

our decision to submit a minority statement, were dictated not by an attempt to whitewash our friends but by the danger of misleading world opinion about what had been going on in Vietnam. Our minority statement was accordingly cast in terms of violations on the other side of the ledger in an attempt to restore an essential balance to the Commission's judgments.

EXERCISE OF FAIR JUDGMENT

Does this demonstrate that we have departed from the standards of impartiality in this particular sphere of our foreign policy? I think not. On the contrary, I think it demonstrates just the reverse. As I suggested earlier, the exercise of impartial judgment demands a concern for accuracy and a desire not to mislead or to be misunderstood. It also demands the maintenance of the same - I repeat the same - critical standards towards both sides.

Unless one were to prejudge the issues at stake in Vietnam and to conclude that the South and the United States are totally wrong and the North wholly in the right, it is senseless to argue that Canada can demonstrate its independence of judgment only in criticism of United States policy - and in criticism of that nation alone.

There have been other instances in which Canada has had to choose a course of action when there was little unanimity among its allies about what the general Western interest required. It has always been difficult to decide, for example, to what extent trade and other relations should be developed with the Communist nations. We have taken the view, however, that trade in non-strategic goods was desirable. We have tried to develop contacts and exchanges provided the other side was prepared to deal with us on a basis of genuine reciprocity. Although we have not been prepared to support the entry of Communist China into the United Nations on the terms it has so far set, we have made it clear in our own statements of policy that we recognized the desirability of having that nation in the world organization....

I believe that it is also important to consider *why* we are able to take an active and constructive role in international affairs. Proof of a genuinely independent Canadian role is to be found as much in an examination of the fundamental circumstances of our national existence and of our diplomacy as in an indication of viewpoints on current problems....

BASIC OBJECTIVES

I believe...that there are five basic objectives which the Government must seek if we are to remain truly independent: (1) we must have military security; (2) we must have expanding economic strength; (3) we must be able to exert influence on others; (4) we must be able and willing to play a creative role in many areas of international affairs; and (5) we must maintain a basic unity at home in Canada concerning our national interest in world affairs.

The Canadian Government believes that NATO defence arrangements, and the continental arrangements which fit logically into them, provide security, which is the basis of independence. It believes that

these defence arrangements offer the partnership into which a sovereign state can enter without loss of national identity or independent viewpoint. For this reason, it has set a high priority on maintaining strength, stability and good political relations among allies.

I know that there are some Canadians who see in such arrangements only the political constraints of an alliance, only the possible dangers of undue political influence by larger members in the affairs of others. I wonder how seriously these critics have considered the overwhelming limitations on our independence and on our fruitful participation in world affairs which isolation, neutrality and military weakness would create....

U.S.-CANADA INVOLVEMENT

For Canada, of course, geography and economy facts make it inevitable that a large part of that capital should come from the United States, and that a large part of our trade should be with that nation. In entering into agreements with the United States on the Columbia River, on automotive products and on many other matters affecting economic conditions, the Government has considered the long-term economic needs of the country.

The very scale of our involvement with the United States in economic matters naturally brings some problems, along with major benefits. Some argue that, in time, economic involvement on this scale will submerge our independence.

I believe that there are some simple and effective answers to this prediction. I do not accept this type of political or economic fatalism. We shall not lose our independence in this way unless we want to. We are engaged in a process of economic development which should render us basically stronger, not weaker, both in a continental and in a world sense. Where our exposure to the much greater forces of the American economy creates particular problems for some part of our economy, we take remedial action. On the basis of friendship and mutual respect, we bargain with representatives of the United States to obtain the best conditions for our country, as they do for theirs. We have certainly not ignored other possibilities for developing our country, and our businessmen contest world markets as vigorously in competition with close friends as with anyone else.

It is important that we should see these basic conditions of an alliance and of close economic relations as being, on balance, means of fortifying our independence in world affairs, not as limitations upon it.

INFLUENCE ON OTHERS

The third basic objective I mentioned is that we must be able to exert influence on others. We should have a wide association with other nations and we should systematically cultivate friendly relations with allies and other nations as a means of developing our capacity to influence the course of events. These may appear to be obvious diplomatic objectives not necessarily related to the specific questions on independence being discussed. It is, however,