

relations. Yet we should do well to remember:

- (1) that there is no peace settlement in Europe and no immediate prospect of one;
- (2) that a prime source of tension – the division of Europe, and more particularly of Germany – continues;
- (3) that the U.S.S.R. is militarily stronger than it has ever been in the past and retains massive forces in Eastern Europe; and
- (4) that, despite its progress, Europe alone could not withstand a revival of Soviet political pressure, let alone the pressure of Soviet military power.

In other words, while there has been undoubted progress in Europe, we have not reached the point where the West can safely dispense with NATO's military strength for defence against aggression.

This does not mean that NATO countries will not be prepared to join the countries of the Warsaw Pact in measures calculated to reduce tension further, in any way that could bring about a mutual reduction of forces. In this and in other ways, NATO can make an important contribution to the growth of confidence necessary to reach a mutually-agreeable settlement in Europe. This will help in "building bridges to the East".

CANADA'S NATO ROLE

How do we see Canada's role?

First – Canada will continue to work through NATO and through every other possible channel, bilateral or multilateral, for progress towards *détente* in Europe.

Second – Canada will contribute its fair share to NATO's collective defence needs, given that the security of Europe contributes to the security of Canada. If in this way we can help to maintain stability in the Atlantic region, it is surely to our advantage to do so.

Third – Canada has persistently advocated that the members of NATO examine the future purpose and structure of the Organization. We are in the midst of that examination now.

Fourth – The precise nature of our military commitment is not fixed. It will vary according to changing military requirements, to the contributions of our partners, to what we can best and most economically contribute. The level of forces contributed to NATO has traditionally been a matter for collective rather than unilateral decision. We continue to believe that individual contributions to the military strength of NATO should be the subject of consultation among the members of the alliance.

But whatever the shorter-term requirements and patterns, the long-term goal in NATO remains to reach a settlement between East and West such that NATO, in its military aspect, may no longer be essential to our security.

NORTH AMERICAN DEFENCE

Another security issue is the question of renewing the NORAD (or North American Air Defence Agreement) in 1968. The Government is now studying the future of NORAD. There is one point which should be emphasized now because it is apparently not widely understood – that is, that NORAD is an

air-defence arrangement, which does not now – nor would its renewal – in any way entail or imply a commitment by Canada to accept or participate in any American anti-ballistic missile system which might be deployed for space defence at some future date. We hope, of course, that the United States will succeed in convincing the U.S.S.R. to accept a moratorium on ABM deployment so that the question of North American arrangements will not arise.

CANADA AND PEACE-KEEPING

Recently, there has been some confused criticism of the conception of peace-keeping and Canada's role in United Nations activities in this field. The position of the Canadian Government on this question is clear – we recognize that peace-keeping and efforts at "peace-making" should be pursued simultaneously. Peacekeeping forces contribute to the restoration or creation of conditions within which political settlements may become possible and meanwhile help prevent a deterioration in the situation. Our objective in supporting United Nations peacekeeping activities has been to buttress the ability of the organization to hold the ring while the parties to a dispute attempt to settle their differences. We have, however, always taken the position that the parties should meanwhile make every effort to reach a settlement. Instead of belittling peace-keeping because of the problems which United Nations forces have encountered (for example, in the Middle East), critics should devote their energies to suggesting ways to strengthen the UN's ability to discharge its primary responsibility for peace and security and to ensure that future UN forces will have better terms of reference for carrying out their mandate.

Canada has not simply been playing a passive role in the peacekeeping field. From the creation of the first force, Canada has made a concrete contribution by participating in most peacekeeping operations. We have also sought, whenever possible, to promote movement by the parties towards a settlement.

I am convinced that Canadians want us to go on making a contribution to UN peace-keeping in spite of the undoubted difficulties – and certainly in spite of the claim of one observer recently that peace-keeping is a "vestigial" Canadian interest. To my mind, far from being "vestigial", peace-keeping is a forward-looking idea, which has proved its usefulness. This is certainly not the time to turn away from the United Nations and back to international conditions as they existed earlier in this century....

DISARMAMENT AND NON-PROLIFERATION

Recently, one observer of our external relations thought that Canada should, as a new direction, assign a high priority to disarmament and non-proliferation. I was amazed, not at the goals themselves, but at the idea that anyone could suggest that Canada has not attached fundamental importance to these goals. Canada is dedicated to the goal of general and complete disarmament and we have participated actively in every international disarmament forum and in every disarmament effort since the Second World War in attempting to achieve that end. Despite political impediments, some pro-