

ing to responsible people in the sector and there are big issues that need to be resolved before the market could responsibly be deregulated," he said.

"There is access to ports issues, there's quality control issues, there is market information issues and these are the things that really do have to be

WA Liberal senator Alan Eggleston, who has warned he might cross the floor to support deregulation if the legislation reaches the Senate, called for compromise.

He suggested a regulatory body could be established in states that wanted a regulator to replace Wheat

maps meet the desires of the other states to have a more regulated market by other means, such as setting up state-based regulatory authorities," he told the ABC yesterday.

"I do philosophically support deregulation and so does the West Australian Liberal Party. We'll be pushing very hard to have an out-

as a monopoly by the Australian Wheat Board until the wheat-for-oil scandal broke in 2005.

Deregulation began in 2008, but there are now disputes about the future of interim regulators put in place at that time, as well as issues such as access to transport and marketing infrastructure.

given Mr Romney's background in the financial sector and analytical approach, it is unlikely he will rush to decisions.

He goes on to point out that Mr Romney is a more "full blooded" free trader.

"It seems likely that Romney would be prepared to push harder and take greater risks in the cause of free trade than Obama."

The two party leaders differ in their views on the role of the United Nations. Mr Obama views the global body as a useful contribution to ensuring countries are "observing the rules of the road", whereas "Romney is a UN sceptic and believes UN forums can become forums for the tantrums of tyrants," he says.

Dr Fullilove adds that Mr Obama has proven to be a "skilful and effective commander in chief" who has used force more often than expected.

"Romney's experience is minimal. For all that, it is hard to discern a fundamental clash in world views," he says.

World, page 18 ■

# Assange defamation case questioned

**Marianna Papadakis**

WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange was unlikely to succeed in a defamation case against Prime Minister Julia Gillard because he was outside the statutory time period in which claims must be brought, lawyers said yesterday.

Sydney defamation barrister Clive Evatt said he accepted a brief in July after a phone call from Mr Assange's father, John Shipton.

But other top defamation lawyers questioned Mr Assange's motives for

announcing the action, given that plans to launch a political party and for Mr Assange to run for the Senate were revealed by Mr Shipton in an interview before Ten Network's telemovie *Underground: The Julian Assange Story*.

Mr Evatt said Ms Gillard allegedly defamed WikiLeaks when she told a radio station in 2010 it acted illegally by releasing 250,000 classified US diplomatic cables.

Bruce McClintock, SC, said that, as Mr Assange had not acted on the defamation case for two years,

he believed it was clearly a stunt.

Several other defamation experts including Kennedys' partner Patrick George said the action was outside the statutory limitation period and would be highly unlikely to be granted an extension by a court.

"The actual statement probably does suggest something defamatory. But there would be a respectable case that it was true," Mr McClintock said.

"All she [Ms Gillard] would have to show is that it was contrary to the law of a place that had jurisdiction."

Australian Defamation Lawyers principal Barrie Goldsmith said the comments could only be brought within the one-year statute barred period if they were on Ms Gillard's or the government's website.

Ms Gillard could also claim qualified privilege.

There were other questions on how Mr Assange would give evidence from the Ecuadorian embassy.

Mr Evatt said Ms Gillard's comments were "all over the internet" and that the case would be pursued vigorously.

AUSTRALIAN FINANCIAL REVIEW 9/10/12