J. AUSTRALIA

20.14

PRIME MINISTER

E. & O.E. - PROOF ONLY

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE FOR AUSTRALIAN MEDIA, CHOGM CONFERENCE CENTRE, NEW DELHI, 29 NOVEMBER 1983

 \underline{PM} : ... before the end of the day Mr. Ramphal has in mind \overline{th} at we should have a preliminary brief meeting to work out what the future course of action should be. I expect that to happen before I leave tonight.

JOURNALIST: Prime Minister, are you expecting to see President Reagan, or how are you going to convey the message that Australia rejects linkage on ...

 \underline{PM} : No, that Australian position has been known. It has been $\overline{conveyed}$ before. We have said that in the relevant international forums, so what I have said here is not something new and it is a position which the United States is aware of. If I'm having any further discussions — or when I'm having further discussions with the President I, of course in the appropriate context, would remind him of it.

JOURNALIST: Prime Minister, in Goa you mentioned that you hoped to have the first meeting here on the Cyprus group. I gather that hasn't happened yet.

 \underline{PM} : No, I just answered that. I said that before the end of \overline{th} is day - we are scheduled to leave about 8 o'clock tonight - before we leave we will be having a meeting of the heads of government of those five nations.

JOURNALIST: Just a short summing up overall comment on your experiences in CHOGM.

 \overline{PM} : Worthwhile for these reasons. Firstly, it has given me \overline{th} e opportunity to meet a wide range of leaders of the Commonwealth covering aligned, non-aligned countries, countries at all stages of economic development and from all geographical areas. Now, that has been useful. It will mean on my part a greater capacity to conduct effective relations with these countries because I know the leaders personally. Secondly, it has been an occasion in which some specifically useful things have been done. Two in particular - Cyprus - the creation of the five nation working group to operate alongside the United

Nations Secretary de Cuellar. I think it adds to the possibility of resolving that matter. I'm glad that Australia is one of those five nations. Secondly, in regard to Grenada - that was indeed significant to get an agreed position on that and I think the communique reflects the growth of understanding that took place here amongst the lot of us because it doesn't involve any recriminations about the past. It emphasises the need to accelerate the return to constitutional government. I think that was important. It was indeed a remarkable achievement.

JOURNALIST: You were surprised at the achievement of that?

 \underline{PM} : Yes, because when you listened to the debate on Thursday, the \overline{in} itial debate, the differences were so wide and deep that it seemed to me a fairly difficult task to get an agreed position, but that was achieved.

JOURNALIST: Do you think there has been an anti-American bias here, Prime Minister?

PM: It is true that some countries - I don't go into names - tend to view most international issues with an element of anti-US bias. I think that is true, but it doesn't dominate.

JOURNALIST: ... that anti-American bias at this meeting?

PM: People are entitled to express a view. I think what you've got to, at the end, test, Paul, is what is said and what is done and if you take, for instance, the Grenada resolution, the United States doesn't get a mention in the resolution, so people might in the course of debate express some views and give some emphases, but in the end they weren't indulging directly in an attack upon the United States. They were concentrating upon the future. So I think one understands those things.

JOURNALIST: They certainly were in South Africa, though weren't they.

PM: They were what?

JOURNALIST: They were indulging in that sort of attack on the US.

PM: Yes, to some extent. Their concern is that the linkage by the United States between the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola and the settlement there. They certainly reject that linkage and think that it is unhelpful, counter-productive. But, at the end there has got to be an understanding in the economic area of the vast importance of the United States to the welfare of, not only these countries but the rest of the world. It is very sensible, in my judgement, that adverse judgements that countries might want to make about the United States on particular issues should not be allowed to cloud their understanding that it is in the interests of the rest of the world to try and have as constructive relations with the United States as possible and to try and see that the United States plays as large a role as it can in the international community because it obviously has the capacity to determine to a very large

measure the rate of growth in trade in the world. And also it has the capacity, more than anyone else, to participate in constructive assistance to those countries of the world which most need it. And I'm conscious of that and I think they all should be. That doesn't mean that you have to endorse everything that the United States does or says, but it does suggest that one ought to be conscious of the importance and the relevance of the United States. It is rather difficult it seems to me, on the one hand totally to condemn the United States in terms of international politics and on the other side not to recognise its primary importance in the economic and development area.
