

but that is the way the world is, and I'm very much more satisfied that the United Nations is a proper reflection of the world today than it was before Peking entered. And this is one of the reasons why we took the initiative that we did: first of all, in recognizing Peking as the Government of China, and secondly in taking such a forthright position on the seating of Peking in the China seat.

#### THE COMMONWEALTH

Q. Now, in another sphere, these events have had great strains on the Commonwealth, too. Do you feel that the Commonwealth can survive this sort of thing? I'm thinking of India-Pakistan, the Rhodesia settlement — all these things that seem to be tearing away at the membership.

A. It depends on what you expect from the Commonwealth. For a long time Canada has not regarded this as economic grouping. We were a member of the dollar group rather than the sterling group, so we didn't have the same sort of interests as other members of the Commonwealth. So for us the economic side of the Commonwealth was not too important. Nor did we think that there could ever be common policies in the Commonwealth towards the rest of the world. You may recall that it was Canada that objected many, many years ago, to any attempt to have a common foreign policy in the Commonwealth, and that has now become the accepted doctrine. Our view of the Commonwealth is that it is an excellent place to have discussions about world problems amongst a group of countries that are representative of the various elements in the world today: various colours, various approaches; we have aligned countries; we have non-aligned countries; we have black; we have yellow; we have white-faced people. In other words, the Commonwealth to us is a microcosm of the world. The advantage of the Commonwealth is that the representatives can sit down together and talk informally on the basis of having one common language, which is English, and having a set of institutions that enables us to meet together and to understand what the other was saying without elaborate explanations. And if our Prime Minister, Mr. Trudeau, has his way there will be much greater informality in the proceedings — fewer set pieces, more exchange of views than we have seen in the recent past. And I do hope that this is the way that the Commonwealth operates in the future, but any idea that the Commonwealth has common policies, or even common interests, is really an idea of the past. The Commonwealth is now representative of the world and that is its great advantage: that we can have these informal meetings not in the setting of the United Nations but amongst a group of old friends.

#### EUROPE

Q. There seems to have been some progress towards *détente* in Europe, between East and West Germany and so on. Do you see much hope for actual settlement of some of these problems?

A. Yes, I really have been quite optimistic for some time and I think this optimism is being justified. We, in Canada, have been working for *détente* over a long period of years and our cause was, of course, greatly strengthened by the accession to office of Willy Brandt, as Chancellor of the Federal German Republic. He, too, has been interested in *détente*, and more progress has been made under his administration than for many years. We're now on the verge of a settlement of the treaties between the Soviet Union, and Poland and Germany. In due course, I hope that the two Germanies will be able to work out a *modus vivendi* so that both of them can enter the United Nations. This would be a tremendous step forward and these are matters that are in prospect. They're not just dreams, they are possibilities, and very real ones that everyone is working towards. So I think that in Europe we are moving to a situation when there will be a good deal less tension. Indeed, I don't think that Europe is going to be the centre of our concern in the future. I think it's going to be the apparent conflict between the Soviet Union and China.

\* \* \* \*

#### ECONOMIC PROBLEMS AND TRADE

Q. The economic problems themselves have been plaguing the world as a whole. Do you see any hope of a better international monetary and trading system emerging from all this?

A. I don't know whether it will be better. That remains to be seen. So much depends upon the future policy of the United States. Our fear has been that the United States was not only faced with immediate problems which required them to take some undesirable and rather drastic steps to redress their balance of payments, but we were concerned, and still are, about the possibility that the United States may be turning inward — that a protectionist trend may be developing in that country. And if it does, then we would have to adjust ourselves to it and out of this would emerge a situation less desirable than what has prevailed in the postwar period. However, the President of the United States has said that that is not the way his administration intends to take the United States, that after this crisis — out of which they hope they will emerge with a better alignment of currencies and the reduction of what they consider unfair barriers to United States' exports — the United States will then revert to its policy of promoting freer trade on a multilateral