



CANADA

COMMUNICATION

88

ACL

FOR RELEASE TUESDAY,
DECEMBER 29, 1970.

POUR DIFFUSION MARDI,
LE 29 DECEMBRE 1970.

THE HONOURABLE MITCHELL SHARP,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
YEAR-END INTERVIEW WITH BOB ABRA FOR THE CBC-IS

ENTREVUE DE FIN D'ANNEE
ACCORDEE A M. BOB ABRA
DU SERVICE INTERNATIONAL DE RADIO-CANADA
PAR L'HONORABLE MITCHELL SHARP,
SECRETAIRE D'ETAT AUX AFFAIRES EXTERIEURES

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

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

is better than the British themselves had asked for in the case of industrial products, a little shorter in the case of agriculture. They have a series of other negotiations going on affecting certain industrial raw materials that are of interest to us. We're supporting them in trying to get some special provisions that will enable the British economy and their suppliers to avoid unnecessary disruption during this period.

Q. On our other European relations, are we any closer to a conference on European security, and do you think Canada's voice would be heard in such a conference?

A. It is now generally agreed that Canada and the United States would attend a European security conference. There was some doubt about this at the beginning, but now all the Eastern bloc countries have at one time or another said, of course, "We assume that Canada and the United States would be there". So I think our voice will be heard. As to when a conference would be held, I think real progress has been made towards this objective. When I think back to the prospects, say a year or more ago, they were much poorer than they are now. The big change came about with the accession to power of Willy Brandt in the government of West Germany. His "ostpolitik" opens prospects for a genuine détente. He's been pursuing his negotiations with the Soviet Union and with Poland, indeed has reached agreements, subject to ratification. The German government has made it very clear that they will not ratify these agreements until the problem of Berlin has been eliminated by some sort of agreement about access and about relations between the Federal German Republic and West Berlin and so on. In the NATO countries, generally we believe this is a wise policy, and therefore at the last meeting we said that progress towards a European security conference would depend especially upon the progress made in the settlement of the Berlin issue. So I believe we have made substantial progress, but we haven't yet achieved the basic conditions necessary to the success of a conference. We may, of course, in the next few months.

Q. Speaking of NATO, do you see any change in the foreseeable future in Canada's stance with the organization?

A. No, I don't see any change in the foreseeable future. I believe that our position within the Alliance, and the Alliance generally, is strengthened by the review that Canada made. There had been some who had suggested that Canada should not be in the Alliance, it was not in our interests, that we didn't add to our security by belonging to the Alliance. We discussed all those questions. We looked at NATO and we looked at the alternatives. We considered whether we should be neutral or non-aligned, or just in an alliance with the Americans or in NATO but without any troops. We discarded all those alternatives and we came to the conclusion it was in Canada's interest, having in mind our geographic position, the nature of our relations with Europe and with the United States, that we should not only be in the Alliance but that we should contribute to the forces in position in Europe.

Q. There have been some efforts towards balanced force reductions on both sides. Do you see any response coming from the Eastern side?

A. There's been a minimum response. Six months ago we asked the Warsaw Pact countries to respond to a suggestion from the NATO countries that we were prepared to discuss mutual and balanced force reductions. The response from the Warsaw Pact countries was that they were willing to talk about foreign troops--balanced reductions of foreign troops. We had included in our proposal, of course, indigenous forces. At first we wondered whether foreign forces meant just those that were outside of Europe, like the American forces, whether the response was simply that the Americans should withdraw, but it didn't appear so, it appeared as if foreign troops were meant to be troops that were foreign to the country in which they were located. Our view is that this is an opening, and that we should move on from the presence of foreign troops and their reduction to the reduction of indigenous forces--that there is a chink in the armour, one might say, in the Iron Curtain, and that it ought to be taken advantage of.

Q. Well, there seems to have been some progress on disarmament with the agreement on the Seabed Arms Treaty. What chance do you see of further agreements?

A. There are many opportunities, it seems to me, for progress and agreements. Everything depends upon how willing the countries are to make progress. The Seabed Arms Control Treaty, which was negotiated a few days ago, will probably come into force in 1971. We're going to press again very hard for a ban on underground nuclear tests to supplement the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty. We've been looking at this question of international seismic capacity. It seems to us if we could find out how effective the countries of the world working together could be in detecting explosions, this would at least give us a factual basis for proceeding further on the underground nuclear tests, and we sponsored a resolution calling on all countries to contribute their seismic capabilities. We've been talking about mutual and balanced force reductions, well, this is another aspect of some possible progress in disarmament. On chemical and biological warfare, there's been the recent American announcement that they're going to destroy all their stocks. We're working for a convention to supplement the Geneva Protocol of 1925 which would prohibit the development, production and stockpiling as a means of waging chemical and biological warfare. It isn't an easy task because you've got the problems of tear gas and things of that kind. And then finally, while progress has not been startling, it does appear as if the Americans and the Russians are moving ahead with their SALT talks--Strategic Arms Limitations Talks. They are the most important diplomatic negotiations going on in the world today, because if we could find some way of limiting the stockpiling of nuclear

weapons, we would have achieved a great thing, not only in terms of possible destruction of another war, but in terms of the resources that would be freed for more useful purposes.

Q. A great deal hinges on the attitudes of the Soviet Union, of course, towards the West. How much progress have we made towards more normal relations ourselves with the Soviet Union?

A. Quite a bit. You look back at relations with the Soviet Union in recent years. Expo '67 was a sort of a turning point. Six thousand Soviet citizens came to Canada in connection with Expo '67, had a good look at our country, and probably revised their views about what we are like. And certainly it created an atmosphere of good will and interest in Canada. In October of 1969 I had Mr. Gromyko here--the Soviet Foreign Minister, and at that time he extended an invitation to Mr. Trudeau to go to the Soviet Union. The crisis we had over the kidnapping prevented Mr. Trudeau from going in 1970, but he'll be going in 1971. This would mark a new high point in our relationships. My colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, M. Pepin, is going over to Moscow early in the new year to sign an agreement on co-operation and the industrial application of science and technology. This would be the first inter-governmental agreement on exchanges between the Soviet Union and Canada. We've been working with the Soviet Union on Pacific fisheries, and we've had agreements with them there. So I think we're making progress. There are bound to be conflicts, but we seem to be learning how to deal with them. This, I think, is an augury of good will for the future.

Q. That brings up the subject of the United Nations, and a year ago you were rather critical of the performance at the U.N. Has there been any marked improvement, in your view?

A. Well, a remarkable thing happened this year in the United Nations. I remember when the session began people were rather pessimistic about what might be done this year. In fact, a great deal was accomplished. Not spectacular things. The United Nations didn't end the Viet Nam war, or the Middle East War, but it did some very useful things, particularly in the field of the disarmament of the seabed, in the launching of the Second Development Decade, in the field of the environment. While there was a good deal of pessimism about the Twenty-fifth Anniversary celebrations and some disappointment that more of the world figures didn't emerge, and appear before the United Nations and make their speeches, it wasn't a bust after all. We have been moving ahead with our initiatives in trying to improve the procedures. As I said a year ago, the United Nations is in danger of drowning in a sea of words. We spent a good many more words deciding what to do about it, but at any rate, we've now got a resolution approved which authorizes a study of these procedures and presumably there will be some improvement there. There was also an agreement that the

Charter would be looked at in 1972. More important perhaps than all of that was the prospect that the United Nations may, within the foreseeable future, become more universal. Great progress was made on the China question this year. I think the fact that we had entered into diplomatic relations with Peking and changed our vote on the Albanian resolution lead the way. For the first time there was a majority in favour of seating Peking. This was progress. If the Germans are successful in their negotiations with the Russians and the Poles and with the East Germans, then it may not be long before the two Germanies are in the United Nations. And so on. So it was by no means a lost year.

Q. In our relations with the United States there has been concern about a trend toward economic protectionism as well as our own concerns about resource development and foreign ownership. Do you see any sort of continental détente developing on these matters?

A. I don't think that there will be any continental approach to these kinds of questions. I have never felt that this was desirable, and I don't think the Canadian people do either. I don't believe it is necessary to have a continental approach to any of these questions in order to have satisfactory relations between Canada and the United States. There are areas in which we must co-operate, of course, on a continental basis, simply because of geography. Many years ago we decided that there would be exchanges of hydro-electric energy across the border, so that we didn't waste our resources in travelling unnecessary distances in order to link up with the various grids. We have pipelines that cross the border so we must have a common approach to the movement of gas and of oil. That doesn't mean that we have a continental energy policy. It just means that where geography requires us to co-operate, we will co-operate. More generally, however, I think that Canada will try to maintain a policy of dealing with all countries rather than exclusively with the United States. The danger that the integration of Europe has posed to us--the possibility that we might be somehow excluded from Europe by a protectionist sentiment there, or by the establishment of new discriminatory trading relationships, forcing us to enter into some sort of preferential arrangements with the United States--I don't think that would be in our interests, and therefore we must continue working in Canada towards a multilateral trading world, one in which we have access to markets throughout the world. This doesn't mean that we'll do less trade with the United States. Indeed we may do more, but we will do it on the same basis as we trade with Europe, or we trade with Japan, or the Pacific.

Q. Now, some progress has been made in the development of the Agency for Co-operation among French-speaking countries. Would you see this agency becoming a parallel to the Commonwealth?

A. To some extent there are parallels. This agency, that has been created amongst the French-speaking countries, begins,

however, as an agency for technical and cultural co-operation. The Commonwealth began as a political organization, as an organization of those countries that had once been colonies of the United Kingdom. And it is only in recent years that the Commonwealth has set up Commonwealth fellowships and exchanges and economic co-operation. Similarly, the Francophone agency has no preferential trading arrangements whereas the Commonwealth began with preferential trading relationships, but those are disappearing, and if Britain enters the Common Market, presumably a lot of them will disappear--may vanish altogether in the long run. And yet there are some parallels and I think that if the Commonwealth survives and the new agency prospers that they will become very much more similar, simply because they will be engaged much more in co-operation in cultural matters, in education and in scientific and industrial exchanges. But at the moment there are some very big differences. For example, the meeting that is going to be held in Singapore is concerned with political questions, in other words it's concerned with discussion by the heads of the governments of world questions affecting the Commonwealth--affecting the members of the Commonwealth. It's a place where the heads of government can get together to discuss informally the questions that are discussed more formally, say, in the United Nations. It's a sort of microcosm of the United Nations. The Francophone countries, on the other hand, are not of that character at all. The agency has been created specifically for the purpose of promoting cultural and technical exchanges.

Q. Our own relations with Francophone countries have seen an emphasis on development assistance, particularly for those countries in Africa. Will this become a much larger part of our development programme?

A. Yes. Quite deliberately so. A few years ago the government came to the conclusion that the distribution of development assistance neglected, relatively, the Francophone countries, and one of my former colleagues, Lionel Chevrier, went on a tour of the Francophone countries and at that time established the basis for the programmes that are now getting under way. It's taken a little time to get these programmes under way, but now they're moving quite quickly and I expect that the proportion of our aid going to Francophone countries will rise quite steadily. Of course, this is not the only place where this will happen. The whole emphasis of our programme is changing. It began with the Colombo Plan countries many, many years ago--India, Pakistan, Ceylon were the biggest recipients, still are the biggest recipients of our aid. They're growing less rapidly whereas our aid to the Caribbean countries, to the Francophone African countries and to one or two other areas is being given new emphasis.

Q. Do you see any hope that Canada can reach the goal set in Mr. Pearson's report to the World Bank of .7% of official aid?

Yes, I think so, but this government has decided that it will not state any specific target date. We have found that the setting of these target dates imports into our fiscal planning an unnecessary rigidity. When we look back at our history over the last few years, we found that our present priorities were being established by decisions that were made many years ago, and that we didn't have enough flexibility in our fiscal planning to respond to immediate emergencies. So we said, as a matter of principle, we were not going to enter into any rigid commitments. So that our treatment of development assistance is no different to other matters that we have urgently before us. However, what we did say was that every year the proportion of our GNP going into aid would increase. This last year, 1969--or at least the last year for which we have figures--we were at .42%, I think, of GNP on official aid. And this coming year I should think that will go up substantially, so we're not so far away from the .7, but we haven't fixed any specific date to reach it.

Now, turning to another area of the world, we have made some moves toward closer relations with Latin America. Has this part of our policy developed significantly, and do you see any move toward the Organization of American States?

Yes. As you know, in our Foreign Policy Review we decided not to join the OAS at the present time but to bring about closer relationships with that organization and with the various countries in Latin America. We've just nominated a senior officer at our Embassy in Washington as Canadian Liaison Officer to the OAS, and it's our intention that a Canadian permanent observer will be named once the conditions of such an appointment have been agreed upon with the Organization of American States' Secretariat. We're continuing our contribution through the Inter-American Development Bank in capital assistance, and we're in process of starting a bilateral assistance programme that will double Canadian aid in the region. We've just sent a mission down to Latin America. It's returned from visiting certain Latin American countries, and another mission will be making a visit in the next few weeks. We are going to appoint in 1971 some additional personnel to certain of our diplomatic posts in Latin America to assist in administering the expanded aid programme. We've also been looking at the possibility of joining certain inter-American organizations which are linked with the OAS. We're holding discussions with the officials of these organizations, for example, the Pan American Health Organization, and it's hoped that in the next year we'll be able to make some announcements about this.

* * *

Où en est-on présentement dans nos rapports avec les pays de la francophonie, et plus particulièrement avec l'Agence de coopération culturelle et technique?

...

- R. Je puis en toute confiance qualifier "d'excellentes" nos relations avec la vaste communauté des pays dits francophones, c'est-à-dire ceux où le français est la langue officielle ou d'usage. Dans un reflet du souci de se voir pleinement réaliser le prolongement du bilinguisme canadien sur le plan international, le Canada maintient des relations avec tous les pays de cette communauté. Il s'est intéressé activement ces dernières années à accroître et resserrer sa coopération économique avec ces pays, surtout ceux de l'Afrique francophone. Il était tout à fait naturel que le Canada s'intéresse intimement à la création d'une agence de coopération culturelle et technique entre ces pays. Il a donc participé à la première conférence de Niamey en 1969 qui appuyait l'idée d'une agence de coopération culturelle et technique et à celle tenue en mars 1970 à nouveau à Niamey où était entériné le projet. Le Canada a signé la convention établissant l'Agence et, quelques mois plus tard, l'a ratifiée. Dans ce même esprit, le gouvernement canadien entrevoit avec plaisir d'être l'hôte de la deuxième conférence générale de l'Agence au tout début de l'automne de 1971.
- Q. L'Agence canadienne de développement international a plus que doublé ses crédits à l'Afrique francophone au cours des deux dernières années. Peut-on encore espérer une intensification de cette aide?
- R. En effet les programmes d'aide canadien à destination des pays africains francophones ont connu un accroissement remarquable. Ils ont passé de \$12 millions en 1967-68 à \$34 millions en 1969-70. Pour l'année fiscale actuelle, le niveau se situe à environ \$50 millions. Le volume des programmes a donc plus que quadruplé au cours des trois dernières années. Il est évident qu'un tel rythme de croissance ne peut être maintenu indéfiniment et que, par conséquent, cette croissance se normalisera dans les années à venir. Le nouveau président de l'Agence, M. Paul Gérin-Lajoie, prend de l'intérêt tout particulier aux programmes à destination des pays de langue française.
- Q. Certains sont d'avis que l'élargissement du Marché commun affaiblira les relations du Canada avec l'Europe occidentale. A-t-on enregistré certains progrès pour contrevenir à un tel risque?
- R. Sans doute il existe un danger que l'élargissement du Marché commun puisse affaiblir nos relations avec l'Europe. Nous menons une campagne sur plusieurs fronts pour faire valoir les intérêts et le point de vue canadiens. Le ministre de l'Industrie et du Commerce, M. Pepin, et moi-même, venons d'avoir des consultations sur ces problèmes avec le Marché commun, la Grande-Bretagne et d'autres parties concernées. Nous avons souligné que l'élargissement du Marché commun ne doit pas se faire aux dépens des pays tiers comme le Canada. Nous avons invoqué le réel danger actuellement d'une confrontation commerciale entre l'Europe et les Etats-Unis et nous avons suggéré que la

Marché commun et les Etats-Unis se concertent en association avec les autres pays intéressés tels que le Canada pour éviter les risques d'un tel conflit. Il nous apparaît plus que jamais nécessaire dans les circonstances actuelles que la libéralisation du commerce se poursuive sur une base multilatérale. Néanmoins, l'élargissement du Marché commun n'est pas nécessairement destiné à affaiblir les relations du Canada avec l'Europe. Il nous offre aussi des possibilités à saisir et nous avons pleinement l'intention de les exploiter.