



PRIME MINISTER

E AND O E - PROOF ONLY

TRANSCRIPT - FORUM BRIEFING - 27 AUGUST 1984 - TUVALU

6.00 P.M., PRIME MINISTER HAWKE

P.M. :

WE CONTINUED OUR DISCUSSIONS OVER LUNCH ON THE NUCLEAR FREE ZONE PROPOSAL... ABOUT TESTING AND DUMPING. SOME OF THE STATES MADE IT CLEAR THAT THEIR POSITION WAS ONE OF WANTING TO BAN ALL INVOLVEMENT WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS OR ANYTHING TO DO WITH THE NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE BUT OTHERS AGREED, I THINK THE MAJORITY AGREED, THAT ANY ZONE CONCEPT COULD ONLY BE ACCEPTABLE AND OPERATIVE IF IT LEAVES INDIVIDUALS COUNTRIES FREE TO MAKE THEIR OWN DECISIONS ABOUT THE QUESTION OF THE VISITS OF NUCLEAR ARMED AND NUCLEAR POWERED SHIPS AND THAT RIGHT, WHICH I THINK YOU WILL ALL RECALL, WAS INTRINSIC TO THE PROPOSAL WHICH I PUT TO THE FORUM IN CANBERRA LAST YEAR, HAS BEEN ACCEPTED. THERE WAS SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT NOMENCLATURE, WHETHER IT SHOULD BE CALLED A SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE, THERE WAS ONE SUGGESTION THAT WE SHOULD BE TALKING ABOUT SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR WEAPONS FREE ZONE BUT THAT WAS NOT ACCEPTED AND INDEED WAS NOT PROCEEDED WITH. THE QUESTION OF NOMENCLATURE IS, I THINK, RELATIVELY UNIMPORTANT BUT IT IS A MATTER THAT CAN BE DEALT WITH BY THE WORKING PARTY. ON THE QUESTION OF THE PACE OF FURTHER PROGRESS, ONE SUGGESTION WAS RAISED BY ONE MEMBER THAT THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY MEETING, LATER THIS YEAR, SHOULD BE ASKED TO ENDORSE IN THIS YEAR, THE PROPOSAL THAT WAS NOT REALLY PROCEEDED WITH BECAUSE THE MORE GENERAL VIEW I THINK WAS, THAT IT MADE SENSE THAT WE IN THE REGION SHOULD DO MORE WORK ON THE PROPOSAL OURSELVES BUT THERE WAS AGREEMENT THAT THIS

.../2

SHOULD NOT BE SOMETHING THAT WE SHOULD BE CASUAL ABOUT, THERE IS AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF PROCEEDING EXPEDITIOUSLY; CERTAINLY SPEAKING FOR AUSTRALIA; WE WILL DO ALL THAT WE CAN, NOT ONLY BY THE PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE BUT BY OUR OWN INPUT, TO ENSURE THAT THE MATTER IS PROCEEDED WITH EXPEDITIOUSLY. IT WOULD BE A HOPE, I SUPPOSE THIS IS AN OPTIMUM POSITION, THAT OUT OF THE WORK OF THE OFFICIALS THAT WE MAY BE IN A POSITION ACTUALLY TO PRESENT A DRAFT TREATY BY THE 1985 FORUM WHETHER THAT WILL BE POSSIBLE, OF COURSE, REMAINS TO BE SEEN OUT OF THE WORK THAT WE DO BUT I THINK YOU CAN SEE THAT THE ATTITUDE THAT WAS ADOPTED THAT BEFORE WE REALLY INTRUDE FURTHER OUR CONCEPT INTO INTERNATIONAL FORUMS PARTICULARLY THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IT MADE SENSE THAT WE DO MORE OF OUR OWN WORK. I COULD SAY BY WAY OF BROAD CONTEXT, THAT THE SENSE OF URGENCY HOWEVER IN GETTING OUR OWN WORK DONE, WAS AGREEMENT THAT THE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT HAD DETERIORATED, I HAVE MADE REFERENCE AND MADE PROVISION TO THE BREAKDOWN OF THE START AND INF AND THE STAND OFF SITUATION WHICH DEVELOPED BETWEEN THE SUPERPOWERS AND I BELIEVE THAT THERE WAS GENERAL AGREEMENT THAT IN THIS SITUATION WHERE THE TRADITIONAL FORA FOR PROCESSING MOVES TOWARDS REDUCTION IN ARMAMENTS, PARTICULARLY NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS, HAD SOMEWHAT BROKEN DOWN. IT WAS THAT MUCH MORE IMPORTANT THAT WE IN THIS REGION SHOULD DO WHAT WE COULD TO PROGRESS OUR WORK SO THAT WE COULD PUT TO THE WORLD OUR CONCERN ON THIS ISSUE. THERE WAS AN UNDERSTANDING IN THE DISCUSSION OF THE FACT OF INTERNATIONAL FREEDOM OF TRANSIT ON THE HIGH SEAS AND THAT, OF COURSE, WAS ALSO A POSITION WHICH WE FROM AUSTRALIA HAD MADE CLEAR IN FIRST PUTTING THIS POSITION BEFORE THE FORUM IN 1983. THERE WAS REFERENCE TO THE PAPER WHICH WAS PRESENTED TO THE FORUM BY NAURU ON THE QUESTION OF DUMPING. THEY HAVE SHOWN, WITH KIRIBATI, A PARTICULAR INTEREST AND INVOLVEMENT IN THAT ASPECT OF NUCLEAR CONCERN AND THERE WAS A REFLECTION OF THE CONCERN AT THE LACK OF PROGRESS IN COMMITMENTS BY THE METROPOLITAN POWERS. SO ON THIS QUESTION OF DUMPING AND WE WILL PICK UP THE PAPER BY NAURU AND KIRIBATI AND THE PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE LONDON DUMPING CONVENTION, THAT WILL BE A MATTER THAT WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE WORK OF THE STUDY GROUP BECAUSE IT WAS RECOGNISED AS A USEFUL PAPER. MAY I ALSO PICK OUT ONE OR TWO OTHER POINTS THAT WERE TOUCHED UPON. THERE WAS REFERENCE TO THE SCIENTIFIC PARTY, WHICH IN THE LATTER PART OF LAST YEAR, YOU WILL RECALL, HAD GONE TO MORUROA AND WHILE FORUM MEMBERS INDICATED THAT THERE WAS SOME RECOGNITION IN THAT REPORT, THAT THE EXTENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN MAY NOT NEED TO BE, IN ALL ITS RESPECT, AS LARGE AS PERHAPS HAD BEEN THOUGHT BEFORE, NEVERTHELESS THAT REPORT COULD NOT LEAVE ONE WITH ANY SENSE OF COMPLACENCY AND IN ACKNOWLEDGING THE REPORT WE UNANIMOUSLY INDICATED THAT IT IN NO WAY DIMINISHED THE OPPOSITION OF ALL FORUM MEMBERS TO THE CONTINUATION OF NUCLEAR TESTING BY FRANCE. WE ALSO WELCOMED, AND THAT WILL BE REFLECTED IN THE COMMUNIQUE, THE STATEMENT BY THE LATIN AMERICAN PERMANENT COMMISSION FOR THE SOUTH PACIFIC, THAT CONSISTS OF CHILE, COLUMBIA, ECQUADOR AND PERU, ALL COUNTRIES WHO RECENTLY ISSUED, I THINK IT WAS ON THE 6TH OF JULY, A CONDEMNATION OF FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING IN THE PACIFIC. AND ONE OTHER POINT WHICH I THINK AROSE IN THIS DISCUSSION, WHICH SHOULD BE NOTED, WAS A SUGGESTION FROM THE

PRIME MINISTER OF WESTERN SAMOA, THAT IN ADDITION TO THE STATEMENTS THAT WILL BE CONTAINED IN THE COMMUNIQUE REFLECTING THOSE MATTERS WHICH I HAVE TOLD YOU ABOUT TODAY, AND IN ADDITION TO THAT HE SUGGESTED THAT ALL FORUM MEMBERS SHOULD IN FACT WRITE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE ON THE QUESTION OF NUCLEAR TESTING AND OPPOSE IT. AND THIS WILL BE DONE, I BELIEVE, BY MEMBERS INDIVIDUALLY AS WAS ALSO THE SUGGESTION FROM THE PRIME MINISTER OF WESTERN SAMOA, THAT LETTERS SHOULD ALSO BE WRITTEN TO THE JAPANESE GOVERNMENT INDICATING OUR CONCERN ABOUT THE POSSIBLE PROPOSALS IN REGARD TO NUCLEAR DUMPING. THAT DISCUSSION OCCUPIED THE GREATER PART OF THIS AFTERNOON. WE GOT ON AT THE VERY LATTER STAGE TO REPORTS ON THE QUESTION OF THE POSSIBILITY OF A SINGLE REGIONAL ORGANISATION, BUT I REALLY HAVE NOTHING TO REPORT TO YOU ON THAT. THERE WAS A COMMITTEE ESTABLISHED ON THE LAST OCCASION TO LOOK AT THIS ISSUE - THAT IS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION AND THE FORUM. BUT THAT COMMITTEE HAD NOT HAD THE OPPORTUNITY OF DOING ANY SUBSTANTIAL WORK ON THAT SO THERE'S NOTHING TO PUT FORWARD ON IT. AND WE AT THE END WERE ON THE ISSUE OF REGIONAL CO-OPERATION AS IT AFFECTS SMALLER FORUM MEMBERS. BUT THAT HASN'T COME TO A CONCLUSION. THAT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, IS A COVERAGE OF WHAT HAPPENED THIS AFTERNOON.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE, SIR, SOME OF US HAVEN'T SEEN THE AUSTRALIAN PROPOSALS WHICH HAVE BEEN PUT TO THIS MEETING. DO THEY VARY FROM THE CANBERRA COMMUNIQUE GREATLY, OR WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO MAKE THEM PUBLIC.

P.M.: I'LL LOOK AT THAT. THEY ARE THE PROPERTY OF THE FORUM, BUT SPEAKING FOR MYSELF I DON'T SEE ANY REASON WHY THEY SHOULDN'T BE AND I'LL MAKE ENQUIRIES ABOUT IT.

JOURNALIST: DID ANY FORUM MEMBERS EXPRESS ANY CONCERN ABOUT THEIR DEFENCE OR SECURITY IN THE EVENT OF A TOTAL, A PROPER, NUCLEAR FREE ZONE WITH NO WARSHIPS IN IT AT ALL BEING INTRODUCED.

P.M.: NO, THERE WAS NO SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THAT BUT I THINK THERE WAS IMPLICIT IN THE CONTRIBUTION PERHAPS OF ONE OR TWO MEMBERS OF THE VIEW THAT THEY HAD TO RETAIN THE RIGHT AND INTENDED TO RETAIN THE RIGHT TO HAVE VISITS OF NUCLEAR-POWERED AND NUCLEAR-ARMED SHIPS TO THEIR PORTS. AND SO I GUESS INFERENTIALLY THAT DID ENTAIL A JUDGEMENT ON THEIR PART THAT THEY BELIEVED THAT IT WAS APPROPRIATE TO THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF DEFENCE AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS THAT THEY SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO DO THAT.

JOURNALIST: HOW MANY COUNTRIES INTEND NOW THAT WE'VE GOT A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE TO HAVE VISITS OF NUCLEAR-ARMED OR POWERED SHIPS.

P.M.: WELL, LET ME REFER TO THOSE TWO WHO HAVE THEM, WHO HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE THEM, AND WOULD REGARD IT IS APPROPRIATE- AUSTRALIA HAS IT, FIJI DOES AND I THINK IT WAS CLEAR FROM THE CONTRIBUTION OF TONGA THAT THEY WOULD PUT THEMSELVES IN THAT CATEGORY. ON THE OTHER HAND VANUATU, FOR INSTANCE- THIS IS NOT

REFLECTING ANY PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL DISCUSSION BECAUSE THEY HAVE MADE A DECISION OF DECLARING THEMSELVES A TOTAL NUCLEAR FREE ZONE. SO THEY WOULDN'T HAVE NUCLEAR-POWERED VISITS THERE, NUCLEAR POWERED SHIP VISITS.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE WAS THERE ANY SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSITION THAT THE MATTER BE RAISED AT THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY OR IT WAS IT JUST ONE VOICE.

P.M.: ESSENTIALLY ONE VOICE BUT IT WAS NOT PROCEEDED WITH.

JOURNALIST: DID MR LANGE EXPLAIN TO THE FORUM WHY HE WASN'T WANTED TO RAISE IT WITH THE U.N.

P.M.: WELL I THINK THE VIEW OF NEW ZEALAND WAS THAT THIS MAY GIVE SOME SORT OF IMPETUS, BUT I THINK THERE CAME TO BE AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE VIEW THAT IT MADE MORE SENSE FOR US TO DO THE WORK. I MEAN THERE ARE SOME QUITE SPECIFIC MATTERS THAT NEED TO BE ADDRESSED. WITHOUT GOING INTO THEM ALL, ONE OBVIOUS ELEMENT IS THE QUESTION OF THE GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITS OF THE ZONE THAT WOULD BE ENVISAGED. THERE MAY BE SOME DIFFERENCES OF VIEW ABOUT THAT SO, WE CAME TO THE VIEW, I THINK, THAT IT MAKES MORE SENSE TO CLARIFY PRECISELY THE SORTS OF THINGS THAT WE HAVE IN MIND, AND THAT YOU ARE MORE LIKELY TO GET THE OPPORTUNITY OF MAXIMISING SUPPORT WITHIN THE UNITED NATIONS ONCE WE HAD DONE OUR WORK. BUT LET ME BE FAIR, TOTALLY, TO NEW ZEALAND IN THIS MATTER THAT THEY WANTED TO MAKE SURE THAT THE IMPETUS WASN'T LOST. AND THAT IS A VIEW THAT IS SHARED, CERTAINLY BY AUSTRALIA AS THE SPONSOR OF THIS CONCEPT. AND WE HAVE MADE IT CLEAR THAT WE WILL EVERYTHING TO FACILITATE, NOT MERELY BY FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE, BUT IN TERMS OF INPUT, TO ENSURE THAT THIS WORKING PARTY NOW IS AN EFFECTIVE, FUNCTIONAL ORGANISATION.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER, IN YOUR OWN OPINION, AND PERHAPS ON A SCALE OF TEN, HOW NUCLEAR FREE IS A ZONE THAT ALLOWS THE TRANSIT OF NUCLEAR ARMED WARSHIPS.

P.M.: WELL, IT IS AS A ZONE, I THINK, TOTALLY FREE. IF YOU LOOK AT THE RECORD OF OPERATION OF THE UNITED STATES VESSELS, FOR INSTANCE, AND I HAVEN'T BEEN TAKEN INTO THE CONFIDENCE OF THE SOVIET UNION SO I CAN'T SPEAK IN RESPECT OF THAT SUPERPOWER. IF YOU LOOK AT THE UNITED STATES THEY HAVE A VERY LARGE NUMBER OF, I DON'T KNOW THE PRECISE NUMBER, BUT WELL OVER ONE HUNDRED NUCLEAR POWERED VESSELS TRAVELLED THE EQUIVALENT OF VERY MANY MILLIONS OF MILES, HAVE BEEN INTO ABOUT 150 PORTS IN 50 COUNTRIES AND WITHOUT ANY ACCIDENT OR SEEPAGE OF MATERIAL. NOW THE FACT THAT VESSELS HAD THAT RECORD WILL BE TRAVERSING THE AREA AND BY THE DECISION OF AUTONOMOUS SOVEREIGN COUNTRIES MAY IN FACT VISIT THEIR PORTS DOESN'T DIMINISH THEREFORE, I BELIEVE, IN ANY SIGNIFICANT WAY FROM THE CONCEPT WHICH IS THAT WE ARE SAYING THAT WE AS NATIONS WILL NOT ACQUIRE NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WE WILL NOT MANUFACTURE THEM, WE ARE OPPOSED TO THE TESTING OF WEAPONS IN THE REGION AND TO THE DUMPING OF NUCLEAR WASTE. SO YOU WOULD HAVE TO BE

A PRETTY PERVERSE AND NEGATIVE SEEKER AFTER FACTS TO SUGGEST THAT THAT MAINTENANCE OF THE RIGHT OF TRANSIT ON THE HIGH SEAS INVOLVED ANY DIMINUTION OF AN EFFECTIVE CONCEPT.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER, IS THIS RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR FREE ZONES IN FACT AIMED PRIMARILY AGAINST FRANCE AND NOT PARTICULARLY AT THE AMERICAN FLEET. AND IF THAT IS THE CASE COULD THERE BE A REACTION FROM FRANCE THAT WOULD EFFECT THE FORUM'S ABILITY TO EXERT PRESSURE ON FRANCE FOR THE MORE SPEEDY INDEPENDENCE FOR NEW CALEDONIA.

P.M.: NO I DON'T SEE THE TWO THINGS AS LINKED BUT LET ME REPEAT THE POINT THAT I THINK I MADE WHEN I ARRIVED HERE YESTERDAY WHEN SOME OF OUR AUSTRALIAN JOURNALISTS QUESTIONED ME. WE DON'T DELUDE OURSELVES THAT THE PURSUIT OF OR EVEN THE EARLY ACHIEVEMENT OF A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE CONCEPT BY THE COUNTRIES OF THIS REGION WOULD OF ITSELF FORCE FRANCE TO STOP ITS TESTING. WE WOULD BE POLITICALLY NAIVE TO BELIEVE THAT THAT RESULT WOULD FOLLOW. I THINK IN THESE SORTS OF THINGS ITS A QUESTION OF AN ACCUMULATION OF PRESSURES, EXPRESSIONS OF VIEW. I MEAN I GO BACK AS YOUR AUSTRALIAN COLLEAGUES IN THE PRESS WOULD RECALL TO THE POINT I MADE IN REGARD TO THE FRENCH ATMOSPHERIC NUCLEAR TESTING - WHEN WE TOOK UP THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THAT IN THE EARLY 1970'S IT WAS PUT TO US THAT THIS WAS PRETTY POINTLESS. BUT THERE IS SOME EVIDENCE THAT THE ACTION WE TOOK THERE ACCELERATED THE DECISION OF THE FRENCH TO STOP ATMOSPHERIC TESTING AND TO GO UNDERGROUND. NOW I MERELY SEE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE CONCEPT BY THE COUNTRIES OF THE REGION AS ONE ELEMENT OF THE PRESSURE. AND GOING TO THE SECOND PART OF YOUR QUESTION ABOUT THE REACTION OF FRANCE TO THIS PROCESS, TO WHAT THEY WOULD DO ABOUT NEW CALEDONIA, I THINK THAT'S A QUITE ERRONEOUS ASSUMPTION - BECAUSE YOU WILL RECALL THAT I HAVE SAID, AND I THINK IT'S A VIEW SUBSTANTIALLY SHARED BY ALL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM, THAT WE DON'T REALLY QUESTION THE INTEGRITY OR INTENTION OF FRANCE ABOUT WANTING TO SEE INDEPENDENCE FOR NEW CALEDONIA. RATHER THEY DO HAVE APPREHENSIONS ABOUT WHAT MAY BE THE OUTCOME THERE OF A TOO EARLY GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE. BUT WE NEVERTHELESS TAKE THE VIEW THAT THERE SHOULD BE AN ACCELERATION OF THE MOVE IN THAT DIRECTION. NOW I THINK FRANCE WILL UNDERSTAND THE VIEWS THAT WE HOLD ON THAT AND THE INTEGRITY IN TURN WITH WHICH WE HOLD OUR VIEWS. AND I WOULD NOT IMAGINE IN ANY WAY THAT THERE'LL BE ANY RELATION BY FRANCE IN ANY REACTIVE WAY OF WHAT WE'RE SAYING ABOUT A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE AND WHAT THEY WOULD DO IN THAT AREA OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITY.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER, DO YOU ACCEPT THAT BECAUSE NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN TRANSIT ARE INSTANTLY DEPLOYABLE THAT THEREFORE THEY SHOULD BE REGARDED AS PERMANENTLY DEPLOYABLE.

P.M.: WELL THEY ARE PERMANENTLY DEPLOYABLE BUT I'M TRYING MY BEST TO FOLLOW THROUGH WHAT'S INVOLVED IN YOUR QUESTION.

JOURNALIST: I SUPPOSE IT COMES BACK ...

P.M.: COULD YOU TELL ME WHAT THE POINT OF YOUR QUESTION,
I DON'T QUITE FOLLOW IT.

JOURNALIST: I SUPPOSE IT COMES BACK TO WHAT SORT OF SANCTITY IN A
NUCLEAR FREE ZONE WHICH ALLOWS TRANSIT.

P.M.: WELL THIS QUESTION OF SANCTITY - WHAT YOU'VE GOT TO UNDERSTAND
IS THAT THE CONCEPT OF NUCLEAR FREE ZONE IS NOT SIMPLY ABOUT THE
TRANSIT OF WEAPONS WITHIN IT. IT INVOLVES AN UNDERTAKING ON THE
PART OF THE COUNTRIES PARTY TO THAT TREATY THAT THEY WILL NOT
MANUFACTURE OR ACQUIRE OR STORE NUCLEAR WEAPONS. NOW THAT'S
IMPORTANT IN ITSELF - IF A SIGNIFICANT SECTION OF THE COUNTRIES OF
THE WORLD MAKE THAT COMMITMENT - SO THAT'S IMPORTANT. SECONDLY, THEY
INDICATE THAT THEY ARE OPPOSED TO AND WILL USE WHAT POWERS THEY HAVE
TO STOP THE DUMPING OF NUCLEAR WASTE MATERIAL IN THEIR REGION. SO
THAT HAS ITS IMPORTANCE. NOW THOSE THINGS HAVE AN INTRINSIC LIFE AND
REALITY OF THEIR OWN. IT JUST SEEMS TO ME, IF I MAY SAY SO IN MY
NORMAL GENTLE FORM, THAT IF YOU'RE GOING TO CONTINUE TO LIGHT UPON
ONE ASPECT - THAT IS THAT THIS CONCEPT IS CONSISTENT, AS IT MUST BE,
WITH THE RIGHT OF TRANSIT ON THE HIGH SEAS AND SAY THAT MEANS THERE
IS NO REALITY IN THE CONCEPT. ALL THAT REVEALS IS NOT SOMETHING
ABOUT THE CONCEPT BUT SOMETHING ABOUT YOUR ATTITUDE TO IT.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER IF THE FORUM COMES UP AND FINALLY ACCEPTS
THIS RESOLUTION WHAT WOULD THE POSITION IF THE MICRONESIAN STATES,
WHICH MAY BE OBLIGED TO HOST AMERICAN NUCLEAR DUMPS, WILL THEY BE
ABLE TO JOIN THE FORUM OR WOULD THEY BE ...

P.M.: WELL THERE IS TWO POINTS ABOUT THAT OF COURSE. YOU APPRECIATE
THAT THEY ARE NOT FULL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT
CONSTITUTIONALLY SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENT NATIONS. THEY HAVE THE RIGHT
OF OBSERVER STATUS BUT AS SOON AS YOU'VE SAID THAT YOU'VE ANSWERED
YOUR QUESTION - IN TERMS THAT THEY ARE NOT SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENT
NATIONS, THEY HAVE A CONSTITUTIONAL RELATIONSHIP WITH ANOTHER
METROPOLITAN POWER - THEN THERE IS THE ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION. THAT
DOESN'T MEAN THAT THEY WILL NOT BE ABLE TO HAVE AN INTEREST IN THE
WORK OF THE FORUM MEMBERS ON THIS AND THEY MAY WELL EXPRESS A VIEW
THAT THEY DON'T HAVE THE CAPACITY BY DEFINITION THAT A SOVEREIGN
INDEPENDENT NATION HAS.

JOURNALIST: ... SOME OF THEM SEEM TO BE MAKING OVERTURES TO JOIN THE
FORUM WHEN THEY GET A DEGREE OF INDEPENDENCE WHICH WOULD PERMIT THEM.
WOULD YOU DENY THEM MEMBERSHIP BECAUSE THEY MAY HAVE NUCLEAR
FACILITIES ON THEIR TERRITORY.

P.M.: NO, THE POSSIBILITY OF BECOMING FULL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM ONLY
ARISES WHEN THEY ARE FULLY SOVEREIGN INDEPENDENT NATIONS AND WE DON'T
KNOW WHAT THE POSITION WOULD BE IN THEIR COUNTRIES WHEN THAT POSITION
ARRIVES. SO MY AUSTRALIAN COLLEAGUES WILL TELL YOU THAT I'M NOT
PRONE TO ANSWERING HYPOTHETICAL QUESTIONS.

.../7

7-0.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE DO YOU ARGUE THAT THE NUCLEAR FREE ZONE WILL MAKE A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION TO NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND IF SO WILL IT DO IT JUST BY POSITIVE EXAMPLE OR THROUGH SOME OTHER MORE CONCRETE WAYS.

P.M.: WELL ONCE YOU GET INTO THE AREA, THIS BORDER AREA, OF NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION YOU KNOW THAT NEXT YEAR IN 1985 IS THE REVIEW YEAR FOR THE NPT TREATY. AUSTRALIA HAS A VERY FIRM VIEW ABOUT THE IMPORTANCE OF THAT INSTRUMENT - IT'S BEEN REALLY THE ONLY INSTRUMENT IN EXISTENCE WHICH OFFERS A BASIS FOR PREVENTING THE PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONRY. NOW ALL I CAN SAY THEREFORE IN RELATION TO THAT QUESTION IS THAT I'M NOT ONE FOR OVERSTATING WHAT CAN BE DONE IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA. IF YOU KNOW ANYTHING ABOUT INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS YOU KNOW THAT IT'S FOOLISH TO OVERSTATE THE POSSIBILITY OF INITIATIVES. I THINK WHAT YOU CAN SAY ABOUT IT IS THAT, THAT THERE IS GOING TO BE AS YOU LEAD UP TO THE NPT REVIEW TREATY NEXT YEAR THAT ATTEMPTS BY MANY OF US TO TRY AND GET AN UNDERSTANDING ON THE PART BOTH OF SIGNATORIES TO THE NPT AND OTHERS WHO HAVEN'T YET SIGNED IT OF THE NECESSITY OF TRYING TO MAKE THE BASIC CONTRACT WHICH UNDERLIES THE NPT WORK. AND IT IS ON THE ONE HAND THAT THE NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES SHOULD NOT INCREASE THEIR WEAPON CAPABILITY BUT SHOULD MOVE TO A REDUCTION OF IT AND IN RETURN FOR THEM HONOURING THAT PART OF THE CONTRACT THEN NON-NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES SHOULD DECLINE THEMSELVES TO MOVE TOWARDS THE ACQUISITION OF WEAPONS. SO THEREFORE MAKE IN RESPECT TO YOUR QUESTION I WOULD SAY THAT TO THE EXTENT THAT WE GOT A NUMBER OF STATES IN THIS REGION WHO IN A SENSE FORMALISED THEIR COMMITMENT TO THE NON-ACQUISITION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, THAT WOULD BE SOMETHING. THE PROCESS TOWARDS THAT WOULD BE PART OF THE ARGUMENT THAT ONE COULD USE ABOUT A COMMITMENT IN REGARD TO A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF STATES IN THIS REGION TO TRY AND MAKE THAT CONTRACT WORK. NOW I DON'T WANT TO OVERSTATE, IT'S NOT GOING TO DO MORE THAN THAT I THINK.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER YOU TALK ABOUT THE TALKS ABOUT THE GEOGRAPHICAL EXTENT OF A POSSIBLE NUCLEAR FREE ZONE. ARE WE TALKING ABOUT OR CAN WE TALK ABOUT ANYTHING OTHER THAN THE ECONOMIC ZONES OF EACH INDIVIDUAL STATE PUT TOGETHER. IF SO WHAT CAN WE SAY..

P.M.: I DON'T THINK WE CAN TALK ABOUT IN A STRICT LEGAL SENSE MORE THAN AREA EZ'S. BUT THERE'S MORE TO IT THAN THAT - I THINK IT'S A QUESTION OF NOMENCLATURE. YOU SEE THERE'S BEEN A TENDENCY TO TALK ABOUT THE SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE. WELL ONCE YOU GET UP INTO SOME OF THE AREAS IN WHICH OUR MEMBERS OF THE FORUM ARE INVOLVED WE'RE SPEAKING OF WHETHER YOU ACCURATELY DESCRIBING IT IN TERMS OF THE SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE, THAT IS REALLY THE CONCEPT THAT IS INVOLVED.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE IS THERE A FEELING AMONG SOME OF THE FORUM COUNTRIES THAT A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE FOR THEM AS A MEANS OF WEAKING OF ANZUS.

P.M. : NO. THERE'S ONLY TWO OF US IN THE FORUM WHO ARE MEMBERS OF ANZUS - NEW ZEALAND AND OURSELVES. AND NEW ZEALAND REASSERTS ITS COMMITMENT TO ANZUS AND WE, THAT IS AUSTRALIA, WHEN WE RAISED THE CONCEPT FOR THE FIRST TIME LAST YEAR MADE IT CLEAR THEN, A POINT WHICH WHICH ESCAPED A COUPLE COMMENTATORS IN AUSTRALIA I MIGHT SAY, BUT NEVERTHELESS WE MADE IT CLEAR IN CANBERRA LAST YEAR THAT INTRINSIC TO THE PROPOSAL WAS THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE FORUM TO MAKE THEIR DECISION ABOUT THE VISIT OR NON-VISIT OF NUCLEAR POWERED AND NUCLEAR ARMED VESSELS. SO AS THE PRIME MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND MADE CLEAR TODAY THE QUESTION OF THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUAL STATES IS SACROSANCT AND WHAT NEW ZEALAND DID OR DID NOT IN THE EVENT FINALLY DO ABOUT THAT ISSUE WAS A MATTER INDEPENDENT OF THIS..

JOURNALIST: DID ANYONE DISPUTE THAT RIGHT BEING SACROSANCT?

P.M. : NO.

JOURNALIST: WHEN THE DRAFT PROPOSALS PUT - WERE THERE ANY AMENDMENTS PUT AT ALL?

P.M. : NO WELL THE WAY THE FORUM IS OPERATED, WHICH I THINK IS A VERY SENSIBLE ONE, IT THAT YOU HAVE A BASIS OF DISCUSSION. THE AUSTRALIAN PAPER FORMED THAT. THERE WERE SOME DRAFT AMENDMENTS CIRCULATED BUT THERE WAS NOT VOTE ON THE RESOLUTION OR ON THE AMENDMENTS. AS I'VE PUT IT TO YOU IS HOW IT TRANSPIRED AND I THINK THAT PROVIDED A BASIS WHICH WAS CERTAINLY TOTALLY SATISFACTORY TO US FOR THE WORK NOW OF THIS WORKING PARTY TO PROCEED ON IT. BUT THERE WAS NO VOTE.

JOURNALIST: WERE SOME OF THOSE AMENDMENTS ACCEPTED BY ...

P.M. : NO REALLY THEY WEREN'T PURSUED. TO GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE, THE QUESTION OF NOMENCLATURE AND THE SUGGESTION THAT THE WORK WEAPONS BE INCLUDED, WELL THAT WAS FLOATED BUT NOT PURSUED. ON THE QUESTION OF GOING TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WELL THAT AGAIN WAS FLOATED BUT IN THE DEBATE THAT FOLLOWED IT WAS THEN NOT PURSUED.

JOURNALIST: WERE THERE ANY OTHERS?

P.M. : WELL THE ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT ARE THE QUESTION OF THE INCLUSION OF WEAPONS IN THE TITLE, THE QUESTION OF GOING TO THE UNITED NATIONS. ONE SUGGESTION THAT WAS MADE WAS ABOUT AIMING TO HAVE A DRAFT TREATY BY 1985. THAT WAS ACCEPTED AS AN OBJECTIVE AND THAT CERTAINLY MAKES SENSE. WHETHER IN FACT, GIVEN THE COMPLICATED ISSUES THAT HAVE TO BE DEALT WITH, THE WORKING PARTY WOULD BE ABLE TO PROCEED THAT FAR TO ACTUALLY HAVE A DRAFT TREATY READY FOR NEXT YEAR I'M NOT SURE. WE, AS I'VE SAID, WE WILL DO EVERYTHING WE CAN TO TRY AND ACHIEVE THAT OBJECTIVE.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE ON THE POSSIBILITY OF JAPANESE NUCLEAR DUMPING, HOW STRONG WAS THE EXPRESSION OF CONCERN OVER THAT POSSIBILITY. SPECIFICALLY WAS THERE ANY DISCUSSION TODAY ABOUT POSSIBLE ACTION

AGAINST JAPAN?

P.M.: WERE FEELINGS WERE STRONGLY HELD, PARTICULARLY BY THOSE MEMBER COUNTRIES ADJACENT, BUT NO THERE WAS NO REFERENCE TO POSSIBLE COURSES OF ACTION.

JOURNALIST: MR HAWKE HOW WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO CALL THIS A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE IF, FOR EXAMPLE, WE HAD AMERICAN WARSHIPS PARTICIPATING IN EXERCISES CARRYING LARGE QUANTITIES OF AMERICAN NUCLEAR BOMBS IN THE WATERS OF POSSIBLY TONGA OR AUSTRALIA - HOW CAN IT BE A NUCLEAR FREE ZONE?

P.M.: WELL, I WILL GO OVER IT AGAIN. I THOUGHT IT WAS FAIRLY CLEAR BEFORE. NO COUNTRY WHICH ENTERS INTO A TREATY CONCEPT OF THIS KIND DOES SO ON THE BASIS THAT ITS GIVING AWAY ITS RIGHTS TO MAKE DECISIONS WHICH ARE RELEVANT IN ITS PERCEPTION OF ITS OWN..... (TAPE BREAK)...IN VIETNAM THEY HAVE COMMUNICATION FACILITY, THEY HAVE NAVAL BASE FACILITIES, THEY NOW HAVE 17 AIRCRAFT DIVIDED BETWEEN THE BEAR AND BADGER AIRCRAFT, NOW THAT IS, I AM NOT SAYING THAT IN ANY BELIGERENT SENSE, I AM SAYING MERELY THAT THOSE THNGS ARE DESCRIPTIVE OF THE REAL WORLD, OF WHICH WE ARE PART, OF WHICH WE ARE VERY ADJACENT. NOW IT IS AN EXERCISE IN ILLOGICALITY FOR YOU TO IMPLY, EVEN IF YOU DON'T ASSERT IT, THAT YOU CAN NOT CONSISTENTLY HAVE A VIEW ABOUT WHAT IS NECESSARY FOR YOUR STRATEGIC ALLIANCE RELATIONSHIP AND ALSO MAY I SAY PARANTHETICALLY ALSO RECOGNISE THE REALITY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, THAT IS THE RIGHT OF FREEDOM OF TRANSIT ON THE HIGH SEAS AND AT THE SAME TIME, BE ABLE TO ENTERTAIN A VIEW THAT YOU WILL DO WHAT IS OPEN TO YOU IN OTHER AREAS TO TRY AND USE YOUR POWERS TO LIMIT THE OPERATION OF NUCLEAR, OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE NUCLEAR CYCLE IN YOUR AREA. THAT IS, THAT YOU CAN AT THE SAME TIME, MAKE DECISIONS THAT YOU WON'T, MANUFACTURE, USE OR ACQUIRE NUCLEAR WEAPONS YOURSELF. YOU WON'T STORE THEM. THAT YOU WILL OPPOSE THE DUMPING OF NUCLEAR WASTE MATERIAL. I AM AFRAID, HAVING SAID IT TWICE, IF YOU CAN'T UNDERSTAND THAT DISTINCTION, THERE IS NOT VERY MUCH HOPE THAT A THIRD TIME OF SAYING IT ON MY PART WILL CLARIFY IT ANY MORE.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER, WHICH FORUM COUNTRY IS LIKELY TO ACQUIRE, STORE OR MANUFACTURE NUCLEAR WEAPONS?

P.M.: NONE, AS FAR AS I CAN SEE.

JOURNALIST: PRIME MINISTER, WHAT IS YOUR ASSESSMENT OF MR LANGE'S GRASP OF THE SO-CALLED INTERNATIONAL REALITIES?

P.M.: I THINK HE HAS A GOOD GRASP OF THEM
BT

JOURNALIST: Prime Minister, just on the reinscription. Was there a feeling in the general agreement to reject the Vanuatu proposal. Was there a feeling this was for all time, or was there any suggestion that the rejection don't exist here that might be considered again next year?

P.M.: There are very few things that are for all time. No, it was a decision by the Forum in respect of this year. We will be meeting again in 1985, I suppose it is conceivable that another decision could be taken then.

JOURNALIST: (Inaudible)

P.M.: What I have said before I left Australia remains valid, and that is, that the Cabinet will consider the report of the Senate committee of inquiry and we will consider that and our position in regard to matters involved in that report will be made clear to the Parliament when we resume next week.