

POUR DIFFUSION IMMÉDIATE
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

LE 5 JANVIER 1973
JANUARY 5, 1973



STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY
OF STATE
FOR EXTERNAL
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE
D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES
EXTÉRIEURES.

ENTREVUE DE FIN D'ANNÉE
ACCORDÉE À LOUISE DECELLES
ET BOB ABRA DU SERVICE
INTERNATIONAL DE RADIO-CANADA
PAR MONSIEUR MITCHELL SHARP,
SECRÉTAIRE D'ÉTAT AUX
AFFAIRES EXTÉRIEURES

YEAR-END INTERVIEW OF THE
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR
EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, THE
HONOURABLE MITCHELL SHARP,
WITH LOUISE DECELLES AND
BOB ABRA OF RADIO-CANADA
INTERNATIONAL

Q. Mr. Sharp, where in your view have been the major developments in international affairs during the past year?

A. I think the most important has been the movement, the further movement, towards détente in Europe. This has been a remarkable year. When I spoke to the United Nations in September of this year, I had said that there had been more progress towards world peace in this last year than since the formation of the United Nations itself. You've seen the movement towards détente in Europe, represented by the negotiations between the Germans and the Russians and the Poles and now the culmination in the agreement shortly to be signed between the two German states. We've seen the beginnings of the conference on European Security, the meetings in Helsinki where the preparations are being made for what everyone hopes will be a successful conference. We've seen on the other side of the world the development of relations between the United States and China, which is very significant because it has shown how the world situation is no longer polarized between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is now more of a triangular relationship and this has affected the whole outlook for peace and for development in the world. But I look upon those as probably the major developments during the year.

Q. Have you been satisfied with the progress made in the Helsinki conference?

A. Well, we don't expect rapid progress in this conference. Canada, as you know, is one of the participants because we have been invited along with the Americans. We have been invited because of our vital interest in Europe and also because we have, of course been engaged in two world wars in Europe. And we are now a member of the NATO Alliance and are contributing troops in Germany in the defence of the West. Our view is that a European Security Conference can be very useful, but only if it is well prepared and only if it deals with issues of substance. We're not interested simply in a declaration that no country is going to commit aggression or is going to invade another country, those are motherhood questions. We're interested in questions dealing with issues. We would like to see greater freedom of movement of people and of ideas and of information. We believe that this is a way of improving the security of Europe. We're interested in reducing the military confrontation that now takes place in the centre of Europe. So we are not disappointed in what is going on in Helsinki. We expect that the route towards a European Security Conference that accomplishes something valuable will be a long one and we are quite prepared to participate in it on that basis.

Q. At the same time, parallel approaches have been made toward Eastern Europe for talks on mutual and balanced force reductions...has there been an equal amount of progress there?

A. I don't think so, not yet. We have made advances, however, in laying down an agenda for talks on this subject. This was resisted for a long time. The NATO countries, however, have been promoting these talks and the Soviet Union has now agreed to have them. We have not

required a link between the Security Conference and the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks. We do believe, however, that there is inevitably a link between them, whether admitted or not. I can hardly believe that we will make progress towards genuine security in Europe unless we do reduce the military confrontation. And these mutual balanced force reductions are intended to reduce the level of confrontation without reducing the security of any of the members.

Q. The treaties between the two Germanies open the way for both of them to be recognized and join the United Nations. Do you feel that's a further step toward more European co-operation, or could it just provide another forum for debate?

A. I believe that it is a very constructive development. The division of Germany at the end of the war and the possible, not only the possible conflict, but the conflicts that have occurred since the end of the war, the difficulties in moving about between the two Germanies are potential dangers to the peace of Europe. The fact that the two Germanies have now initialed a modus vivendi and will be signing it very shortly, is to my mind very substantial progress. Indeed, it is of such a character that we are now prepared to enter into discussions with the German Democratic Republic for the exchange of diplomats. We also think it paves the way for the two Germanies to get into the United Nations. It was most important that there should be an agreement on a modus vivendi to reduce the possible causes of conflict before the two Germanies do enter the United Nations, otherwise they would just be bringing their own problems and adding to those that we already have in that body.

Q. Speaking of the United Nations, have you seen much progress in its deliberations this year?

A. It's been very substantial in some fields. There is no doubt about it, that in the fields of security, peace, that the United Nations is still not the main place where discussions take place. For example, the Vietnamese negotiations are taking place outside of the United Nations. The SALT talks between the Russians and the Americans are taking place outside, the MBFR discussions are taking place outside, the European Security Conference is taking place outside the United Nations. But the United Nations is the place where many of these things can be brought in for general debate in order to get the views of countries who are not participating in these other conferences. But the more substantial achievements of the United Nations are to be found quite outside this field. They are to be found in the environment, in the questions of trade and aid. In the law of the sea, probably the most significant events in international affairs will take place under United Nations auspices in this coming year. Namely the law of the sea conference.

- Q. It has been the first year in the U.N. for the People's Republic of China...has their performance added to the progress of the organization?
- A. They have proceeded rather cautiously. It has, however, changed the whole character of the debate in the United Nations to have the Peking government present. Because, as I said earlier, you don't have the polarization between the Soviet Union and the United States. The old blocs are breaking up as they try to assess their position in the light of the entry of another "great" power, which doesn't want to be a great power. I feel that the entry of Peking into the China seat has brought about a much more realistic character to the debates in the United Nations. They are not now quite so unrelated as they were when the China seat was occupied by the Nationalist government that didn't have effective control over the people of that country.
- Q. One of the constant questions is that of peacekeeping operations... either under the U.N. or other...and Canada has been putting forward some specific views on this type of operation. What progress has been made there?
- A. Not as much as we would have liked. The central problem is that differences of view between the United States and the Soviet Union over the direction and control of peace-keeping operations authorized by the Security Council. They have a difference of view as to who should be in charge of a peace-keeping operation. In September, this year, we put forward a written paper containing suggestions which might enable the committee to make progress on this issue and it examines for example, ways in which the military staff committee might provide advice and assistance to the Security Council on the establishment, direction, and control of peace-keeping operations. The mandate of this special committee on peace-keeping operations was renewed by the General Assembly this year and we expect that the committee will begin detailed consideration of the Canadian proposals and others early in the new year. It is very difficult to be very optimistic about it, however, this is an extremely difficult and serious difference of view between the two major powers. And until they can agree on something we're not going to make much progress.
- Q. Something to the same difference of view appears to have come up in the question of Vietnam and a truce supervisory force or a peace supervisory force. Do you feel that there has been any improvement in the position regarding such a supervisory commission?
- A. I think it is significant that Canada has said publicly what its conditions are. Otherwise people might have quite unrealistic ideas of what can be done and the conditions under which it can be done. Too often in the past there has been a tendency to believe that you throw in a supervisory commission or you throw in a peace-keeping force without

having definite terms of reference, without too clear an idea of what it might do. This has been embarrassing not only to the members of the supervisory commission but frustrating to all concerned. So on this occasion when we did get a little bit of notice that our name was being used, we decided to make clear what experience had taught us, not only in our own interest, so that we did not get involved in an operation that would be futile, but also for the guidance of other countries that might be thinking of participating or might be asked to participate. At least that is an advance. We have yet to see whether the conditions are such that we can participate or that it is a useful exercise for anyone to participate. After all we don't have to be members of this, we're not seeking to be members of the commission in Vietnam but we recognize that we have responsibilities and as such we decided to say these are the conditions that must be met, otherwise the operation will be useless.

Q. With the possibility of peace in Vietnam, is Canada offering any offer of rehabilitation for those countries?

A. Yes, some time ago we made it quite clear that we wanted to play a full part in special programmes in special rehabilitation. In Foreign Policy for Canadians which was put out a couple of years ago we announced our intention to do so and that remains valid. A cease fire would permit perspective donors to evaluate the needs for reconstruction assistance as well as the appropriate channels for making such assistance available. It is very difficult for the time being to prepare more than contingency plans although we've had some preliminary discussions with other governments and agencies interested in relief and reconstruction in the post-war situation.

Q. What about other Pacific relations?...with Japan and Pacific countries of the Commonwealth...how have they developed?

A. Well, of course, there has been an enormous development in our relations with Japan. Trade just grows from year to year and Japan is now our fourth trading partner. We continue to devote a great deal of effort to the promotion of our trade with Japan. We're also having, of course, contacts in other directions too, politically we have more to talk about than we did. Japan followed our lead in recognizing Peking as the government of China. That was--I remember, when I talked with the Japanese delegation that was in Canada a couple of years ago--that was something that they were not at that time contemplating. But within a very few months they changed their minds and negotiated, and after the change of government in Japan, and have now followed our lead. So, we have many reasons to want to keep closely in touch with them. They are going to be an extremely influential country in the whole of the Pacific region. Indeed, probably occupying a pivotal role in relations with the Soviet Union, with China, with the United States and with us. There has also been some development, of course, in our relations with other countries, we've been having more to do with Indonesia which, with a population of a hundred millions or so, is bound to play

a large part in Southeast Asian affairs. Australia and New Zealand are also in process of changing their foreign policy as a result of changes of government, and we look forward to having more direct contacts with those countries. Not arising out of our Commonwealth relationship, but just because we have more bilateral matters to discuss.

- Q. The changes in government of both Australia and New Zealand seem to indicate some drifting away from Commonwealth, or at least from Britain. Do you feel this is a result of British relations with the expanded European Economic Community or is it a natural development?
- A. Well, the Commonwealth itself has changed so much. We were never in quite the same position as Australia and New Zealand in relation to the Commonwealth because we were a dollar country. We were never a part of the Commonwealth's sterling area. For us, the relationship within the Commonwealth was a political relationship, it wasn't an economic relationship. We looked upon the Commonwealth as a place where countries that had some common history, that had once been all colonies, that represented many parts of the world, that could get together to talk about not only bilateral questions but also about world questions and to do so without the elaborate paraphernalia of a United Nations' meeting. We still believe this. I believe Australia and New Zealand, because of the evolution of affairs, is probably coming to adopt our view of the Commonwealth. I don't know if it means any weakening of ties, it just means a changing in the character of the Commonwealth itself and of their place in it.

- Q. There have been some steps in Latin America, particularly in trade and assistance, with Canada joining the Inter-American Development Bank.... What problems remain there....?

- A. I suppose there are always some problems with Latin-American countries that arise out of the nature of their production, to some extent they are competitors as well as customers. They've always had fairly close ties with the United States and with Europe. We have to make way against those natural tendencies or historical tendencies, but we're doing quite well. We've certainly made very rapid progress in the field of institutional arrangements. That apart altogether from the fact that we've now become a permanent observer in the OAS, we've joined the Inter-American Development Bank, we belong to their health organisation, their agricultural institution, we're gradually spreading ourselves through those inter-American agencies, we've been stepping up our trade promotion in all sorts of products, so on the whole I think we are making fairly good progress. But it's not an easy place for Canadians to develop their relations. There aren't the historic links that we have with America and Europe. And there isn't the natural complementarity that exists between Japan and Canada. Many of the countries in Latin-America

are exporting raw materials or exporting food in competition with us, so that our markets are of a rather different kind than Latin-America. Their markets are for capital goods, machinery, equipment, and things of that kind.

- Q. Similarly in Africa, Canada is now is joining in a fund for the African Development Bank, somewhat similar to the preliminary fund that we had with the Inter-American Development Bank. Are there other steps in view for relations with the black African countries?
- A. There has been a very rapid development in our relations with black Africa over the last few years. You may recall that we quite deliberately increased our contacts with the Francophone countries in Africa about the time the Trudeau administration took office. And now our aid programme is balanced pretty well between Francophone and Anglophone countries. We have been extending those relationships in several directions, both in cultural matters, aid matters, to some extent in trade, but trade is not yet a very large part of our contact with that part of the world, Africa is not a great market. It's a place where we can be of help and where the fact that we are bilingual in the same way that Africa is, with the two principal languages, English and French, enables us to work in both parts and to support them. So this is the sort of the role that we have in black Africa today, it is not one that is based entirely upon trade, that will come later, but it is based essentially upon aid, upon assistance in the development of these countries. It is also an area, of course, in which we have some of the principal coloured nations of the Commonwealth and we use our Commonwealth relations with countries like Nigeria, Tanzania, Zambia, and Kenya to maintain contacts to assist them in their problems. We have good working relationships in the United Nations and in other places where we can help one another achieve certain common goals.
- Q. But in Africa, the question of relations with South Africa and Rhodesia remain...do you see any hope of resolution in that area?
- A. No, I am not very optimistic at the present time. I don't think there has been very much progress in either direction. The Pearce Commission failed to find a basis for settling the differences between the British and Rhodesians. In the last two months new discriminatory measures have been enacted in Rhodesia which suggest that the rejection of the settlement may have strengthened the hand of the Rhodesian right wing, so it's very difficult to be very optimistic about that. And in South Africa, I haven't seen anything that leads me to believe there's very much progress being made there to end the apartheid or even to modify it. So we have continued to take the same attitude on both questions, that we will not recognize Rhodesia, while that illegal regime continues there, and in South Africa, we maintain an embargo on the sale of arms, we don't recognize that they have control over Namibia, but as you know, we do not believe that an economic boycott, or anything like that, would advance our cause. I don't know how its all going to turn out, but in the past year I don't think we've made very much progress.

Q. Now closer to home, with the United States, the problems seem to centre around trade, but there have been some other differences on policy, some perhaps more apparent than real over the Vietnam peacekeeping idea or truce supervisory idea. Are political differences hampering other relations?

A. I don't think so, I don't see any evidence, indeed, I was gratified the other day when Secretary Rogers was asked whether the conditions we laid down for our Vietnamese participation on the Supervisory Commission were reasonable and he said perfectly reasonable, the Canadians are perfectly reasonable. So if anybody had had any doubts about this before I think they were removed by Secretary Rogers' statement. Some people had suggested that there was a misunderstanding, a difference of view, but as far as I knew there wasn't. And I was gratified without any coaching from our side when Secretary Rogers answered a press inquiry by saying that the conditions we laid down for our participation were perfectly reasonable. I don't think that we have any major political differences, we have some difficult trade issues and these I think in 1973 will be discussed at great length, I hope they can all be settled amicably. I don't think there is any reason why they shouldn't be. We both are mutual beneficiaries, for example of the automobile agreement, both Canada and the United States have benefited. This is... then if we approach it from this basis I don't think we'll have difficulty in reaching settlement. On resources, there aren't any differences. The Americans have certain objectives and so have we and I believe that we can probably settle our differences to be mutually beneficial. After all, in any trade negotiation it is only successful if both sides benefit.

Q. Thank you very much Mr. Sharp.