



78/11A

## Commonwealth Heads of Government

## Regional Meeting

Australia 1978

12 February 1978

## P R E L I M I N A R Y T R A N S C R I P T

PRESS CONFERENCE

by the Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Fraser,  
and the Secretary-General,  
in the Juliana Room, Hilton Hotel, on 12 February

---

Secretary-General, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to welcome you all here and especially the Secretary-General, who has worked for quite some time and so enthusiastically and constructively for the particular purposes of the Commonwealth and through the Commonwealth for the wider purposes of trying to create a better and a more peaceful world. So, Secretary-General, welcome. I hope that this conference is as useful and constructive as other ones that you have attended.

I would particularly like to welcome media from overseas as well as the Australian media. I recognise one or two familiar faces. I hope that they will find their time in Australia useful and maybe also that they will have some time to enjoy themselves.

I am pleased that this meeting which is, I think, the largest meeting of Heads of Government to be held here, is being held in the Commonwealth context I have always believed that the modern Commonwealth, with its great diversity of nations and people within it, has the possibility and the reality of playing a very useful role in the world where there are often difficult and, seemingly in the short term sometimes intractable problems that defy solution. I do believe that the modern Commonwealth plays a useful and constructive role in world affairs.

I have also believed that Australia has not always been as constructive and as enthusiastic a member of the Commonwealth as she ought to. Over the last little while we have tried to redress that, at least so far as Australia is concerned.

The Commonwealth of Nations does link a cross-section of the world and it can and is, I believe, making a significant contribution.

What is happening in this conference is in many senses a new experiment for the Commonwealth. It came out of discussions at the last meeting in London in which the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting endorsed the concept of regional meetings from time to time, where regional countries felt and believed that

they had common purposes that they wanted to discuss and regional problems that they would like to tackle, but within a Commonwealth context, I believe also that this is a particularly useful part of the world to begin that experiment. Represented here this week there are a number of small states, very small by world standards, as well as states that are very large by world standards.

In a full Commonwealth meeting or in the United Nations or in other major international organisations, it is sometimes difficult for small states, I believe, and I think they believe, to get the representation and the hearing which is their due and which is necessary if their particular problems are to be overcome.

So one of the significant matters for discussion at this meeting are the problems of small states and the Commonwealth's role in helping to seek ways and means of achieving solutions to their very real but sometimes unique problems.

It would be wrong if anyone expected great and dramatic results from this conference. Major problems in the world are not generally capable of solution in one step or at one meeting. They are not of that kind. What they do need, however, is a commitment by a number of countries, by a number of Heads of Government to work for a reasonable and proper solution of the problems. It is a step-by-step process. If this conference can take some useful steps in helping to overcome regional questions and at the same time if it can take one or two steps in advancing matters, such as the differences between countries of the world in relation to the Common Fund, then this conference itself will have played a useful role.

In addition to that, of course, there is the intangible, immeasurable benefit of Heads of Government being able to meet together, and their officials to meet together, to discuss problems and to get to know each other that does lead to a very much better understanding of problems, of attitudes and where there are, as inevitably there will be differences, does lead to a much better understanding of each other's point of view. That is one of the great and intangible benefits of the Commonwealth, and one of the reasons why the Commonwealth has endured. I have said on a number of occasions that I believe the modern Commonwealth is much, much more influential than the old Commonwealth ever was, the old, somewhat narrow, Commonwealth of five countries. Certainly if, as I do not think could have happened, that old Commonwealth of five countries had survived to 1978, it would not have influence, it would not have impact, it would not be able to play the constructive role and the useful role that the modern Commonwealth does at the present time.

On the basis of this meeting I think as you know there are two days of conference in Sydney; there will be some informal discussions when Heads of Government go to Bowral and then the final meeting will be held towards the end of the week again in Sydney; the emphasis is on economic and regional issues. There

is a particularly useful proposal from India for a consultative group on energy - one that is very much welcomed and supported by Australia - an examination of alternative energy sources.

In another way, this is also one of the most interesting proposals because, as I understand it, one of India's problems is the question of energy and alternative energy sources for domestic or industry purposes at the village level. Sources of energy at that level might well have a very real link with the energy problems of small states, and that could lead to identification of interests in relation to energy between one of the largest nations in the world and between a number of the smallest nations of the world.

There are clearly other economic issues, the questions of trade and the questions of access not only within the region but also countries within the region to countries outside the region. I mentioned the question of the Common Fund and how I hope that the discussion during the course of this week of matters in that area can be advanced. Australia has taken decisions which certainly gives her own position a new look and I think will take a view somewhat closer to that of the Group of 77. I think it opens up possibilities for a general advance in the long-standing discussion about the Common Fund. As a commodity exporter Australia does have a number of common interests with the developing countries. To this extent I think we stand apart from a number of the other so-called developed countries which do not have that same interest. We therefore perhaps have a better understanding and concern of the very real problems that developing countries face that are dependent so largely on trade and commodities, a trade that is often uncertain and often unstable as to quantity and to price. The need for stable and reasonable arrangements at a proper price level is of enormous importance to the developing world.

I believe, Mr. Secretary-General, that this meeting will contribute to even better regional understanding. I think it is going to be a constructive meeting. I have already had discussions with a number of Heads of Government this morning and yesterday and I think they, too, are looking forward to the week's discussions.

Before throwing this particular press conference open to questions, I would like to ask the Secretary-General to address the gathering in any way you would like to.

SECRETARY-GENERAL:

Thank you, Prime Minister. You have covered the ground so adequately that there is not too much more that I would like to add.

I would like to say at what is my first meeting with the press in Australia in a formal way how very pleased I have been to note the kind of interest you have taken in the meeting and the kind of background writing that has occurred in the

Australian media, in radio and television. It has all been done with deep interest and great understanding and sympathy. There has been a tendency from time to time in some capitals where Commonwealth meetings are held for the media to indulge in a kind of Commonwealth bashing. We have been altogether free from that approach. There are, of course, many issues of immense concern and some controversy within the Commonwealth. It is not free from contrariety within its membership but we rely very greatly upon an informed public opinion to sustain the kind of confidence that the leadership of the Commonwealth now has in it, in its potential and in its works and your own understanding is a very important element in building that information and contact with the public. So I look forward as the conference unfolds to continuing close relationship with the media and to your continuing to serve the causes of the Commonwealth in the many years ahead.

I think, Prime Minister, there will be many occasions in the next few days when your own quite bold initiatives that have led to this meeting will be the occasion for justified praise. I would like on this very first occasion to place that on record. The Commonwealth owes a great deal all the time to initiatives of this kind that strike out in new directions and it is its capacity to respond to them, to absorb them, to mould them in ways that are relevant to the needs of a very new kind of Commonwealth that helps to make it continue to be relevant to its very variegated membership.

I can confirm what you said that there is abroad, beyond the Commonwealth, a mood which takes it with seriousness. I think our last meeting in London substantially advanced the standing and the respect in which we are held in international circles and I am certain that this new endeavour, for it is a new endeavour, is bound to lead to similar responses.

The very fact that 12 Heads of Government from countries as varied in so many ways as those who are here, is an indication of how seriously they take Australia's commitment, your own personal commitment, Prime Minister, to the causes of the Commonwealth and to the concerns which they at the level of national leadership feel and articulate within a Commonwealth forum. I am sure, therefore, that the auguries are good for a successful meeting.

It is a very wide region and in many ways the enormous value of this meeting lies in the fact that it brings together people who have not been together in an intimate way before. A meeting of Commonwealth Heads of Government now seats around the table some 36 presidents and prime ministers. We will have seated around the table here just 12. There will be somewhat more informality and a good deal more intimacy, perhaps for that reason, a good deal more frankness and straight talking, but all the better for it. It is out of that kind of exchange of views that understandings develop and that a convergence of opinions emerge which sustains Commonwealth relationships.

I would like, Prime Minister, to join you in indicating for the press our willingness to be as responsive as we possibly can to your questions.

MR. FRASER: It is over to you.

Q. Mr. Fraser, what is the Australian Government's attitude to the Common Fund? I gather that it was discussed in Cabinet last Thursday but there has not been .....

MR. FRASER: No, there has not been anything said yet. The Common Fund is in some ways a complex proposal that will just be basically about three issues. At the last June meeting a working group was established within the Commonwealth which did prepare a very useful report in relation to the Common Fund and it was not the sort of report that was in any way committing on governments but in helping to define issues that in itself can help to resolve differences between countries. It was a useful document.

I think the Commonwealth Secretariat believes that ministers should meet a little later to discuss that report - I do not mean during this meeting, a full Commonwealth ministerial meeting - and Australia certainly supports that view.

There have been many arguments between the Group of 77 and Group B countries about how a Common Fund should operate and how it should be financed, and the decisions Australia took last week in a sense take it, I think, a considerable way ahead of the general Group B countries, developed countries, in its attitude to the Common Fund.

We had earlier stated a view that indicated we would support the fund being funded by the producers and consumers of commodities, that comes from the individual commodity arrangements, and also maybe by governments and were prepared to consider "other measures" which many developing countries believed ought also to be financed through the fund.

We have made the firm decision that the fund should be funded not only by contributions from producers and consumers but also direct contributions by governments and also that it would be proper - and I think this is the more significant change in Australia's attitude - that it would be proper for the Common Fund to fund other measures which could be involved with transport, distribution, a number of other matters which are related to some aspects of commodity trade.

There is a degree of imprecision in relation to the views people have of other measures and I think we will be suggesting for consideration that it might be worthwhile

for the Commonwealth to establish a working group to study the nature of other measures and the terms and conditions that should apply to enable funding to take place.

The views that Australia has taken, take us a step or two closer to the attitude of the Group of 77 but nobody is going to get everything they want out of the Common Fund. There is going to be a process of compromise in getting the fund operating, but I hope that the attitude that we are taking will contribute to the debate and contribute to the debate in a way which will enable a resolution of the issues. I think the discussion has gone on too long. We are one of the significant world commodity traders and therefore we do understand what happens when demand changes dramatically or when price changes dramatically. It can upset the whole internal economies of a particular country. I believe that the developed countries need to approach any forthcoming discussions in relation to the Common Fund with a greater degree of commitment than they have so far shown.

- Q. Mr. Prime Minister, in your private discussions with the prime ministers of Fiji and New Zealand, did you find that they were enthusiastic and strong supporters of the aims and the holding of this conference?

Secondly, we were told earlier that in the discussion you had with the PNG prime minister you both agreed that this conference should look closely at the problem of drug trafficking in this region and that perhaps some solutions or measures for better enforcement might come up. Could you tell us a little more on that?

- MR. FRASER: Part of your question I cannot answer at the moment because Mr. Muldoon is not yet here. He is coming in a little later so I have not yet had a bilateral discussion with him. I will be seeing him. I am going from this conference almost directly to meet him.

I have not noticed any reluctance on the part of other Heads of Government in relation to this particular meeting and in one sense at not a great deal of notice I think it remarkable that 11 of our guests have been able to come here at one time because Heads of State and Heads of Government do get booked up sometimes quite a considerable period ahead and I know for a fact that more than one of our guests has made up his mind to come here, despite a considerable degree of personal inconvenience in relation to other arrangements that have been made concerning their own programmes.

I think that the countries of the Pacific are looking forward to a forum where they believe, and I make that in broad terms and as far as I know without exception, looking forward in broad terms to a forum where their own

problems can be discussed in a useful and constructive way where they do not get overshadowed by problems that loom larger on the world stage when you get into the major Commonwealth conference or in the United Nations. I would hope that one of the lasting results of this kind of meeting might well be the situation in which the problems of small states and of areas such as the Pacific that have very real problems which are not causing trouble really to anyone get proper attention. When I say not causing trouble, are not a cause of concern for world peace or matters of that kind, and can get proper attention and a proper focus put upon them. I hope that one of the things we can explore is the ways and means by which the Commonwealth might be able to contribute to that particular objective.

Australia, as you know, is very much concerned about drugs and the attack that seems to be being made on the Australian consumer market from people outside. There have been some very large hauls of drugs in Australia in recent times and while it has not formally been part of the agenda it has been informally canvassed as a matter that might well be discussed. There are world arrangements in relation to drugs as you know, but when the minister concerned in Australia, Mr. Fife, was recently overseas it was certainly his impression that some additional measures of international co-operation could be pursued to make our general attack on the drug position more effective. When I say our general attack I mean the total attack of nations because it is not just an individual national problem. It is a problem that transcends national boundaries to a very great extent. Personally I would hope that even though it is not formally on the agenda something might come of this.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Prime Minister, before the next question, perhaps I ought to say in respect of the first part of the last question, that it is something of a record in Commonwealth meetings for us to have the kind of hundred per cent attendance that we have achieved on this occasion. To my own knowledge Heads of Government meetings over the last 15 years have never been without some one or more, usually three or four, prime ministers or presidents who could not find it possible to come. That we have achieved this on this occasion is, I think, a fair indicator of the positive character of the response to the proposals of the meeting.

Q. Prime Minister, will you be taking up the drug problem, the drug situation, in your bilateral discussions with the Malaysian and Singaporean delegations, and also can you give us an idea as to how much the hosting of this conference is costing?

MR. FRASER: I cannot give a precise figure. I have seen a particular figure mentioned, I think, of a million dollars. I think that is somewhat overstating it and it may be

nearer half that figure but I do not want to be held to that in any sense, shape or form at this stage because the Australian Government has been concerned to make sure that our guests are as comfortable as they can be. There is a fairly busy work schedule and we want them to be comfortable and well looked after for the week they are going to be in Australia. Let me only say that whether my estimate is nearer the actual figure or whether the estimate that I have seen printed is nearer the actual figure, in terms of the broader Commonwealth and for Australia I believe every cent is very well worth while being spent.

Q. As far as the drug situation in bilateral discussions with Singapore,.....

MR. FRASER: I have not had bilateral discussions with Singapore to this point. I welcomed the Prime Minister obviously this morning and the discussions with Malaysia, the plane was a little bit late and to avoid keeping all of you waiting they were suspended and will be resumed at a later point but I have been mentioning that particular matter with most of the bilateral discussion that I have been holding.

Q. Prime Minister, has the refugee question come up in your discussions so far with Malaysia?

MR. FRASER: No, it has not been raised. Australia stands ready to speak to it if it is raised but it has not been raised yet.

Q. Does Australia have any proposals to put on refugees to Singapore and Malaysia, Mr. Prime Minister?

MR. FRASER: I do not think in that sense. We do believe it is very important that the arrangements for handling refugees that have been established be maintained. The work of the United Nations is of enormous importance but we all know there is a very acute problem that is likely to remain while the problems between Cambodia and Vietnam remain.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, will this be seen as a good opportunity for considering a common approach to the next conference of the law of the sea?

MR. FRASER: I would have thought that the law of the sea matters will certainly be introduced and I know my Foreign Minister, Andrew Peacock, has been very concerned that more progress has not been made in relation to that, but when you say common approach the purpose of these discussions, I think, is to discuss, to explore and I certainly hope that there are some things as a result that we can do together, certainly on a regional basis. One of the things

that was indicated last June and which I support very strongly is that regional meetings of the Commonwealth ought not in any sense lead to a situation in which there is a caucussing or a ganging up on other world forums, or on the Commonwealth as a whole so if there is discussion and further exploration of particular matters, that is one thing. Countries will come to their own decisions about attitudes they will take and express in other forums, Commonwealth or otherwise, but I would hate to see and I am sure everyone here would hate to see anything that could be construed as caucussing by countries outside those who are represented, whether they are within our region or in the wider world forum. That would be bad and I am sure we would all be opposed to it.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, does not this conference to a certain extent overlap with the South Pacific Forum?

MR. FRASER: No, I do not really think it does, in its purpose, I mean. Countries are obviously represented very often in more than one international organisation. You might very easily say, does not the Commonwealth itself overlap with the United Nations. I have said on many occasions that the Commonwealth is a microcosm of the United Nations but I also believe that on many occasions, because the number of tensions that are so often evident at the United Nations are largely absent from the Commonwealth discussions, that it is possible for the Commonwealth to make progress on a particular issue in a way which maybe the United Nations cannot achieve or cannot achieve so readily.

So, just to suggest that there is more than one organisation discussing a matter is not to make it as a point of criticism. The South Pacific Forum has a very important regional role looking purely and simply, really, at the regional problems of the member countries. This is a larger meeting. I think it can complement the work of the Pacific Forum because I believe it can assist the countries of the Pacific in different ways, perhaps in ways that the Forum itself would not be able to achieve. The Forum can work for areas and avenues of co-operation that this larger meeting could not achieve, again because there is some difference in the totality of interests. If it is possible in a subject I mentioned before, for example, to define very real areas of common concern, how best you supply energy sources at the village level in India. If that is applicable to the countries in the Pacific that is a common interest that would not emerge from Forum discussions. In addition, the attitudes that are expressed here can by individual countries be taken into wider forums and if they believe in a certain matter, they will work for it in that wider forum, whether it is the Commonwealth or the United Nations. There are two members of ASEAN here, who might equally say: does it not cut across the work of ASEAN? Again, I would say very firmly, no, it does not. ASEAN has a very specific and very important regional role which from the outside Australia supports.

You need to look at the purposes of meetings and their function. I do very strongly believe that the more international communication on a personal basis, the better it is. When the Head of a Government tells you something and he is sitting next to you, you get quite a different view of it, very often, than from reading some words that somebody has sent in a cable. It might even be saying almost the same thing. It might be using almost the same words, but you can see his face and look at his expression and it is obviously much better. It is not often that Heads of Government can get together in this way. Quite specifically in relation to the Forum, it has got its own very particular and important role which Australia supports strongly and seeks to encourage.

The matters that will be discussed this week, if anything, will only strengthen the capacity of Forum countries to support their own purposes from within the Forum.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, do you expect there to be questions about increased aid for the South Pacific nations?

MR. FRASER: Nobody has raised that and we have made certain decisions which individual member countries will be advised of at the present time in relation to aid but these are matters that were on the - not to a total extent but in part - were on the aid programme. For example, we will be providing \$10 million to a very important hydro-electric project in Fiji, the Development Bank will be providing the major part of the funds. I think the total project is about \$75 million and discussions will take place between Australian and Fiji officials about the manner and distribution of Australian aid for that particular purpose. Andrew Peacock will be ready to announce the form and distribution of the special aid from the C.I.E.C. meeting and our share of that - I think the total contribution of \$18 million has already been announced, but its actual distribution - you might remember that at the Paris conference it was decided that this aid should be in a form that is quickly distributed to meet particular purposes. The countries that are represented here that are to be recipients of part of that amount will be advised. We will be providing a loan to the Forum shipping line of \$180,000 which is necessary so that it can commence operations. There are matters of this kind - in many senses they are not part of the mainstream of the conference. I think Australia is rather taking the opportunity to mention these things to the countries concerned at this particular time. I think it is on wider issues that the real use of this particular conference will demonstrate itself.

Q. Mr. Fraser, will you be arguing at the conference that the unemployment figures for Australia released last Friday which the acting minister said were higher than expected will make it harder still for Australia to let in more imports from the region?

MR. FRASER: To put that question into context, obviously it does not make it easier when there is unemployment but I am glad that question was asked because over recent times Australia's trade position has not been adequately understood. When you look at Australia's imports of industrial products from developing countries, Australia stands at \$45 a head of our population, the United States at \$40 a head but then you fall to the European Community at \$27 a head and Japan at only \$17 a head. If you look at the per capita imports of textiles, clothing and footwear which are particularly sensitive items, Australia stands at - from the ASEAN countries for example - \$2.14 a head, the United States 63¢, the European Community 51¢, Japan 25¢. On both those bases Australia is importing much more per capita than three large trading blocs which house very close to 600 million people. I think countries do understand that an Australian market of 14 million people obviously cannot solve the trading problems of our own region much less the trading problems of the world especially when 25 per cent of our total export, about nearly \$3,000 million worth, are subject to import quotas, bans, prohibitions and all the rest, Non-tariff barriers in other words, which often destroy any possibility of trade. Even despite that, from all developing countries in the five years up to the last statistics we have, 1976/1977, trade has increased by 40 per cent per annum, from the developing Commonwealth regional countries represented here by 32 per cent per annum, from ASEAN countries by 41 per cent per annum, even if trade began on a relatively low base, a relatively low base soon grows into a very large sum indeed, at that rate of increase, and I believe that is recognised.

Let me give another comparison. If the ASEAN countries had the same access to Europe, to North America and to Japan in textiles, clothing and footwear, as they do to Australia, they would be exporting an additional \$1,000 million worth of textiles, clothing and footwear and that, I think, tends to put Australia's position, which has not always been adequately understood, into perspective.

Q. Is that the line you have been putting to the Malaysian Prime Minister?

MR. FRASER: I think this is consistent with views I have been expressing publicly and privately for nearly a year now, certainly for the last eight or nine months.

Q. Sir, a general question. Why did you decide to initiate, push and host this meeting? What is in it for Australia? Is it the start of an attempt by Australia to play a more influential role in the region, and generally on the world stage?

MR. FRASER: I do not think in the context of that question. I happen to believe in the Commonwealth, and I had stated views directed to that end long before the Commonwealth conference in London last June. I believe there are many

different ways in which the Commonwealth's purposes can be advantaged. I had indicated before it might have been at a speech in New Guinea at their own independence celebrations, which was quite a long while ago, in political terms - that there was room for a more vigorous and wholehearted commitment on the part of Australia to the Commonwealth. I believe that is so. Believing that, it is obvious that it be the purpose of any government that I lead to give effect to it. It is not a question of individual countries exerting a leadership role within the Commonwealth. It is a question of consensus, of having common views. If Australia or India or Fiji express views that are generally accepted, then the Commonwealth will pursue those views. But if a particular country expresses views that are not going to have a general consensus amongst other members of the Commonwealth then the Commonwealth will not go down that particular path. So it is a consensus organisation and I think it ought to be. That is not to say that countries should not try to put forward constructive ideas. I think we all ought to, all individual members of the Commonwealth, and I believe all members of the Commonwealth seek to play that role. What we are doing in relation to the Commonwealth is not just directed only at that because right from the earliest times the Foreign Minister was seeking to do more in relation to the Pacific. Our aid had been very much orientated purely to South-East Asia, Papua New Guinea, a bit further afield but very much South-East Asia and Papua New Guinea and in terms of the problems they face. Until Andrew Peacock became Foreign Minister, I believe that Australia had not given adequate attention in aid terms to the problems of Pacific countries. We have sought to redress that in terms of increase so I think you have got to look at all of this as part of a pattern, part of a purpose, but I certainly hope it is not looked at as any attempt of Australia to stand on a pedestal or anything of that kind because that would be very far from the truth. It is being in one sense a member of a team, the team being the Commonwealth, and lending what weight Australia can to Commonwealth purposes.

Q. Prime Minister, the Common Fund will require uncommonly large funding if it is to operate effectively. Are the decisions your Cabinet has taken, presumably in principle, to support the Common Fund, firm enough for you to now make a firm commitment that Australia would be a major contributor to the Common Fund and if so by how much, in round figures?

MR. FRASER: No, it is not possible to put a figure on it. It is possible to say, certainly, that Australia would be a contributor to the Common Fund.

Q. A major contributor, sir?

MR. FRASER: In relation to our population. We need always to have that in mind because let us not forget that 600 million people in Europe, North America and Japan and they are fairly powerful, influential trading groups and Australia's 14 m. is relatively small by comparison with their approaching

600 million. I quite deliberately made the point that producers and consumers need to be involved in any funding for a Common Fund. The obligations of getting stability and trade do not only fall on producers, they fall on consumers and it has been recognised from time to time in international wheat agreements, international sugar agreements, but I believe also, and I think this is unfortunate, that very often the greatest progress towards agreement so far as European countries is concerned is made at times when there are low commodity prices because then it is obviously in their interests to push forward for agreement on the basis of a fairly low base and there is a tendency to lose interest if prices go in another direction. But I hope that transitory matters can be put aside and that everyone can approach the question of a Common Fund with a very real sense of commitment because without that commitment it will not be reached, it will not be evolved and from our own experience in trade, we are looking now, and this is a domestic matter, to try and get a more even balance in meat prices in Australia and Australians will know what the lack of that has meant to many people in this country. We are also operating a commodity arrangement which Australians alone - this is producers and governments or by loans - have funded to try and get more stable prices for wool on the world market and in many senses what we do does set a stability in wool prices right around the world. So these things can be done and it is out of that experience, I think, that our conviction that arrangements can be made to work is found, but they will not work unless there is a commitment. There needs to be a commitment not only by the developing countries, as there certainly is, but also by developed countries who have obligations to help establish stable trade arrangements at reasonable price levels for commodities. So who is going to find how much finance there is in this, I do not know.

Our commitment to provide funds is there. That is unequivocal. But you need to look at the totality of funds required and Australia would certainly be prepared to pay its own fair and reasonable part in this arrangement as we have in other international arrangements.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, one follow-up question on trade. The arguments that you put about Australia's trading position as it is to the rest of the world, you put them before, as you said, and Malaysia and Singapore have continued in their criticism. I am wondering what you are going to be saying to the Datuk and to Mr. Lee to make them see the error of their ways. Are you going to be putting any new arguments to them?

MR. FRASER: I think it would be presumptuous indeed, of me, to suggest that anyone should see the error of their ways, certainly anyone - anyone at all. There is one point that I would like to add just before we close. I have not said it here, but I have said it in Kuala Lumpur and on other occasions. What Australia can do in terms of trade and

access to Australia's markets depends not insignificantly on the kind of access that we can get to other markets, and the fact that we are denied access to many markets in Europe, Japan and also in the United States, where we face non-tariff barriers which means absolute barriers, covering matters that could be worth up to \$3,000 million on an annual basis, clearly has an implication for the Australian economy. It makes the Australian economy weaker than it would otherwise be and has a serious impact on the kind of access that we can allow on an increasing basis to other countries. I think this is starting to be understood. I was delighted to see that a Secretariat paper, prepared as a background paper for this conference, while very justifiably expressing the views that other people have about access to Australia's market, also paid recognition to the difficulty that Australia is faced with by the non-tariff barriers that the European Community in particular places on exports from Australia. There is a very real inter-relationship in these things. If we can understand that better we will, I think, start to understand our common purposes better and thereby get to a position where we can perhaps do more about overcoming whatever difficulties there may be.

.. ..