

sanctions approved by the UN), Canada does not refuse to trade with a nation because it disapproves of its form of government or finds some of the actions of its government repugnant or repulsive. From time to time, we had been urged to do so by Canadians and foreigners who dislike regimes like those in Cuba, China and the Soviet Union, but we did not follow this advice; indeed, we encouraged trade with those countries as a means of promoting contacts between our respective peoples, and I believe the great majority of Canadians approved of the Government's position.

The nub of the matter is the purpose of cutting off trade. What is the intention? To change the policy of the South African Government? If so, the embargo would have to be extensive before it would have much effect and there is no evidence at all that an embargo would be widely supported by the principal trading nations.

Is it to punish the South African Government or the white minority? I am inclined to think that the worst sufferers would be the black majority, who do most of the work in South Africa in producing goods for export.

Or is it to satisfy our own emotional needs to express our repugnance for apartheid? Is so, then I think that emotional satisfaction has to be measured against the considerations I have mentioned. This is not callousness or putting money-making ahead of principle. Our embargo on arms shipments is evidence that Canada does not give priority to money-making. The proposal that Canada should cut off or even discourage trade in peaceful goods with South Africa should be looked at honestly and forthrightly and the decision made in the interest not only of ourselves but of the oppressed for whom we have sympathy and to whom we want to give support.

If trade sanctions imposed unilaterally are a form of punishment not likely to bring about reform, it is perhaps strange that many people who decry punishment as an answer to crime and social misbehaviour within their own societies are so eager to see it imposed internationally, where the possibilities of good results are so much more remote.

I have tried to give you some idea of the basic thinking that went into the general paper. I believe it is a unique document; I know of no other nation that has attempted to articulate the principles behind its foreign policy. I know it is not perfect, but I suggest it merits your thoughtful consideration. This is a free society and you are all welcome to do all you can to push the Government in the direction you want it to go, either in general or with regard to a specific issue.

Is there anything new in the papers? Leaving aside the specific Government decisions they contain, which are obviously new, I think there is. First, we have thought out our foreign policy in a more systematic way than ever before. This is more than an intellectual exercise; it will affect the formulation and operation of specific policies in the future.

For many years, a great many Canadians had seen Canada primarily as an active member of the Commonwealth, the United Nations and NATO and as a close ally and partner of the United States. The foreign policy papers