

ourselves. We were Canada, and few outside our borders doubted our independent, mature and legitimate voice.

During the 1930s, Canada validated its individuality further on the international stage. And, when we went to war again in 1939, there was no question about who made the decision to send Canadians abroad -- the decision was unequivocally "made in Canada."

Our war effort, relative to our size, was unparalleled. Extraordinarily, we emerged from that conflict with the fourth-most powerful military machine in the world. But militarism was neither the lesson we wished to learn nor the vocation we chose to follow. The suffering, loss of human life and degradation of human decency that the war visited upon the world gave us renewed objectives and visions, albeit deeply rooted in traditional Canadian values. We became strong advocates of multilateralism, believers in security through alliances. We petitioned for open, liberal trading regimes and became, over time, leaders in arguing for worldwide covenants guaranteeing respect for basic human values.

Our skills and success at war made us believers in peace.

Those who led us out of the war and into the peace recognized that, in spite of our momentary power, we were neither by size nor by leaning a great military nation. We chose, instead, to assure our own defence within the context of a greater collective commitment, and to use our skills and capabilities to help preserve peace elsewhere. In the post-war period, we quickly earned an envied reputation as a nation of peacekeepers. In so doing we were extending the values on which we had built our own country into the international arena.

Scholars have heralded the "independent" nature of certain key foreign policy decisions taken by Canada. The 1956 Suez Crisis is a case in point. But we did not take action at the time of Suez, or in South Africa's membership in the Commonwealth, or, indeed, in our relations with Cuba, merely to demonstrate "independence." We took the actions we did because of the values and interests we believed to be at stake, and with a clear recognition that we could influence the overall course of international events.

Canada's leadership in the fight against apartheid in South Africa goes back to the days of John Diefenbaker and is consistent with a strong Canadian concern for human rights and social justice, which I have continued to pursue as Chair of the Commonwealth Committee of Foreign Ministers. Our forward-looking stance on non-proliferation and weapons transfers in the wake of the Gulf War, and, indeed, our recent insistence to a reluctant world that the Yugoslav Crisis be considered by the United Nations Security Council -- these are just a few of the more recent examples of how Canada's foreign policy has diverged from our traditional friends and allies, and has had real impact on the unfolding of events.

But we were not searching for divergence simply for the sake of being different. In all of those cases, we were acting in what we