



## PRIME MINISTER

E. & O.E. - PROOF ONLY

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE, AUSTRALIAN HIGH COMMISSION,  
NEW DELHI, 23 NOVEMBER 1983

---

PM: It seemed to me that what might be most useful to you were if I were to go through, not every detail but the outline of the contribution that I made and relate it to the proposals that were contained in Mr. Trudeau's opening submissions.

So going first of all through the contribution I made I went in opening to the dimension of the problem that we're dealing with when we're talking about the international arms race, that has reached proportions of about \$700 billion a year, which is meaning that every minute of every day about \$1 1/3 million is being spent on arms. I pointed out, of course, the scandalous waste of human resources and ingenuity that was involved in that. I referred to the increasing level of tension between the super powers in their negotiations, that those relations were permeated with suspicion and that the ... between them is becoming increasingly dangerous.

The context where there had been some attempt to portion blame - I said that it was rather ... to pursue that in detail. I said that Australia did not subscribe to the view that the United States bears the greatest responsibility for the present difficulties between the super powers. I pointed out that our western societies are open and that open debate takes place which often exposes concerns and perhaps some weaknesses. This sort of thing is not reflected in the Soviet Union, which is pursuing the armaments program with unprecedented proportions.

I made the point that in my discussions with the United States administration at the highest level, I believed them to be sincere in wanting to bring a halt to the arms race. I asserted that Australia does not accept the position that the nuclear weapons states alone should have the right to determine these issues, that their calculations - indeed their miscalculations - can effect us all and indeed could eliminate us all. The Australian Government does not accept that unilateral disarmament is a viable option in bringing about an end to the arms race. What is required are realistic and concrete and balanced proposals which have at their heart a recognition of national security interests.

/2...

I pointed out that as far as Australia is concerned, our security interests require collective arrangements for our defence and we have such an arrangement in the ANZUS alliance. I pointed out that we clarified the nature of that alliance and that it has been accepted by the three treaty partners.

I pointed out that a consequence of our security arrangements with the United States need the presence on Australian soil of joint facilities. They play a positive role in maintaining western security and they also have a significant role in verifying arms control and disarmament agreements.

I pointed out that this government has greatly elevated arms control and disarmament goals within our foreign policy, that we are a member of the multi-lateral disarmament negotiating body and that in those bodies we are promoting a negotiation of treaties to end nuclear testing, to ban chemical weapons and prevent an arms race in outer space.

In the wider political arena we are using what influence we have to convince the super powers to moderate their antagonism and to improve their levels of understanding.

I pointed out that disarmament objectives are guided by the three following principles - security for all states at the lowest possible level of armament, stability in nuclear balance, and an adequate verification of disarmament agreements. In line with those objectives we are attaching a particular priority to efforts aimed at securing nuclear disarmament through reductions in the nuclear arsenals, the upholding of the international non-proliferation regime and the conclusion of complete bans on nuclear testing. I also referred to our proposal for a nuclear free zone in the South Pacific.

I said that adequate protective provisions and verification is the crucial pre-condition of progress in the area that we're talking about and that Australia would wish to encourage and support action in that field and I pointed out in particular in considering our own capabilities, we are actively examining the possibility of improving Australia's capacity to monitor nuclear explosions by further developing our seismic monitoring capability.

That was in the area of verification. I said the problem of proliferation is, of course, more difficult and that fact was indeed reflected in the discussion which had taken place within the conference to the point of my intervention.

They acknowledged there is no fool-proof means of preventing proliferation of nuclear explosives, but we believe that the process can and should be slowed down and the cost to the proliferator increased.

I pointed out that in the context of any discussion about the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, an issue of particular concern to Australia and I would have thought to all of those gathered, was the position of South Africa. While the concept of apartheid was totally opposed, it would be utterly unacceptable if apartheid were to become nuclear armed and that we all had a vested interest in ensuring that that did not occur.

I said that we believed that the non-proliferation treaty should remain a cornerstone of international effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and despite the view expressed by some, that this was an inadequate treaty, it is the only game in town, as someone else said. I pointed out that we went further than that, of course, and we recognised our obligation under the non-proliferation treaty, particularly article IV which had been referred to in the recent debate in our party and in our government and we recognised our obligation under Article IV of the NPT as a producer and exporter of uranium to facilitate and participate in the exchange of equipment, materials and information for the peaceful use of atomic energy.

We believe, in that context, that we have a particular responsibility to secure improvement in international safeguards against the diversion of nuclear material from peaceful uses. I pointed out further that we supported the proposition for a comprehensive test ban treaty and that we were one of the main promoters in the United Nations of a negotiation of such a treaty.

I then went on to a point which hadn't been touched in the discussion and which I believe insufficient attention is paid to and that is that chemical and biological weapons are second only to nuclear weapons in their capacity to inflict death and human suffering on a massive scale and I put the view that Australia believes that it is especially important that relative international conventions be strengthened and I drew attention to the disappointing fact that only 2/3 of the Commonwealth members are parties for the relevant 1925 protocol of chemical warfare and less than 2/3 agreed to the 1972 biological weapons convention.

I finally drew attention to our concern that the arms race should not extend into outer space, with the prospect of the extension of the nuclear arms race into that arena is frightening in its possibilities. I concluded by saying that I thought the Commonwealth could play a constructive role in disarmament and in reducing tensions and in that context let me say that I supported the idea that had been advanced by Pierre Trudeau in his opening submission. Essentially, the Trudeau proposal is that there should be a five power conference of the nuclear powers and that there should be an agreement between them as to an appropriate ratio of the nuclear weapons that they should hold and on the basis of that agreement then a reduction down on the basis of that ratio and in dealing with vertical proliferation in that way, it should be related to the objectives of the NPT, which, as he pointed out, in its conception was in the form of a compact. That is that if the nuclear powers would agree to a reduction of their weapons, in return the other nations could become signatories to the NPT and agree themselves not to acquire the capacity for nuclear weaponry. Now, he pointed out that the question of the NPT came up for reconsideration in 1985, that he had had some discussions already with Mrs. Thatcher, President Mitterrand and that he was intending to have discussions with the Chinese, the Americans and the Soviets.

I expressed the view, on behalf of Australia, that any initiative in this area was to be welcomed and that we were prepared to welcome that. There was a view expressed in the conference that it

was not appropriate to proceed along that path at this stage and that more work had to be done in general preparatory bilateral with the Soviets and China before going to the point of a five power conference. I expressed the view that there may be a possibility of narrowing that sort of thought of more preparatory work with the Trudeau concept of a five power conference.

I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, that covers essentially the contribution that I made. The discussion for today concluded after 5. It will resume tomorrow. It may be then that I will make a further contribution in the debate.

May I just make this point, which is totally unrelated to today's events, but some information. I will be having lunch tomorrow with Lee Kuan Yew and Foreign Minister Dhanabalan from Singapore and Foreign Minister Ghazali .. from Malaysia.

JOURNALIST: Where will you have the lunch?

PM: It will be here in the High Commissioner's residence.

JOURNALIST: (inaudible)

PM: Well, there may be. I would like it and I'll see if it can be done.

JOURNALIST: Prime Minister, could you place in context the discussions today on disarmament and the Trudeau initiative which you've welcomed, with the news today that the Russians have walked out of the INF talks in Geneva without setting a date for a return.

PM: I suppose obviously that is not a propitious sign, but that is what had been signalled by the Soviet. If the United States went ahead with its proposals for the Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe, I guess in that sense it is not surprising. I would believe that after a period of indication of such protests that the discussions will resume next year and I base that upon the fundamental proposition that ultimately it is not in the interests of the Soviet Union or any of the super powers to have to be expending such an enormous and increasing proportion of their capacity upon this build up of the nuclear arsenal. I think that basic reality will come to bear in the way which will mean the resumption of talks. Whether in the foreseeable future it means that the Trudeau concept of the five power conference is achievable, it is far too early to say.

JOURNALIST: Does your Government support the deployment of the Cruise and Pershing missiles in Europe. How do you square that with what you were saying today, if you do?

PM: Well, you may have noted that I said two things which are relevant to that. I said the Soviet Union has pursued an armaments program of unprecedented proportions. The cause of the problem in Europe was the original deployment by the Soviet Union of the

SS20 and there is no way in which realistically in this world, you can talk about a unilateral move towards disarmament. Nor will a situation be likely to reach - be productive of a general reduction if one side thinks that it is in a position of relative inferiority and so there is nothing at all inconsistent with what I've been saying today and those facts. Indeed, they are totally consistent with and reflect the basic propositions that I've put.

JOURNALIST: Prime Minister, can I ask you what Australia will be doing in terms of increasing its ability to note nuclear disturbances by seismic means, first of all. Secondly could I ask you - do you have confidence that the Trudeau initiative won't die a death like the initiative of North-South dialogue which was so prominent a couple of years ago.

PM: In regard to the first question, all I can say to you is that technical work is proceeding to increase our capacity in that area of seismic monitoring and I don't pretend to bring across the technical detail. In regard to the second, I can't say and nor can any reasonable person say that that proposal of the Canadian Prime Minister will not die the same sort of death as other proposals. Of course I can't say that, but I take the view, and I think it would be the view of the great majority of my fellow Australians, that any initiative is worthwhile because - I mean it is an obscenity - how long have we been going now - about let's say 30 minutes - that in that time \$40 million has been spent on the armaments race. It is just so clear that this would be an infinitely better world if we could have a conversion of ... a part of these resources. Now, if we took the view in respect of any initiative that it may fail and therefore we don't try - that just doesn't seem to me to be the way we should go about things.

JOURNALIST: We were told there was a move by some ... countries for other Commonwealth countries to join Mr. Trudeau in what remains of his mission. What is your view of other Commonwealth nations joining and is there any thought of Australia sending someone along?

PM: Well, you've obviously heard something about it. One of the participants suggested other nations may be involved - two or three others - and our name was mentioned. Let me make it quite clear in respect of that. It was a hypothetical observation made by one of the participants. There was no specific proposal. If such a proposal were made, then, of course, we would consider it.

JOURNALIST: You'll have the opportunity in January, Prime Minister, of talking to the Chinese. Do you think you're likely to raise that then?

PM: Well, there is an interesting conjunction of time on that. The Chinese Premier is going to be in Canada about the middle of January, at the time of his visit to the United States. I've been talking to Prime Minister Trudeau and I believe he would keep me informed of those discussions and it may be that when I go to China just a couple of weeks after that, I may be able to assist in some way in picking up the threads of that discussion.

JOURNALIST: Can we interpret from that, PM, that you will make whatever diplomatic effort we can to assist the implementation of ... the Trudeau initiative?

PM: Yes, I made it clear in there that I believe that there was a need to marry the sort of approach of Mr. Trudeau to that which was put by another speaker. I mentioned of the need to be far more preparatory with bilateral work, particularly with the Soviet bloc countries before you got to the stage of seeking a five power conference. But if there is anything I could do to help the concept, of course, we would do it. But let me emphasise, so that I don't want to belt it up as there may be a plan to do. It was a very low key sort of response because I think it's a very ambitious concept that Mr. Trudeau has put forward. It is worthy of support, but without deluding ourselves, it is something easy of achievement. If there is something we can do to help, we will do it.

JOURNALIST: There was some suggestion of talks of a possible Commonwealth security umbrella for some of the smaller countries. Did you address yourself to that particular idea at all. If you didn't can you tell us what our views on that are now?

PM: No, I didn't and I must say it was put in passing by one speaker. It would be quite ... to suggest that it was advancing a serious and developed proposition.

JOURNALIST: Mrs. Gandhi, Prime Minister, seemed pretty critical of Grenada and the events that occurred over there. There seemed to be implicit criticism of the United States. Was Grenada at all raised today?

PM: No, the way the discussion has been structured was really that Pierre Trudeau introduced the matter and it was basically around the area of the arms race and what could be done in that area and there was agreement that the more specific items, including Grenada would be the subject of particular discussions later on.

JOURNALIST: Quickly, Prime Minister, whose initiative was the meeting with the Malaysian and Singaporean delegates?

PM: We raised the question and, as I understand it - I haven't been engaged in the discussion - I think they were more than happy about it and were probably expecting that we would have a meeting.

JOURNALIST: Did you come up with any suggestion about how Australia's Ambassador for Disarmament could play a greater role in the Trudeau initiatives or any other Commonwealth moves?

PM: No, but I would believe that if anything were to develop in this area, obviously having a person particularly charged with responsibility in this area would be useful in maximising our capacity to do something and we would use him.

JOURNALIST: On the question of germ warfare, Mr. Hawke, will Australia be trying to seeking that part or put that in the communique which will be delivered next week - ... other countries to sign those treaties you were talking about.

PM: The question of the communique and how it is done is a matter still to be decided. You will appreciate there is a problem about communiqes, as to whether you have a relatively short document of general political intent which everyone can agree with, or whether you have a much longer document where every sort of items that has been mentioned by participants is included. At this stage there is no decision about that. Speaking for myself, it seems to me - and I said this at the end of my contribution - I said at the end of this debate it is very likely that you are all going to have to say - if we are honest we are all going to have to say to one another, well, what is there that is concrete that has come out of it. It was in that sense that I said that a move of support by those who haven't signed the 1925 protocol and the 72 treaty that adherence to that would be something specific and worthwhile and that we were working towards a new treaty to expand the 1925 protocol. Now, they may feel that it is worth giving some specific mention to that. It's too early to say.

JOURNALIST: Can I ask a domestic question, Prime Minister?

PM: Yes.

JOURNALIST: The NSW Premier has apparently said today that the \$30,000 limit on the assets test is too low for NSW Property values and will be seeking a response from you on your return. Do you have any ..

PM: Sure, I'll always be prepared to talk with the Premier of NSW. He is a political colleague and a close friend and I'll be more than happy to talk with him.

\*\*\*\*\*