

- Q. Mr. Sharp, it's been a fairly eventful year in international affairs. From the Canadian standpoint, what would you regard the most outstanding event?
- A. Well, from our point of view, the most important event was the United States' balance of payment crisis and the events that followed from that. That is, if you look at it from the point of view of the immediate effects upon Canada. If you look at the world as a whole, I suppose that the most important event was the India-Pakistan War because it revealed the conflict between the Soviet Union and China in a new light.
- Q. Now, in the United Nations a year ago you were critical of procedures there. Do you feel there's been any improvement in the past year?
- A. Yes, following our initiative a committee was established and has brought in a report with a number of quite practical things that can be done. Naturally, we're not satisfied. I said at the time, you may recall, that the United Nations was drowning in a sea of words. Well, I see no stemming of the flood. It goes on as usual. However the changes that are being proposed, and many of which will be accepted I think, may help to reduce the paper -- the quantity of paper -- that is being distributed; will eliminate some of the overlap in discussion and so on. So, I think it was worth while doing, but we're by no means satisfied that the United Nations is operating as it should.
- Q. There's been some severe strains including the India-Pakistan War and some various other things -- strains within the United Nations themselves. Do you think the Organization can overcome this sort of problem that tends to take these strains outside the body?
- A. I don't know whether it can or not because the United Nations is simply a reflection of the world. There has been a very big change as a result of the entry of Peking as the representative of China. This has made a profound difference both to the United Nations itself and to the debates. This came out particularly during the debates on the India-Pakistan War. You no longer had a confrontation between the principal representative of the capitalist world, so-called -- United States, and the principal socialist country -- the Soviet Union. You have a three-cornered situation with the United States, the Soviet Union and China all contributing very largely to the debate and giving to the debate more of an air of reality. It seems to me that before Peking took the China seat there was a distortion in the United Nations debates. Now that distortion has been removed. The situation is much more complex, of course, 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.