



15

## PRIME MINISTER

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERY

**SPEECH BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA  
THE HON R J L HAWKE AC MP  
NATIONAL PRESS CLUB  
WASHINGTON - 26 JUNE 1989**

It is now almost four decades since Australia and the United States signed the ANZUS Treaty. For all the immense changes which have occurred - a region remade, a world transformed - our alliance remains vital, relevant and contemporary. It has done so, because both Australia and the United States have creatively adapted the alliance to new imperatives and new challenges.

An alliance founded on fear of immediate regional threat in the Pacific - the then recent memory in Australia of how close we came to invasion by Japan - has taken its place as part of the wider Western alliance directed at maintaining global security.

An alliance conditioned by the early years of the cold war now forms a framework for consultation and co-operation in the emerging new era of reduced East-West tension.

An alliance originally concerned with military containment has taken on additional roles, including the underpinning of arms control agreements between the superpowers.

An alliance founded, in the minds of many Australians, upon deep apprehension of instability and uncertainty in Asia has retained its relevance in a period of Asian dynamism, development and prosperity.

An alliance which once had on its consultative agenda only security and political concerns has become a forum for discussion also of important economic issues.

An alliance which Australians initially saw as providing, above all, an American commitment to Australia's security in the event of attack, has become a vehicle for continuing collaboration in support of our national policy of defence self-reliance.

And because we have managed to keep the alliance contemporary in these ways, our commitment to it has endured and remains today unequivocal. And these are the reasons why we host Joint Defence facilities; why we welcome United States ship and aircraft visits; why we share in intelligence exchanges; and why we co-operate in defence procurement, training and exercising.

It is true - very regrettably so - that for the time being at least, the third party to ANZUS, New Zealand, is no longer an active partner. Its position on ship visits will have to change for it again to become one.

But my point is that as far as Australia and the United States are concerned the alliance remains as vital and as strong as it has ever been.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is not just - or most importantly - the alliance between Australia and the United States which is adapting to fundamentally changing circumstances in the world. The Western alliance generally, and especially NATO, is doing so. This is as it should be, for the West as a whole now has a tremendous opportunity and responsibility to look beyond its traditional rationale of military defence and deterrence against attack - important though that remains. The West can and must grasp new opportunities to achieve security of a deeper and more enduring kind.

That concept of security has, I suggest, the following elements:

- . the improvement of East-West relations
- . the continuing quest for disarmament and effective arms control measures
- . enhanced international economic co-operation and, particularly, the replacement of shortsighted attitudes by enlightened self-interest in international trade
- . international co-operation for the resolution of conflict
- . and the harnessing of international effort from East, West and the Third World to resolve issues vital to the future of mankind, notably the protection of the environment.

In each of these fields Australia will play its part.

In East-West relations and arms control, the present situation is qualitatively quite different from that which applied at the time of the failed attempt at detente in the 1970's. Western policy failed then because, in seeking to moderate Soviet international behaviour, it made no demands for reform or the extension of human rights in the Soviet system itself. That policy effectively only allowed the old Soviet rulers to delay the inevitable reforms that Mr Gorbachev has now undertaken.

But the pack ice of the cold war is thawing. A new, more soundly based, detente is now open to us. This time it is not a matter of trying to buy improved international conduct from the Soviet Union and its allies. Our role must be to encourage changes in conduct which they themselves have already decided, for reasons of their own self-interest, must be made. Greater freedom, tolerance of a greater range of opinions, a more honest way of looking at their past history and their present problems - these can be seen in the Soviet Union, in Hungary, in Poland.

In these countries the requirements of economic reform - the recognition that the command economy cannot deliver the goods - are being accompanied by a heartening degree of political reform.

I do not want to overstate this. The trend is not uniform throughout Eastern Europe. Glasnost and Perestroika have a long way to go. In China, the recent tragic and brutal events show that a leadership which pioneered economic reform is nevertheless capable of suppressing aspirations for democracy in the most repugnant and, I believe, ultimately futile fashion.

Nonetheless what we are seeing in different ways is unambiguous evidence that the system of Marxism-Leninism and of the command economy is being strained to breaking point.

Accompanying these domestic changes in the East we are seeing more constructive international behaviour. I have said before that the West must insist upon deeds, not just words. But deeds there have been in the INF Treaty, in Afghanistan, in Indo-China and, only this week, in Angola.

For the West, what is required is firmness, patience and courage. These qualities are fully demonstrated in President Bush's dramatic and farsighted proposal for conventional force reductions in Europe.

America's allies can and must play an important part in the process of realistic arms control and reduction of tensions. For our part, for example, Australia's sponsorship of the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone and our initiative against the proliferation of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia supplement our support for global nuclear non-proliferation and a global ban on chemical weapons.

Our hosting of the Government-industry Conference on Chemical Weapons in Canberra in September will give a valuable stimulus to efforts to exorcise this spectre.

And in seeking to develop our own relations with the Soviet Union, we will always keep in view the wider Western perspective.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The next factor I mentioned was the operation of the international trading system. And here I have to say that aspects of the Western performance in recent years leave much to be desired. We must improve our performance if international economic security is to be assured.

We have built our prosperity in the post-war period essentially on the foundations of an open trading system. It has brought tremendous benefits to Americans, to Europeans, to Japanese and to Australians.

Yet the future of this system hangs in the balance. To succeed in the current round of multilateral trade negotiations would bring tremendous benefits. To fail would be disastrous.

In this negotiation, Australia has many interests. But pre-eminently our concerns and our hopes relate to agriculture for it has been there, more than any other sector, where distortions and irrationality have emerged and have prevailed largely unchecked. I urge upon Europe, Japan, and the United States - our major trading partners with whom we generally enjoy excellent commercial relations - a new approach to agriculture, one based, as I have said, on enlightened self-interest.

Naturally, I focus in this forum on the United States.

Australia recognises that the provisions of the 1985 US Farm Bill and, in particular, export subsidies encompassed in the Export Enhancement Program were developed to counter the incursions made by subsidised European Community production in world agricultural markets. Australia shares US concerns about EC subsidy policies pursued under the Common Agricultural Policy and for many years has been engaged in a process of trying to limit the damaging effects of the CAP on world agricultural trade. I expressed our very strong objections in Paris and London last week and will do so in Bonn this week.

Australia recognises also that, in implementing the EEP, the US has not intended to harm non-subsidising agricultural exporters such as Australia.

Nevertheless, Australia has found itself in the crossfire of the escalating export subsidy war and our grain exports have been adversely affected. While the damage has lessened over the past year or so, owing to lower world grain harvests and a running down of stocks, there remains a danger that competitive export subsidisation will again damage Australia when grain surpluses re-emerge.

Australia is therefore disappointed that the United States does not yet accept that the EEP has had harmful effects on Australia - effects similar to those resulting from EC subsidies provided under the CAP.

However, we have reached substantial agreement on the fact that such distorting arrangements are, in the longer term, damaging to international trade and that they all should be on the table in the context of the Uruguay MTN Round.

This provides something of a breathing space for the US and Australia on the EEP issue. The Uruguay Round is scheduled to conclude at the end of 1990, when the US is also scheduled to introduce successor legislation to the 1985 Farm Bill. The EEP is likely to have a minimal immediate effect on Australia up to the end of 1990 compared to the earlier years of its operation. This is because wheat is in short supply globally, not least because of two successive US droughts. World wheat prices are therefore relatively high and the outlook is reasonably optimistic at least until the end of 1990.

All this means that if we can achieve a successful outcome on agriculture from the Uruguay Round by the end of 1990, and, out of these negotiations, the US is able to look again at the role of the EEP in its farm policy, then we may have found a solution to this problem which exists between us. That would be very welcome, for it has been a major problem in our relations.

We must work closely together over the next 18 months to keep national and international reform of agricultural trade high on the international agenda and to work together on the difficult task of achieving a successful outcome to the Round.

In case this sounds like special pleading, let me make this wider point - both Australia and the United States realise that unless an acceptable outcome can be negotiated in the Uruguay Round on agriculture, other sectoral negotiations in the round will be imperilled. All countries, whatever their trading interests, will be the losers.

Ladies and gentlemen,

As in the security and arms control area which I mentioned, in the economic area too Australia has tried in our regional policies to support wider global objectives - in this case a fair and open international trading system.

One of the major features of the coming decade will, in my view, be the continuing dynamic growth of the economies of the Western Pacific and South East Asia.

So, last January in Seoul, I referred to the desirability of now taking new and practical steps to enhance economic co-operation in this region. I suggested then the creation of a consultative economic forum, which would continue into the 90s and which would need to be serviced by modest institutional arrangements.

I have in mind that Ministers from the South East Asia and Western Pacific region, together with the United States and Canada, should come together to discuss how best to advance regional economic co-operation, and to explore how we may build on the new economic interdependencies and new opportunities which have arisen in this part of the world.

We have sought to develop this proposal carefully with our partners in the region, on the basis of consensus and I am glad to say that it has gathered an encouraging momentum. During intensive consultations over the past couple of months, we have found, without exception, general support both for the concept that the time has come to advance regional economic co-operation in a concrete way; and for our proposal to hold an initial ministerial level meeting later this year to pursue this objective.

I believe that, with political will, vision and leadership, reservations which inhibited the development of similar ideas in the 70s and early 80s will, as this decade draws to a close, be dispelled. The time has come.

In case there are any lingering doubts in this country or anywhere else I should stress, again, that what we are proposing is not a trade bloc. The countries of the region would not touch this with a forty-foot pole, and rightly so. The whole thrust of our overseas trade policy is based on the need to work for the success of an open multilateral trading system.

In referring to this Australian initiative, I wish at the same time to make it absolutely clear that we want and welcome the continued strong presence of the United States in the region - political, strategic and economic.

As Pacific friends and allies we hope that the United States, which has such strong economic links with the countries of South East Asia and the Western Pacific, will participate constructively in our initiative.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Today marks the 44th Anniversary of the signing in San Francisco of the United Nations Charter.

I know that there have been times when, in this country, the UN has hardly been regarded as congenial to Western interests.

But those days are past.

Not only is the United Nations playing a revitalised role - for example, in the Persian Gulf, in Namibia, in Afghanistan and elsewhere. There are simply some tasks of such universal importance, and of such universal character, that they can only be accomplished in the spirit of genuine internationalism, which was envisaged at San Francisco on this day in 1945.

That is why I referred to the need to harness international co-operation across the divide of ideology and across the divide of economic development to tackle the threat to our environmental security.

If one nation pollutes the air or the oceans, or squanders its irreplaceable legacy of forests or living species, that is a loss not just for that nation, today, but for all nations.

Recently a great deal of attention has been focused on the Antarctic because of the discovery of the hole in the ozone layer above that continent. Let me draw your attention to a pressing issue concerning what is on, and beneath, the surface of the continent itself - the issue of mining and oil drilling in Antarctica.

Australia has recently decided not to sign the Antarctic Minerals Convention because we did not believe that it provided proper safeguards against damage to this the last pristine continent. We believe all mining activity in Antarctica should be banned.

We seek instead a comprehensive Antarctic environment protection convention and the creation of a Wilderness Reserve. We do so, of course, within the Antarctic Treaty System. Both our countries are foundation and active members of this Treaty which has served humanity well for more than a quarter of a century.

The principal objective of an Antarctic Environment Protection Convention would be the conservation and protection of Antarctica's unique environment and its dependent and associated ecosystems.

Let me take this opportunity, for the first time publicly, to spell out the main elements I believe such a Convention should contain

- . an agreement to protect Antarctica's environment and ecosystems, fully respect its wilderness qualities, respect its significance for regional and global environments, and protect its scientific value;
- . a ban on mining;
- . in regard to other activities, arrangements which will let us assess the impact of proposed Antarctic activities or facilities;
- . a means of determining whether sufficient knowledge exists to enable adequate impact assessment;
- . an agreement not to undertake activities where there is insufficient knowledge to judge whether they are environmentally sound;
- . and, criteria and standards to enable those judgements to be made.

We have already received support from the French and Indian Governments on this issue; and I very much hope the US Government will, in time, lend its support.

Ladies and gentlemen,



There are many other issues of great interest to Australia and the United States which, if time permitted, I would have liked to discuss and which I will be further discussing with the President, other Administration officials and members of the Congress. But clearly in this forum I owe it to you to allow you to determine the agenda, in the session of questions and answers.

So I conclude these remarks with a reference to that stout champion of the freedom of the press - Thomas Jefferson.

In his first Inaugural in 1801, Jefferson stated as a guiding principle for the Republic "peace, commerce, honest friendship with all nations .... entangling alliances with none".

The imperatives of history, and of America's own destiny, have involved the United States in many alliances - though I trust the American people, at least in Australia's case, find no sense of entanglement.

And indeed our alliance is only a means to those other goals and principles set by Jefferson - peace, commerce and honest friendship.

Our friendship, our alliance, our capacity to work together - far from compromising Jefferson's laudable wider objectives - can positively contribute to a safer, more prosperous and better world.

---