

I think that the word today gets to be "advised," and I think that some of the shortfalls which Senator Carter and Senator Connolly are both talking about lie in the advice area. I often think it is perhaps far too much to expect nations today to consult about the wide range of problems that come before them, either bilaterally or multilaterally, and I would put it to you—and I would be interested in your comment—that I think it is in the area of advice that the shortfall lies.

Hon. Mr. Sharp: I think there is a good deal to be said for that, Mr. Chairman, and it arises out of the rapidity of change in our society and in technological developments.

There are many instances of that nowadays. For example, we have seen it most vividly recently in relations between the United States and Europe, where a good deal of the difficulty seems to have arisen out of the process of consultation or of advising; where the Europeans criticized the United States for not having kept the Europeans well informed on the development of American policy in relation to the Soviet Union, and, on the other side, the complaint of Dr. Kissinger that the Europeans made up their minds on an issue and confronted the Americans with the result and were reluctant to re-open decisions which it had taken them a long time to arrive at in the process of consultation among the Nine. It is a problem that faces all countries and, particularly, foreign ministers.

Senator Grosart: Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in your comment on the difference between "advice" and "consultation," as this was one of the questions I had intended to ask. Of course, I would have to ask you do you mean "advice" or "advise"? There is a tremendous difference. Are you merely advising them that "this is what we are going to do"—which is the old story or complaint of the provinces in federal-provincial relations that the federal government says, "This is what we are going to do. Take it or leave it!" This, I suppose, is "advise".

The Chairman: Yes, sir.

Senator Grosart: But if you have "advice," you must seek advice; so therefore you have consultation, obviously.

The Chairman: But you have to do something about advice, Senator Grosart. You don't have to do anything when you have been advised.

Senator Grosart: Well, yes. Advice, of course, is a two-way street, but it is a matter of semantics and I won't push it any further than to say that the minister mentioned that this whole area is one of the main problems confronting U.S.-European relations, which, as I think I said the other day, some people have said if it is not solved may jeopardize the democratic governments of Western Europe. And there are references to this throughout the minister's statement.

I would ask the minister what exactly our policy is in respect to, whatever you call it, advising, giving advice to, or consulting with, the United States. Do we say that there are certain matters in which we will consult them in advance, or advise them in advance, and that there are other matters that are not that important? And do we have any kind of mutual understanding that we will fill each other in before we move into certain policies? To make it specific, did we consult with our American

friends before we decided to recognize mainland China? What happened there?

Hon. Mr. Sharp: That is the case I was going to base my reply upon.

When the government decided to have as an objective the recognition of Peking, although it was announced as a general objective, in advance of advising the United States that this was our general objective, as soon as it had been announced we kept the United States informed about the general course of our negotiations. The United States' attitude toward that announcement, or that advice that we gave them, was that that was a matter for us to decide, and they thanked us for letting them know what we were doing.

At that particular point, Secretary Rogers asked me, "What are you going to do about the United Nations?"

Senator Grosart: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Sharp: To which I replied that if we were successful in our negotiations, and we replaced Peking as the representative of China rather than Taiwan, then of course we would follow that by recognizing that the representative of the People's Republic of China should sit in the seat in the United Nations instead of the representative of the Republic of China. He pointed out to me that we had, over the years, taken the view that that was "an important question." His next query to me—

Senator Grosart: Did he point out the assurances we had given to Taiwan that we would not take that attitude?

Hon. Mr. Sharp: No. I do not remember him saying that to me. Whether it was true or not, I do not really know. In any event, he did not say that. He said, "You have always joined with us in saying that this is an important question." And I said, "Well, we might have to change our attitude towards that," which, as you will recognize, caused him considerable distress because the United States, you may recall, resisted very strongly the seating of the People's Republic of China in the China seat.

We also kept them generally informed about the way our negotiations were going. We did not seek their advice—and here I accept the distinction between "advice" and "advise". We kept them informed. We did not ask them for their approval, but we felt, in the interests of good relations between our two countries, that this was an issue about which they were very sensitive, and that they should understand what we were doing so that there would be no cause for misunderstanding.

As you know, the United States itself subsequently changed its attitude toward China. Mr. Nixon went there and visited Mao Tse-tung, who is the President of the People's Republic.

Senator Grosart: Without advising Japan.

Hon. Mr. Sharp: Yes. Well, it is another symptom of this changing international environment that even though the presidents of these two countries met, they still do not recognize one another, formally, in diplomatic language.

Senator Grosart: Mr. Chairman, I know we will be coming to a more detailed examination of the institutions and arrangements for this "advice/advise" consultation process, but I wonder if the minister could give us just a brief outline of the levels at which this process takes place.