

Q. Mr. Sharp, the Government has produced a lengthy review of foreign policy which doesn't really appear to take any startling new directions. What do you see as the major point in this statement?

A. It seems to me that the major point about the review is the way of looking at foreign policy. What the review suggests is that foreign policy should be looked upon as an extension of domestic policy, as a means of achieving national objectives. It isn't concerned with our role in the world, it's concerned with what we want to do in the world. Some of these things may be magnanimous, some of them may be selfish, but whatever they are they're our thing. It means, for example, that we should, as a reflection of our domestic situation, take more interest in Francophone countries than we had in the past. It means that we should put emphasis upon economic matters, upon the environment, and so on. This arises out of this conceptual framework within which we have put our foreign policy.

Q. There is an increasing interest in Pacific relations, with the Prime Minister's tour there, more relations with Japan, recognition of the Peking government. Is this a move away from our more traditional European ties, in answer, perhaps, to the closer partnerships in the European Community?

A. No, I don't think it's that. I don't think it is a reflection of the integration of Europe. What it is is a reflection of our interests, our growing interests in the Pacific. The Province of British Columbia, and to an increasing extent the Province of Alberta, are largely concerned with their relations with the countries on the Pacific. Our increasing interest in the Pacific is a direct reflection of our increasing domestic concern with our trade, our cultural relations, with tourism, and so on in the Pacific coast.

Q. Considering the European Community, there's been some activity to ease the economic problems that might be raised by the enlargement of the Common Market. How much progress has been made?

A. What we have been trying to do is to avoid unnecessary disruption arising out of the prospective enlargement of the Common Market. It would be a great mistake to wait for things to happen. We must anticipate events, so what we have been saying to the European Economic Community and to the British is that this enlargement should not take place at the expense of third countries like Canada. There's no reason why it should. A longer period of transition for the enlargement is only a postponement of the benefits arising from enlargement, whereas it does, for a country like Canada, avoid unnecessary disruption, immediate damage. I think we're making progress. The British have now agreed to a five-year transition period. We might have preferred a longer period, but to some extent this