

arms control forums where Canada has 'a seat at the table' and thus can have a direct impact on the course of events. In your discussions here I hope you will identify and put forward practical suggestions as to how Canada can contribute to progress in these areas.

Canada is not and shall not be neutral in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. We are a member of the Western alliance and we are members out of choice, not circumstance. It is an alliance which requires military commitment and political solidarity. Yet it is also an alliance which relies on consultation and consensus. A healthy allied military effort would not survive in the absence of such consensus. But the right to be heard must constantly be earned. Canada earns that right.

The pursuit of arms control and disarmament has its place beside the defence effort, peacekeeping and conflict resolution. All are essential components of Canada's approach to international peace and security. We must vigorously pursue each of these if we are to maintain Canada's sovereignty and independence. And the world at large should recognize that arms control is a component of, not a substitute for, a healthy national security policy.

A wise and correct approach to security cannot ignore the virtues of arms control, just as arms control cannot ignore the requirements of national security. The search for either at the expense of the other is fruitless. And the search for both is imperative.

Let us recall that the Nobel Prize awarded to Lester Pearson for his superb diplomatic efforts in ending the Suez Crisis was also an award to the dedicated Canadian troops who helped make up the United Nations peacekeeping force. Without the forces trained and equipped to provide a buffer between Israeli and Egyptian armies, the United Nations resolution would have been only so much paper.

We must realize that our sovereignty and territorial integrity cannot be safeguarded by mere proclamation or protest. In addition to a firm legal position with respect to our sovereignty in the Arctic, we require a military capacity to respond to the threats posed by clandestine incursions into our waters, or probes of our air space. This is not a question of political expedience or choice. It is a question of responsible national policy. At the same time we should remember that, for over 35 years, the defence of Canada has been not only a national but an alliance obligation.

I am reminded, in this connection, of a great Canadian who personally embodied the four facets of Canada's security policy. As a soldier, a peacekeeper, an arms controller and a diplomat, the late General E.L.M. Burns personified the basic coherence and compatibility of each one of these roles in the conduct of Canada's security policy. In establishing arms control policies, Tommy Burns perhaps summarized it best when he said there had to be a dialogue between the proponents of security through armament, and the proponents of security through disarmament.

No one component can provide all of the answers. The decisions our government have taken are all directed to the over-arching goal of promoting international peace and security and, through these initiatives, Canada's own peace and security. These decisions have not been easy ones. They involved making some hard choices. We have decided, for instance, that Canada should have the capability to

---