent a lot of time together at the G20 in which we covered a lot of issues – communique drafting issues, trade issues, discussed North Korea, discussed the Middle East – a whole range of issues. So it is a very good and constructive relationship and I want to thank President Trump for the opportunity to work through so many issues as we did at the G20.

JOURNALIST:

Prime Minister – what is your agenda for London?

PRIME MINISTER:

It will be largely focused on national security. We'll be meeting obviously with Prime Minister May and with other ministers and also with security agencies while we are there.

JOURNALIST:

How was dinner last night? What did you have?

PRIME MINISTER:

Look, it was a magnificent dinner. It was, really, I just want to conclude on this point – you know, yesterday and last night was an opportunity for me to get to know President Macron very early in his term and we had the most broad-ranging discussions.

As you can see he is a remarkable leader of a remarkable nation and one whose destiny has been interlinked with Australia for well over a century as we discussed last night.

I think there was a very very valuable opportunity to get to know each other and understand his agenda, his reform agenda and his view of the world and the challenges that we face.

And I might say, I know that you're talking about climate, just in terms of practical matters – I had very good discussions with a number of leaders

about what we're doing in the energy sphere and a lot of interest in what we're doing on storage. There is a growing recognition around the world that as your quantity of renewable energy grows, variable renewable energy grows you've got to provide the storage and the backup to support it. And so a lot of interest in Snowy Hydro 2.0 and what we're doing and I think you will see a lot of investment in pumped hydro around the world to support that renewable energy that is growing everywhere.

JOURNALIST:

Have you invited him to visit Australia?

PRIME MINISTER:

I have, I certainly have and we look forward to doing so at some point the future. I think he would be enthusiastically received. I have no doubt he would be enthusiastically received.

JOURNALIST:

Can you tell us anything about the Disraeli speech that you're going to give?

PRIME MINISTER:

I'll be talking about freedom in the context of national security. That will be main theme of the speech.

Okay thank you all very much. See you in Cherbourg.

[ENDS]