

The following is an excerpt from the statement made on November 2, 1973, by External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp to the Canadian Institute of International Affairs Conference on Canada and the European Community:

... The political role of the Community, particularly in relation to North America, has been stimulated by the American initiative of a "Year of Europe". It seems to me that this initiative was designed to serve a number of useful and timely purposes — to redefine and revitalize the Atlantic relationship and as a reaffirmation of an outward-looking American foreign policy. It was also, I believe, a means by which one great power acknowledged the coming-of-age of another great power.

Although there were some mixed reactions in Europe to the initiative, I believe that the Nine were very pleased to have demonstrated to the world and to themselves their capacity to agree on a collective response to the "Year of Europe" message....

There were, of course, some questions about the implications of the "Year of Europe". One of the first questions many of us asked about the "Year of Europe" was — how would the interests of the industrialized democracies, as a whole, fit this conception? Would it involve a tripolar system — the United States, Europe and Japan? We, of course, remain concerned not to find ourselves polarized around any of the main power centres. That is very much a part of what our policy of diversification is all about.

Nevertheless, outside this country, I have sometimes found an assumption that Canada should fall naturally and inevitably into the U.S. orbit. This is perhaps understandable, but it is unacceptable to Canadians. It is inconsistent with our conception both of what Canada is and what our interdependent world should be. It runs against the grain of postwar Canadian efforts to build an open and liberal world trading system. It is also contrary to the Canadian Government's basic policy of a relationship "distinct from but in harmony with" the United States.

North America is not a monolithic whole — economically or politically. Nor do I think it would be in the interest of Europe to deal with a single North American colossus....

themselves to technical, rather cold, speeches, which in most cases took on political dimensions only when they noted the tensions among the Nine caused by the establishment of certain common policies. It was also inevitable that the Canadian officials should give only routine addresses, since the Canadian Government's attitude towards the European challenge has so far been unimaginative and erratic. Their job was to explain our asthmatic diplomacy, and all they could do was wheeze as energetically as possible.

However, we had a right to expect these bureaucratic shortcomings to be disputed and countered by the many academics and businessmen attending the conference. Do these circles not pride themselves on reflecting more profoundly or acting more energetically than the Government officials? They are not held back by the proverbial caution of the diplomats. These other participants could have explored the widest range of the possibilities for *rapprochement* in trade and economic co-operation between Canada and Europe; they should have urged boldness and innovation, and brought out the logical consequences for Canadian-European relations of the Government's effort at diversification.

Little stimulus

But this was not the case. They were as docile as old-fashioned schoolboys and incredibly reasonable. These "private" participants in the CIIA conference contented themselves for the most part with dotting *is* and crossing *ts* in the official statements. It is sometimes said that imagination reigns in the universities (some wags say that it forms the official opposition in the Federal Government), but on this November weekend its power was nowhere in evidence in the halls of Ottawa's Conference Centre. It is not surprising that the Lester B. Pearson Building so rarely outdoes itself; it receives little stimulus from outside. Thus it is to be expected that, in this instance, the federal ministers have not yet succeeded in inventing a European policy having substance, scope and style.

What, then, is the moral of this conference? It is that, if Canadians want to diversify their external economic relations as proposed by their Government, if they truly hope to reduce gradually the exclusiveness of their economic relations with the United States, and if they genuinely desire the *rapprochement* with Europe that is one of the essential steps in this diversification, they must immediately rescue their European policy from the Govern-

Observers say imagination reigns in universities, but this found 'nowhere in evidence' at conference