

tiveness, the weak support of member nations. However, because of the respect and trust for Canada expressed by UN members from both North and South, it was in a particularly useful position to voice constructive criticism to generate a strengthened UN. Suggestions for Canadian initiatives raised at the seminar included working to establish a group for increased dialogue between North and South, promoting an international peacekeeping conference, and having government leaders attend General Assembly sessions for greater top-level communication. All suggestions were based on the premise of increased dialogue — especially the challenge of changing the attitudinal positions of the superpowers.

### **Canadian Ambassadorial Address**

On October 5, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark announced the appointment of Stephen Lewis as Permanent Representative and Ambassador to the United Nations. Mr. Lewis's appointment was one of two major posts filled by former politicians, Mr. Lewis having been leader of the Ontario New Democratic Party during the 1970s (the other had been Douglas Roche as Disarmament Ambassador). Presenting his credentials to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar in New York October 23, Mr. Lewis told reporters that despite his untraditional background for such a posting (political rather than diplomatic), he was confident of his ability to serve effectively in the capacity of Ambassador to the UN (*The Citizen*, October 24). Mr. Lewis delivered his first address to the UN November 6, outlining Canada's position with regard to the economic crisis in Africa. He spoke specifically of Canadian support for a draft resolution developed by several African nations which set out the emergency situation and suggested possible approaches for international assistance. The UN debate, in which Mr. Lewis's speech formed a part, sought to find consensus on both the content of the draft as well as "mobilize international opinion," according to a *Globe and Mail* report November 5. The African nations, said Mr. Lewis, were seeking world recognition of the crisis.

Following an emotion-charged opening, Mr. Lewis's speech called for action on the part of the world community to both alleviate the immediate crisis and join in an effort to secure long-term results. "We have subjected the crisis in Africa to a continuing and remorseless dissection, and it is now time to act upon generally shared conclusions," said the Ambassador. One of the best opportunities to do so, he added, was presented by the draft declaration before the General Assembly. "Extraneous immoderation," he said, had no place in an international forum seeking an expression of "collective political will." While Western nations must recognize that past initiatives had failed, those of Africa must recognize that some of their "domestic policies [had] been ineffective or inappropriate." Mr. Lewis stated that these admissions were contained implicitly in the draft. Canadian support, in the form of immediate relief and such long-term areas as agricultural and human resource development, and support for greater international "financial flows," would continue and intensify. The speech concluded with a plea for support for the draft declaration. While declarations "neither feed the hungry nor alleviate human suffering . . . they can act as a remarkable catalyst

to collective action," said Mr. Lewis. Canada agrees with the basic tenets outlined in the draft, and since it "ties all of the strands together," it offers "a promising basis for mutual accord" (UN Delegation communiqué, November 6).

### **Pledging Conference**

The Second UN Pledging Conference for the World Disarmament Campaign took place in New York October 24. Under the temporary Presidency of Xavier Perez de Cuellar, the conference once again called upon member states for contributions to the campaign during UN Disarmament Week. The criteria governing the campaign (financed voluntarily) had been established by consensus at its inception: "maximum objectivity" in the information on disarmament disseminated; and a "balanced distribution" of the campaign's activities (External Affairs transcript, October 26). Canada's representative at the conference outlined for attending delegations the past and continuing contributions made by Canada to disarmament. These included funds of \$700,000 for a Canadian Disarmament Fund for the dissemination of information pertaining to disarmament issues (channelled through NGOs, academic groups and individuals), the inauguration of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security (along with the privately initiated Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament), contributions to the UN Disarmament Campaign for informational activities, and a further 1984 contribution to the Campaign (specifically, the Voluntary Trust Fund). Canada also indicated that member states should be provided by the Campaign with more detailed accounting of the uses to which the monies in the voluntary fund had been put.

### **Nuclear Freeze Vote**

The Canadian government received some harsh criticism from peace activists and Opposition Members for its decision to vote against a draft resolution in support of a nuclear arms freeze on November 20. While there were three individual resolutions (L.25, L.32 and L.49), all were similar in advocating a nuclear freeze. While the resolution passed (Canada being among the twelve negative votes), the Canadian government was firm in its defence of refusing its support. In explanation of the Canadian vote, Disarmament Ambassador Douglas Roche outlined the government's reservations (External Affairs transcript, November 20). While Canada would continue to work for a reversal of nuclear build-up as a "dominant priority of Canadian foreign policy," the draft resolutions before the UN as they stood were unacceptable. Canada's negative vote was not an advocacy of an arsenal build-up, but rather the reflection of doubts about the present draft's "practicability." Canada, seeking "significant, balanced and verifiable reductions" in arms levels, views a resolution as less desirable than the more "meaningful response" of an "immediate unconditional resumption of negotiations on reductions," Mr. Roche continued. The Ambassador also listed the flaws inherent in arms control agreements such as the one before the UN:

- agreements must enhance mutual security;
- a freeze would raise problems with regard to definitions, exclusions and inclusions;