

POST-CABINET PRESS CONFERENCE: Monday, 30 May 2016

PM: Okey-dokey, good afternoon. So, as you know, the Budget last week focused on achieving better results for Kiwis and their families. It shows rising surpluses and falling debt, with the economy set to grow at 2.8 percent over the next 5 years. With our books in the black and the economy continuing to grow, we now have choices we simply didn't have 8 years ago. It means we can invest more in health and education and in infrastructure like roads and schools. It means we can support businesses further by investing in innovation, which will not only help diversify the economy but also support some more jobs and higher incomes for New Zealanders. It also means we can help support vulnerable New Zealanders while starting to reduce debt. We recognise that housing, both affordable and social, remains a challenge, and we're working hard to address that.

Around 40 houses are being built every working day in Auckland, four times more than when we came into office. We created 154 special housing areas with the Auckland Council, and we've released land for another 56,000 homes. We've also freed up enough surplus Crown land in Auckland so far for nearly 1,000 homes—20 percent of those must be affordable and 20 percent social housing. We've helped almost 12,000 families nationwide into their first home through the KiwiSaver HomeStart grants over the last year.

In terms of social housing we spend \$34 million every week to subsidise more than 470,000 New Zealanders in social housing and private rentals. We help 134 tenants and their families into social housing every week and we're building around 17 new social houses a week. We also announced in the Budget an additional \$41 million for emergency housing and grants, so there's plenty going on.

We'll soon release a national policy statement on urban development, which will go out for public consultation. It will complement the RMA amendments currently before Parliament. It puts new requirements on councils to provide enough housing development to meet demand. The national policy statement is the next step in the Government's wider programme focused on ensuring councils free up land so houses can be built faster, particularly in areas of high demand. With respect to Auckland, the council will consider its unitary plan options for responding to the housing needs of our largest city in the next few months. I said before the Government's expectations are absolutely clear. We must continue lifting the supply of new houses in Auckland to meet the demands of this growing city. Everyone has a part to play—the Government, the council, developers, and community organisations.

As you may have seen, I'm heading to Fiji next week on an official visit. The visit marks a significant milestone in the renewal of the political and diplomatic relationship between New Zealand and Fiji. It will be the first time in a decade a New Zealand Prime Minister has visited Fiji. I look forward to discussing a wide range of issues with Prime Minister Bainimarama, including Fiji's recovery from Cyclone Winston and the PACER Plus negotiations.

In Parliament this week we'll continue the Budget debate; we'll also have the third readings of the Residential Tenancies Amendment Bill and the taxation bill. In terms of my own activities I'm in Wellington tomorrow and on Wednesday, I'm in Auckland on Thursday, and Taranaki - King Country on Friday.

Media: Are you worried about New Zealand's reputation in the wake of the Panama Papers, and have you ever met with Geoff Cone?

PM: OK, so in terms of the first one, no, I'm not concerned, because I think the Government is taking wide-ranging steps to ensure it has the best policies in place, and they include the review that's being undertaken by John Shewan, the work we're doing with

the OECD. In terms of Geoff Cone I don't think I've formally met him, but I'm pretty sure I've met him at a social event before.

Media: Is it time to roll out the second phase of the AML legislation? I know you have referred to it, but Cone Marshall is not specifically covered by that legislation at the moment, or not on the reporting entities list.

PM: Right—so, yes, it is the time to bring in the second phase, and we're working on expediting that, if you like. My understanding, on the advice I've had, is that Cone Marshall do have a subsidiary which is covered by the AML, Part 1, legislation, but whether those transactions are or aren't, I just simply don't know, because I don't have access to that information.

Media: Isn't it the case that you had some push-back from lawyers and real estate agents on that phase 2 though?

PM: I haven't had any advice on the phase 2; you'd have to ask the Minister of Justice's office.

Media: Have you looked into whether IRD are going to investigate in terms of Kazakhstan or Malta?

PM: Whether they'll look into those areas, I don't have that advice; again, you'd have to ask the Minister of IRD's office.

Media: Doesn't this just show, though, that the system is allowing these structures basically to disguise the beneficial owners and where the funds are coming from, and for people—politically [*Inaudible*] people—like this convicted ex-Prime Minister?

PM: OK, in the first instance, what I'd say is, if you think about Part 1 of the AML legislation, that's quite specific, in terms of—as I understand it—knowing your client and knowing the source of funds. So the obligations on anyone covered under Part 1 of the AML legislation are quite far-reaching. What's clear is to cover off all of the other kinds of entities, I think, that might be able to set up these transactions. So they're likely to be, you know, less intensive in this area, although they might be, it just depends, then we'd certainly need to pass Part 2 of that, and there's no question that as a result of, you know, the debate around the Panama Papers and the sort of wider public debate globally about this issue, we're certainly trying to push Part 2 of that through as quickly as we can.

Media: Does New Zealand have a double tax arrangement with Kazakhstan or Malta?

PM: I don't know. Again, you'd have to ask the office, because we may not necessarily have a double tax agreement. You know, sometimes we only, well, in fact, we'll only have it, as I understand it, a double tax agreement with a country where we're very confident about their actual tax system and tax structure themselves, and they might—and they'd always, obviously, want to have that, which is why we have a smaller number of double tax agreements as opposed to information-sharing agreements. In some cases, the information-sharing agreements for countries is covered under the broader topic of the, sort of, master agreement that we've got, and I just don't know about those countries. With Malta, I think it's yes, but I just don't know.

Media: After the Shewan review do you envisage that the beneficial owner will be visible to IRD?

PM: I just wouldn't want to guess what he might do in that review. I mean, we have huge respect for John Shewan, his capacity to both understand the issues and to understand the wider issue at stake, which is making sure that, I think, we preserve the good reputation that New Zealand's got. So if, as a result of John Shewan's work, he comes up with some recommendations, I would have thought the Government's going to look pretty favourably at those, but what those recommendations might be, I don't know yet.

Media: But isn't it the case that the NGOs involved in this area all say that the only way to solve this problem and restore New Zealand's reputation is to have the beneficial owner disclosed to IRD?

PM: Well, I think one point I'd make is I think New Zealand's reputation's in good shape. It doesn't mean that there can't be further enhancements in terms of the policies that we have that will preserve that good reputation. But, by any definition, I think we're in pretty good shape. What those recommendations are, again, we just need to wait and see.

Media: If other cases come out with New Zealand links—for example, corrupt politicians—would you act any more urgently, or do you think that the Government's on the right track?

PM: Well, my understanding's we're moving pretty much as quickly as we can. John Shewan's work will be back—I think it was 30 June, by memory, but obviously it's a matter of him getting that work done professionally. So, you know, within reason we'd rather take a little more time if we had to. But in terms of the Part 2 AML progress, that's going to happen as rapidly as we practically can. It's, I think, a little more challenging as you go away from the specialist firms, but they're working on that as quickly as they can, and Parliament's already been progressing the issue around proactive disclosure of information to a much greater number of countries than just Australia and the US in terms of FACTA.

Media: What are the issues with the AML Part 2, because it has been a long hold-up. I mean, I think 2 or 3 weeks ago you said you'd put an urgent priority on it, and still no movement. What's been the hold-up?

PM: Well, things don't move instantly, obviously, in Government, so they are, you know, when we put a priority on it we are putting a priority on it and it is moving very rapidly up the work programme for justice, but they've got a very busy programme, and so we're having to leapfrog some other things. My understanding is they're working quite aggressively on it now.

Media: Can you guarantee that IRD will investigate these allegations—these international allegations?

PM: Well, what I—no one has access to the papers at the moment, only the journalists, so if you want to give those to IRD, then you can certainly—

Media: The information's out there though.

PM: Well, the database is out there. I think the broader papers, as I understand it, are being held back by this investigative journalists outfit. So—

Media: Are you saying with all the information out there in the public through reporting, both in New Zealand and around the world, IRD can't act because they can't have access to the papers?

PM: No. What I'm saying is I don't direct IRD. I mean, these are individual tax matters. But IRD is quite conscious of the issue and I think some weeks ago when we were talking about it made it quite clear if they saw anything that they were concerned about, they would go and act on that. Now I haven't had any discussions with them today about whether they've seen anything yet that they're concerned about, but if they do, I'm sure they'll go and have a look at it. But, in the end, that's sort of in their hands really.

Media: Even the DIA says that, you know, they had the reporting entities list but that doesn't guarantee compliance, basically, that these firms are registered with them.

PM: Is that for AML, or was that—

Media: For AML.

PM: For AML. Well, my understanding—and look, I could stand corrected, but my understanding on the Part 1 of, firms covered by Part 1 of the AML legislation, is that it's quite onerous on them. So they have to understand their client, they have to understand the

source of funds, they have to be confident about that information. They are audited on, I think, a 2-yearly basis, and their records are opened up. So any company that's covered by the Part 1 of the AML legislation, takes their responsibilities very seriously—and if they don't, then there are significant repercussions for them.

Media: A quick question on the Navy's 75th anniversary. To your knowledge, is the Chinese Navy invited and do they want, are they likely to come?

PM: I'm not sure whether it's formally been announced, but they've certainly been invited, and I think it's highly likely they'll come.

Media: Given that they obviously have nuclear submarines and whatnot, is that an issue with the Chinese Navy? Are they happy to sort of say [*Inaudible*]

PM: OK, so the anti-nuclear legislation isn't country-specific, it's topic-specific. In other words, you have to meet our law, in terms of being neither nuclear-powered or nuclear-armed. So any ship that comes at any point, whether it is the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the Navy or at any point, and any aircraft that comes from a military capacity—all of those have to meet our legislation. It doesn't matter whether they're Chinese, American, or from any other part of the world.

Media: Sure, but is the Chinese Navy, sort of, more open? Are they just happy to say: "Yes, we confirm, New Zealand, this is a non-nuclear ship.", as opposed to the United States—you would have seen the ambassador is still saying that he's not going to confirm or deny.

PM: Yeah, so the process is—you know, I think we've been through this before. But the process is I as Prime Minister have to sign a waiver of the anti-nuclear legislation, and the waiver is based on the advice I get from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs that the particular vessel or aircraft complies with the New Zealand law. Exactly how they form that advice, you'd really have to go and ask the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. But every waiver I sign—I sign quite a lot of them because it's quite a regular thing—just comes with a form that says, essentially: "We advise you as Prime Minister that you will be complying with the law by signing this waiver, and the advice is to sign it." So how they form that view, I don't know—whether they specifically ask them or whether they just do it through open-source intelligence. For instance, we know lots of ships, you know, don't—are neither nuclear armed or carry nuclear weapons. So I don't know exactly whether some countries are more open than others; you'd have to ask them.

Media: Yeah, I guess my question is just the, sort of, the attitude of the United States is kind of like—you know, why don't they just say?

PM: Yeah, OK, so the Americans, I think, for a long time have had a "neither confirm nor deny" position, but they've also had enough open-source intelligence about which particular ships are either nuclear armed or carry nuclear weapons. I don't think that's, sort of, been hidden, if you like. I think they've made that clear that submarines, I think, do, are nuclear capable, and certain vessels, like the Coast Guard, are not, and that's just part of their open-source reporting. So, I think it's, in the end, quite possible for the Americans to send a ship that foreign affairs would be quite comfortable in providing the advice to me, and me signing the waiver. But clearly we need to comply with the law.

Media: So the Americans themselves wouldn't necessarily have to do anything if it's in the open intelligence arena—

PM: As I understand it, yeah. Foreign Affairs can make an assessment in their own right whether something is nuclear-powered or nuclear-capable. And I think—you guys are, I don't want to say older than me, but shall we say more knowledgeable, maybe, than me—but I'm pretty sure if the *Buchanan* came, they knew at the time the *Buchanan* was neither nuclear armed or nuclear powered. So, you know, at the end of the day if I'd been Prime Minister back then, I'm sure they would've been able to provide—or provide David Lange at the time the advice that he was free to sign the waiver.

Media: But that's the sort of nub where I'm getting at, because, you know, you've got this more relaxed attitude to the confirm or deny thing. You're happy to say: "Look, Google will tell foreign affairs that that ship is not nuclear armed. I'm happy with that." And you don't actually need the American Government to back down on this policy, do you?

PM: I don't think it's right to say I'm relaxed; I'm very—

Media: You're more relaxed than other Prime Ministers have been.

PM: No, no. I'm very cognisant of my responsibilities in meeting the law, but how foreign affairs form their view of whether, you know, a ship complies or not is a matter for them. I'm not asking the Americans or expecting the Americans to do anything different. What I would expect, though, is a ship that comes complies with our law.

Media: Are you concerned that the National Party appear to have broken the lock-up rules of the Budget?

PM: Oh, the embargo. Yeah, I mean, the point is, of course, it's the information that's embargoed, not the location. So if you, Katie, were to do a selfie in the lock-up, as long as it wasn't breaking information, I would have thought that's OK. But, yeah, maybe you can make a case that they shouldn't have any photo. But, you know, I'm not—

Media: So you're saying—I mean, we've all waited and all been under the understanding that you don't transmit anything from a Budget lock-up—

PM: And it's probably—it's probably sensible that they don't. But if you just think through, that's the absolutely purest perspective—I'm sure you're right, and we'd prefer people stuck to the embargo—but it's the information that's embargoed, not the location. I think they just had a picture of inside the lock-up, not of the information.

Media: That photo did also have a Wi-Fi password on it, which, theoretically, you could have then connected to the network and seen those Budget documents—

PM: Yeah.

Media: —if you were in the vicinity.

PM: So that wouldn't be good, and if it had that, then they, you know—they shouldn't have that. But, look, I don't know. I haven't seen the photo. But I'm just saying, you know, that that's the issue. I think we all understand an embargo.

Media: Do you think you should recommend—reprimand someone in the National Party for sending out those photos?

PM: Yeah, well, I'm sure—look, I'm sure they'll cease and desist from taking such graphic scenes, or whatever, in the future.

Media: Just [*Inaudible*], when can we expect the defence white paper?

PM: Soon.

Media: Can we be more specific?

PM: Very soon. So—

Media: This week?

PM: I don't know if it's this week. It's gone to Cabinet—it's been through Cabinet, so it's pretty soon.

Media: The Budget included—

PM: It could be soon, very soon, or pretty soon. You can pick whichever one you want—or tomorrow morning—but it's soon, anyway.

Media: The Budget had a wind-down in funds for the building partnerships capability Taji mission for next year.

PM: Right.

Media: Does that mean you have made the final decision that you won't keep them on past the 2 years, or can we not read that much into it?

PM: No, because what the Budget does is it acts on decisions the Government has made, and the decision the Government has made is that it's a 2-year mission to Taji. Now, you know, it's not my intention to extend it, on the information I have today, but if that was to change, then we'd have to allocate more funds for that.

Media: Plain packaging tobacco—has that been funded by Cabinet, and if so, where is that at?

PM: It hasn't been signed off, but the advice I've been getting has increasingly been that we should be able to proceed with that and without the legal risks that had slowed us up, subject to—on the basis of, off the back of a number of countries who have been acting on their own right. So I'm not sure how far away it is, but it's getting much closer and we're keen to progress it.

Media: Your visit to Fiji—why now?

PM: I think it's about the right timing. Look, at the end of the day, I mean, it's ancient history now about New Zealand's concerns of the military coup. I think, actually, the Prime Minister of the day then, Helen Clark, took the right steps, and we endorsed the position that New Zealand had adopted. But we always said once they got to the point of having free and fair elections, we would normalise the relationship. It's an important relationship for us in the Pacific, and so I offered to go to Fiji. I thought it was an important step for us as the kind of bigger partner, if you like, to do that. And also, on the back of what's happened, of course, as a result of Cyclone Winston, I think it's important just to get up there and see what's happening and the progress our people are making.

Media: You said it's the first time in 10 years, but I can't recall Clark going there. When did she—

PM: I think she went as part of the Pacific Forum, or another particular sort of multi-lateral—it might have been the Pacific Games. She went for a particular event like that.

Media: Is the Government doing enough for the homeless, given that social agencies and workers are referring, are sending clients to an Auckland marae?

PM: Well, if you look at what we did in the Budget, you can see there was a lot of funds allocated to that issue. I think it depends on where you are in the country, but \$200 million more in this area of social housing, the work we've been doing around income-related rents, moving to community housing providers, and the \$41 million for emergency support are all important initiatives. We'll continue to monitor the situation and we'll continue to see whether there's, you know, more that we need to do. I mean, there's always a battle, if you like, for resources, and that includes the support we give to the most vulnerable. I mean, within various different needs of that sector, we're always looking at different areas. But I don't think you can rationally say that we're not doing quite a lot, because we're doing a lot more than previous Governments have done. But we'll keep monitoring that.

Media: Has the Government offered any money at all to Te Puea Marae, at all? Or—

PM: I'm not aware of that.

Media: —for housing for homeless?

PM: Yeah, I'm not aware of that. You'd have to ask them.

Media: Does the Government have a view on whether Auckland's port could be relocated as part of this push to free up more land for housing?

PM: No, it hasn't taken a view on that. I mean, some years ago I think they looked at the issue of the Auckland port, when Steven Joyce was Minister of Transport. And I think at

the time it took the view—it wasn't, I don't think, a formal, sort of, investigation, but it took the view at the time that it was appropriately placed where it was.

Media: Do you think it should now be up for discussion as part of the—to, say, build a large amount of apartments or anything like that?

PM: I think in the first instance it's really a matter for the Auckland Council, but I think most people would probably say if they were to redevelop the area there, it's at the, sort of, higher end of housing. Because if you look at the other end of where the Auckland port is, there's the viaduct area and down there with Wynyard Quarter, they're certainly doing a lot of building down there, but it's reasonably, sort of, middle to high income housing.

Media: What assets would you propose they sell to raise funding for infrastructure?

PM: So it's not for the Government to decide, you know, the make-up of Auckland Council's balance sheet, but it is appropriate that the Auckland Council looks at its balance sheet and looks at how it might fund the growth needs of Auckland City.

Media: Just back on the plain packaging issue, it's my understanding that it's been with Cabinet for about 3 years. Can you give us an idea of the time line and why it's taking so long?

PM: No, it's not quite right to say it's been with Cabinet for 3 years. What happens is the issue got raised many years ago—you're right about that. At the time, the advice that I was getting was that because they were very uncertain about what would happen as a result of the lawsuit that the major tobacco companies were taking against the Australian Government, the most prudent thing I could do was see how that played out. In that period of time, what's happened is the, sort of, world's moved on, there's been quite a number of countries that have moved towards plain packaging, and the advice I've been getting from my officials is that it's safer for us to proceed unilaterally. So it goes to Cabinet at some point and Cabinet makes that decision. I don't think we've made that formal decision yet. There's one other step I think we've got to take, but what I'm saying to you is we're getting much more comfortable and moving more quickly towards that decision.

Media: So it'll happen this year?

PM: I can't give you the exact time frame, but we're moving towards that. We're far less concerned than we were about the legal risks that we faced.

Media: The Australian case—Australia won last year on this case, so, I mean, I was just wondering why it's taking so long and why you don't think, why you're not confident that it'll happen this year.

PM: I'd need to check that, on the Australian position. I'm sure you're probably right, if you know you are, but I'm not 100 percent sure about that. But, anyway, we are moving towards that issue. But it is what it is. You know, that was the advice I got, and that was the decision we took.

Media: Has something changed? Because just a couple of months ago both you and the Minister told me it would definitely be this year.

PM: Yeah, well, I'm sure it will be, but, I mean, I just don't have a timetable. I haven't seen exactly when it's going to be progressed. Sorry.

Media: And British-American Tobacco is still threatening legal action. They say they'll take any means possible. Is that holding Cabinet up at all?

PM: No. As I said, what held us up was the advice I had from the officials at the time, some years ago, which was that we faced legal risk. And it seemed like a lot of money for us to potentially spend on a lawsuit when we were a bit uncertain about what was going to happen in Australia and how much risk we actually faced. And so the more prudent thing to us seemed to be to wait, and so that's why we did wait. And in recent times, when we

started progressing the issue again, which we're keen to progress, the advice to me changed, and said we're much more confident.

Media: Is it just not a priority for Cabinet? *[Inaudible]* sign it off—

PM: No, I just don't know exactly where it is in the pecking order, but we can certainly go and find out for you.

Media: On housing, several senior Ministers—you may have even said this yourself—have said that it isn't a question of money; it's a question of *[Inaudible]* houses are available to buy.

PM: Do you mean for social housing?

Media: Well, that's really what I was going to ask you. What are they referring to there? Do they mean emergency housing or social housing or both?

PM: I think you'd need to look at it in, you know, either the context of the particular question they were asked. I remember Bill English saying that; I don't know if other Ministers have said it. And my memory was that he said that in relation to social housing. I think his argument was it's about getting availability to those particular houses. It wasn't a, sort of, financial issue. And the Government has been doing quite a lot in that space. So if you think about, for instance, both Housing New Zealand homes and the ones that fit within that social housing criteria, the advice that I've had is that while the overall number of Housing New Zealand homes hasn't changed dramatically in recent years, the composition of those have changed and considerably more of them are now in Auckland. I think that was really the point that Bill English was making.

Media: So the Government's seeking to buy more social housing—is that the point?

PM: Well, I think his main point was that the main point holding us back is not financial resources; it's the work that we are doing in that area. And we already are doing that, we are changing that mix, and we have been buying a lot more, as I think I said in my notes. I mean, we're building 17 social houses a week.

Media: Just on that, a quick process issue relating to the \$5,000 payment: when did you find out about that from Paula Bennett?

PM: OK. So the exact timing of it—I wasn't aware that she was going to do it that particular day but it was discussed by Cabinet in the early part of this year. So it's been part of the overall sort of view that she, you know, that she held that we could do that. It's a pretty small amount, because it's potentially 1,500 people and \$750,000 so, therefore, you it was quite within her delegations. But in the early part of the year there was consideration given to extending 3K to Christchurch to a different amount for Auckland.

Media: When did you find out that she was *[Inaudible]* announcement? Did you know that day, for instance?

PM: I wasn't aware she was going to do it that day, but I was aware that at some point she was likely to do it.

Media: So Cabinet signed off on that at the early part of this year?

PM: Well, it's the broader—I think it's around the broader principles of an extension of this kind of financial inducement. I'd have to go back and actually have a look at the paperwork but it's—

Media: But you didn't know about it on—

PM: I didn't know she was going to do it that particular day, but I knew she was going to do it.

Media: Just getting back to the second round of AML, have you been approached by anyone in the legal or real estate communities to say: "This is quite onerous and it's really not a good idea."?

PM: I can't recall any discussions I've had with people in that regard.

Media: A quick question about the Fox Glacier helicopter crash—that company has had its licence suspended by the CAA. The question is, sort of, how does this look for New Zealand tourism—another tourism-related accident?

PM: Well it was a great tragedy, and, obviously, we mourn the loss of the individuals on that particular helicopter that Fox Glacier, you know, lost. I mean, I think at one level what it demonstrates to international tourists—and domestic tourists for that matter, because they might use it as well—is that Civil Aviation take their responsibility seriously. So, in so much that there are questions for them to answer, they're obviously investigating those.

Media: Is it appropriate for Sanford to own the video-monitoring companies of fishing vessels—called Trident?

PM: Yeah, I think so. I mean, look, the important point around Trident is that that is a—as I understand it—both technology and hardware and relations-recording catches on board vessels. And just because a fishing company, or fishing companies as the case might be, own that—that went through (a) a competitive tender process. They, as I understand it—the subsidiary, Trident—had the best technology and, obviously, provided the best value for money. It was quite independent. But, also, all of that information is held by MPI in totality. So they can access it at any time they want, any part of the information. So while Trident provide a summary to MPI's because that is convenient, MPI have access to all of their unbroken data any time they want.

Media: Should Trident be part of the wider review that is going on—that investigation into the investigations?

PM: I don't think so. I mean, I think the issue here isn't whether the technology works, or whether the capability is there—because I think no one seems to be contesting that—they're simply just saying that because, you know, a fishing company, or fishing companies, you, know, have a subsidiary company, that somehow, you know, Greenpeace think that they shouldn't be allowed to have that contract. I wouldn't agree with that. Often you get companies that have specialist interests. I mean, the point I was making this morning, I think, is the right point, which is that the fishing companies themselves have a very strong vested interest that the QMS system works and works properly, because if they don't, in the end what will happen is fish stocks will be depleted and their quota will be reduced. And we've seen that over the past few years in certain areas. They voluntarily reduce their quota. That has quite a big impact on their income.

Now, the reason you need the kind of video capability that Trident provides is because within any system it's possible to have, you know, a rotten apple in the barrel, and so to give people confidence you need the likes of, you know, the video surveillance. You also need the observers on the boats. You need better capability of understanding what everybody's doing. But I don't think there's—if you think through the logics of it—there's any sensible reason why a quota holder would break the rules, because I think in the end it would come back to haunt them.

Media: Is there any process in place within the caucus or to do with Cabinet members or yourself when you're dealing with Sanford issues and Peter Goodfellow, the President of the National Party? How do—

PM: Yes. So he is immensely careful about managing any conflict of interest. I've never had a discussion with him about fisheries matters. If they're raised at the caucus, because he goes to caucus, he always leaves the room. He's obviously not a member of Cabinet so he doesn't get access to that information. So he treats that conflict of interest very seriously and very professionally.

Media: Just in light of those issues that were raised 2 week ago, though, isn't it kind of important that Trident is investigated? I mean it's, sort of, the regulated is—

PM: But the allegations by Greenpeace aren't that the information as a result of Trident is either incorrect or has been altered or doesn't do its job properly. The allegation is just simply a nefarious one that because they're a—you know, because a number of fishing companies own a particular vessel, that somehow they're not the best people to be in that role. I mean, I personally don't agree with that. I mean, as long as they've gone through an open competitive tender and been proven to be the best, in an arm's length transaction, I think it's OK that they have that ownership.

Media: Do you know of any issues that MPI's had with Trident?

PM: I'm not aware of any but you'd need to go and ask the Minister. It just wouldn't come to my office.

Media: Have you been made aware [*Inaudible*] about reports a New Zealander has been killed by a crocodile in Australia?

PM: I saw the media reports but I haven't had any advice from MFAT. OK.

conclusion of press conference