

terms of all of these countries saying: "Good old Canada — they'll take it on and we won't even have to pay our portion of the bill".

Let me just touch on one or two other matters very, very briefly, in terms of China, from which I have just returned. A most remarkable country, one I doubt very much anyone who has not been there can comprehend. Certainly I didn't have the foggiest notion; I could not possibly have "conceptualized" the country without seeing even the small portion of it that I did. But having done that and having had discussions with the leadership in China, I believe it is going to be important over the next weeks and months for us to formulate a precise policy as to how we are going to deal with this country, with its enormous resources and its population that is fast approaching one billion people. We cannot help but recognize that it is going to be as time goes by, I suspect, a most potent player on the world scene. I should again like to spend a lot of time telling you about it but I want simply to let you know that Canada is conscious of the need for a strong approach, a well-thought-out, well-developed approach, so far as Canada-China relations are concerned.

The same is true of Southeast Asia. The ASEAN countries are just now emerging as a growing economic force in the world, with a population almost two-thirds that of the European Community. This is another area where we must look at what kind of influence Canada can have.

Finally, let me just add a word on the nuclear issue. Some of you may have perhaps been following it over these last two years — specifically, whether or not Canada would resume shipments of uranium to its traditional customers. One thing became very clear (and I think one can make this observation of almost all aspects of Canadian foreign policy) — we cannot go it alone. There are very few things we can do ourselves, whether it be sanctions against South Africa or the halting of the export of uranium. Unless there is united international action, the only result will be one of frustration for us because we shall not achieve our goals and there will be losses for us on the economic side as well. In terms of most of the issues of which I have spoken, the most important thing is that Canada act as a member of the international community or some strong element within the international community — such as NATO, such as the "economic summit" group, of which we are a member, such as the OECD. If we do not do that, then it is very likely that our efforts, as well-meaning as they may be, will not really succeed. They did succeed in the nuclear case because those elements were present plus the ingredient I mentioned a few moments ago — leverage. Here is a prime instance where Canada is a major party in terms of nuclear development and all the related subjects. We are one of the two or three main suppliers of uranium in the world, at least at the present time. Therefore we have in that area the capabilities and the power, if I may use that word, to bring about a more desirable situation. That is one that we have pushed to the limit. I think you know that we have "in place" now a regime of safeguards that is the most stringent of any country in the world. When all is said and done, I suppose there is nothing in our foreign policy that is more important than this issue. If we can as a country combine our leverage with our moral convictions against the shocking dangers of nuclear proliferation, it may very well be that, even when measured against such things as our performance in foreign aid, our co-operation with other countries and the whole range of

---