

# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES



CANADA

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 64/36

## CANADA AND THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

An Interview given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Paul Martin, to M. Jean-Pierre Tainturier of LE DEVOIR on December 23, 1964.

### QUESTION (1):

What are the principles which govern Canadian diplomacy?

### ANSWER:

Canada is a middle power endowed with an active diplomacy as befits it in an age of interdependence. Is there a contradiction between the emphasis we place on our efforts toward disarmament and our participation in a defence alliance, between our belonging to the American continent and our special ties with Europe, or between our attachment regarding the evolving Commonwealth and our dedicated support to the United Nations on the other hand? I do not think so. If there is a paradox, it is to be found in the age in which we live, which imposes upon us or permits us a balanced diplomacy.

Canada's might menaces no one. Thus, its action on the international stage does not arouse suspicion nor does it provoke fear of domination. But Canada no longer is so small or so weak economically that it is incapable of exercising a real influence in the world. Its high standard of living gives it the means to effect a balanced diplomacy. Our intense commercial activity gives us the chance to open wide many doors on the world. These opportunities provided by our trading spirit cause us to follow a policy of general interest stemming from our own special interests. This is the policy we follow at the United Nations. Canada, being free and capable of assuming international responsibilities, plays a role of first importance in endeavouring to strengthen the authority of this world-wide organization. There are many examples of our initiatives, our role in Cyprus, in Suez, in the Congo - in fact, wherever peace is in danger.

As other factors influencing our external policy, I might mention the close co-ordination that must exist between defence, on the one hand, and our external policy, on the other, according to the principles enumerated in the White Paper on Defence, and, of course, the increasing importance of our programmes of aid to developing countries. Our close ties, or those we are developing, with the United States, the Commonwealth, the community of French-speaking countries, the Latin American countries, occupy, each in its own way, an important place in the evolution of our diplomacy.

Perhaps I should end by reminding you that a democratic diplomacy must be an open one, and I mean by that intelligible to all. But an efficient diplomacy must also be discreet. Canadian diplomacy answers, I think, both needs.

QUESTION (2):

What attitude will be adopted with respect to Communist China during the UN General Assembly?

ANSWER:

It is difficult to forecast the Canadian position concerning the problem of Communist China at the United Nations since we do not yet know exactly what situation we shall then encounter. As you are probably aware, an item on the representation of China has been proposed by Cambodia and supported by a number of other member states. This item is unlikely to be discussed before February 1965 at the earliest. We do not yet know what sort of resolution the Cambodians will be putting forward. They did, however, co-sponsor a resolution last year that called for the ejection of representatives of the Nationalist Chinese Government and their replacement by representatives of Communist China. Canada has not supported this sort of solution to the China problem in the past, and I have no reason to believe that we shall change our position during the current session.

We do not know yet whether there will be other proposals before the Assembly on this question. If there are, they will probably be concerned with the continuing problem of the status of Formosa and the fact that the General Assembly has no right, by its action on a representation problem, to prejudice the international status of a member already represented in the United Nations. The Canadian Government is anxious to see progress toward a solution of the problem of Chinese representation and the wider question of the entry into the international community of Mainland China. Progress can be hampered, however, by the entrenched positions of the parties chiefly concerned. We must also keep constantly in mind the possible effect of developments in the United Nations on the difficult political and military situation in Southeast Asia. These various factors will be of considerable importance in determining the Canadian position on this subject at the nineteenth session of the Assembly.

QUESTION (3):

What is the attitude of the Canadian Government respecting the deterioration of the situation in South Vietnam, and what is its policy on Southeast Asia?

ANSWER:

As I have commented on several occasions recently, the situation in Vietnam is a cause for serious concern, not only in terms of the hardship and suffering the people of that unhappy country are being forced to undergo as a result of Communist aggression, but also in terms of the implications of this situation for peace and stability in Southeast Asia. All available evidence points inevitably to the conclusion that the basic reason for this instability, both political and military, is the determination of North Vietnam to interfere in the affairs of South Vietnam by sponsoring the Viet Cong insurgents in their programmes of subversion, terrorism, sabotage and murder, and by directing and supplying the armed rebellion in South Vietnam.

Faced with this hostile policy directed by Hanoi, South Vietnam, in the exercise of the legitimate right of self-defence possessed by every state, has appealed for military assistance from abroad, and this assistance has been granted by a number of countries, of which the United States is, of course, the most important. It has been made clear that this assistance is of a temporary nature, and will end when North Vietnam decides to abandon its aggressive activities.

Canada has not rendered military assistance to South Vietnam; our direct interest in the situation in that country stems from our membership in the International Commission set up by the Geneva Conference in 1954 to supervise the implementation of the cease-fire agreement. Within the Commission, our representatives are directing all their efforts to ensuring that that body carries out its supervisory duties in a manner as close to that intended as possible. To the extent that we are frustrated in this attempt, whether by the two other members of the Commission or by one or other of the contracting parties to the cease-fire agreement, we intend to make it plain where the responsibility lies for such failure as we may be forced to accept.

There has been a good deal of speculation about the desirability of a new international conference to settle the problem of Vietnam. While I believe that such a conference might be necessary at some stage to arrange a more durable settlement, I am not sure what positive results it could pronounce at the moment. It is difficult for me to believe that the Communists would honour their existing international commitments, unless such a new agreement turned the whole country over to Communist control; and this is something, I am sure, the people of Canada, as well as the people of South Vietnam, would not wish to see happen. The sine qua non for peace and a durable solution to these problems is abandonment by the Communists of aggression as a means of achieving their ends. In the absence of a decision to this effect by Hanoi, the situation in Vietnam will undoubtedly continue to be potentially dangerous.

QUESTION (4):

The crisis of the Atlantic Alliance was central in recent international conferences. How does Ottawa see this crisis? Is France basically responsible for the present misunderstandings?

ANSWER:

There is no crisis in NATO. This is not a personal opinion. It is the obvious answer emerging from the meeting of NATO ministers that took place last week in Paris. There is thus no question of analysing the elements of a crisis; we must instead try to understand a complex evolution. I left Paris firmly convinced that none of the NATO members was trying to weaken the Alliance. Despite the diversity of choices and attitudes, NATO will once again find that its problems have a common denominator.

It is certain that in Europe, as in the rest of the world, there have been far-reaching developments that have presented the Alliance with serious problems of adjustment. In Canada, however, we find nothing surprising or necessarily discouraging in this. NATO was established 15 years ago; it is,

therefore, natural that we should find ourselves facing problems today that did not exist in 1949.

Canada's goal is to ensure that the Alliance faces these problems frankly and treats them in such a way that a crisis does not occur. We believe that this double objective can be reached, because we have no doubts that the fundamental goals uniting the various members of the Alliance are the same today as yesterday. It is for that reason that we have recommended that the NATO Council take up the nuclear problems of the Alliance. This study has already begun and must continue.

I was asked recently if we would accept the idea that the Alliance should rest on two pillars - one American, the other European. Historically, continental powers have always had the tendency to look on the sea as a dividing element, and maritime powers as a unifying one. Canada, properly speaking, is neither a maritime power nor a continental one; however, we are linked by Franco-British history and this factor places Canada's emphasis on transatlantic relations. If this were not so, Canada would be merely an appendage of the United States.

Apart from the purely Canadian point of view, however, I believe that the idea of two pillars could lead us into trouble. It is very possible that, in the field of economic policy, Europe and North America can, up to a certain point, profitably negotiate certain tariff questions, as is the case in the "Kennedy round". On the other hand, I have often asked myself if this idea of two pillars can be applied to the field of Western defence, and if the idea corresponds to present military realities, even as applied to Europe.

QUESTION (5):

Is the MLF a solution to the defensive problems of NATO? What is Canada's position regarding the handling of nuclear arms within NATO?

ANSWER:

Canada has not yet participated in the preliminary technical discussions on the MLF. However, we see no objection to other members of the Alliance having discussions among themselves. As I have previously pointed out, we do not believe that the proposals concerning the creation of a multilateral nuclear force, taken by themselves, are capable of solving the whole of this problem. We consider that the arrangements that may eventually be adopted should be discussed among the members of NATO, at the right moment, and that these arrangements should correspond as much as possible to the interests of all the members of the Alliance and take account of the probable repercussions they could call forth in Europe and the world. We should obviously not approve of any broadening of the right of decision regarding the use of these weapons. Fortunately, there has been no question of that. These considerations are included among those that will guide the Canadian Government in its present study of the suggestions put forward by Britain. The problem of handling nuclear arms within the Alliance is, as you know, complex and very important. Because of this, it must be approached with caution.

Any decision or agreement that could eventually divide the Alliance would cause us concern. It is obvious that such a possibility is less probable if all the members of the Alliance have a chance to put their views forward. In addition, we have suggested that it would be preferable to study the possibility of a greater participation in the military control of the Alliance by further developing procedures already existing within the NATO framework.

QUESTION (6):

What is Canada's conception of a permanent international peace force for the UN?

ANSWER:

Canada has on many occasions supported the idea of a permanent international peace-keeping force under the United Nations. Canada realizes, however, that the plans for provision of forces to meet the requirements of the UN that were conceived at San Francisco in 1945 have failed to be realized because of disagreement between the great powers. Canada also knows that the plans for such a force envisaged in the last stages of a disarmament agreement are a long way from implementation.

Lacking these alternatives, Canada believes the best way to make progress is to obtain agreement by members of the United Nations on ad hoc arrangements for peace keeping. Such arrangements might include the formation of national stand-by units for service with the United Nations and the creation of a planning staff of military experts within the United Nations Secretariat. In addition, the Prime Minister has proposed that a number of middle powers work out a stand-by arrangement to establish an international peace force for use by the United Nations when required. It has not been possible to implement this idea, but Canada did convene a meeting of countries with peace-keeping experience in Ottawa in November to exchange views on the practical military problems involved. We hope this meeting will contribute to the improvement of arrangements for peace keeping in future.

QUESTION (7):

How could we solve the financial problem of the UN in conformity with Article 19 of the Charter?

ANSWER:

What is involved is the collective responsibility of member states for peace-keeping operations undertaken by the United Nations. A majority of members believe, like Canada, that the costs of peace-keeping operations must be met in accordance with this principle and that the assessments by the Assembly to provide funds for these operations are binding obligations. A few governments, notably the U.S.S.R. and France, do not share this view either of the principle or the law involved.

A confrontation on this issue could only have the gravest consequences for the United Nations, whatever the result of an attempt to apply Article 19. I believe it is essential, therefore, to explore all possibilities of compromise. This calls for willingness to make concessions on the part of all concerned. Time for negotiations has already been gained by the adoption of a consensus procedure in the Assembly, and we are counting on more broadly-based discussions of this problem in the Working Group of Twenty-One, of which Canada is a member.

The Canadian objective in the coming discussions could be described as compromise rather than surrender. It is my hope that a solution can be worked out that does not prejudice the applicability of Article 19, the general idea of the collective responsibility of members for United Nations undertakings or the residual powers of the General Assembly. As I mentioned in my statement to the General Assembly on December 8, the Canadian view is that the principle of shared responsibility should form the basis of any accord we reach, and that responsibility for meeting peace-keeping costs ought to be shared by all members rather than left to a few.

QUESTION (8):

What is Canada's position in the "Kennedy round" of negotiations at Geneva?

ANSWER:

The Canadian Government has, from the beginning, strongly supported these negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which promise to be the most far-reaching ever undertaken among the trading countries of the world. Early in 1964, the Government established the Canadian Tariffs and Trade Committee, consisting of senior officials under the chairmanship of Mr. N.A. Robertson, former Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, charged with obtaining the views of Canadian industry and all other interested parties in preparation for the negotiations. During the summer, the Committee received briefs from a great many groups in all parts of the country, many of whom also made oral submissions in Ottawa, which assisted the Committee in making its recommendations to the Government.

Canada has taken an active part in the preparations for the "Kennedy round" which have been under way in Geneva and elsewhere over the past 18 months. Actual negotiations began on November 16 with the tabling in Geneva of lists of goods to be excepted from the general 50 percent tariff cut, or, in the case of countries such as Canada, of "offer lists" of potential tariff reductions. Canada has a strong team of officials in Geneva led by Mr. Robertson as chief negotiator, and including representatives of the various government departments concerned. It is, of course, far too early to attempt to predict the outcome of the negotiations, since by their very nature they are bound to be long and arduous. We welcome the opportunity, however, to sit down at the negotiating table with our principal trading partners: the United States, Britain, the European Economic Community, Japan and others, in an endeavour to reduce trade restrictions and secure improved access to foreign markets. The Government is convinced that only through expanded exports can we secure the growth in Canadian

manufacturing industry necessary to provide expanded employment opportunities for our growing population. We are not, of course, concerned only with trade in manufactured goods, but also with securing better terms of access for foodstuffs and industrial raw materials through the reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade. Finally, we are anxious that the negotiations should provide increased opportunities to the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to increase their earnings from foreign trade, and thus promote the economic development that is vital to them. We are hopeful that these objectives will be achieved during the coming months.

QUESTION (9):

What has been Ottawa's role in concluding the cultural and technical agreement between Paris and Quebec and in the agreement on the status of the delegation of Quebec in Paris?

ANSWER:

With regard to the first part of your question, it is a matter that is still being examined, and for some time we have been in close contact with the authorities of the Province of Quebec and with the French Government on this question. I hope to be able to announce soon that it has been brought to a happy conclusion. During my last meeting with Mr. Couve de Murville on December 13, we both expressed the wish to see cultural exchanges between Canada and France intensified. To that end, we have decided to begin negotiations soon on the conclusion of an enabling agreement in this field, and I am convinced that the country as a whole will benefit from it.

Concerning the status of the delegation of Quebec, Mr. Couve de Murville and myself are both pleased that our Governments have been able to agree that the delegation in Paris should have privileges and immunities comparable to those which are accorded Canadian provincial representatives in London.

I have made it a point to thank specially the French Government for this decision, which will enable the delegation of the Province of Quebec the better to fulfill its future role.

QUESTION (10):

Is the Cyprus problem close to a settlement? What is the Canadian participation in the peace-keeping operations on the island? What solution does Ottawa advocate?

ANSWER:

The United Nations peace-keeping operation in Cyprus has brought about a considerable improvement in the situation on the island in recent months. Tension between the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities has decreased and there has been some return to more normal conditions.

However, since the Cyprus situation remains potentially explosive, the UN Security Council decided, on December 18, that it had no feasible alternative to the extension of the mandate of the UN Force for another three months. As I announced in the House the same morning, the Canadian Government decided to agree to a request by the UN Secretary-General that it continue its participation in the Force for an additional three-month period. This provides further evidence of Canada's support of UN peace-keeping efforts. We played an active role in the negotiations which led to the establishment of the Force and have been contributing and financing the largest contingent in it.

Canada now has approximately 1150 officers and men in Cyprus. The Canadian contingent, which includes the First Battalion of the Canadian Guards and a reconnaissance squadron of the Lord Strathcona Horse, is deployed along the strategic Kyrenia Road and is responsible for operating the convoy system on that road. It is also responsible for the Kyrenia Pass and St. Hilarion areas. Until the beginning of December, it was responsible for patrolling the "Green Line" in Nicosia, but has now handed over this responsibility to the Norwegian and Finnish contingents and has assumed instead responsibility for the western sector of the Nicosia Zone. In addition, Canada provides the commander and headquarters staff of the Nicosia Zone and contributes a considerable number of personnel to the UN Force headquarters.

Despite the improvement in the situation which has taken place on the island, no acceptable solution has yet been reached to the differences of opinion on the future of Cyprus that continue to divide Greece and Turkey as well as the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities. These differences between Greece and Turkey, two allies in NATO, are a matter of continuing concern to Canada and to the other members of the NATO Alliance. This problem was reviewed at the recent ministerial meeting in Paris, where I appealed to the sense of responsibility of the two Governments and urged that they do all they could to exert a moderating influence on the two communities in Cyprus.

The Canadian Government has followed a policy of avoiding comment on the basic issues in the Cyprus dispute because it is important for us to maintain our present reputation for strict impartiality on this question. Unless we maintain this reputation, it will be difficult for Canada to continue to play a useful role in the UN Force. This does not mean, of course, that the Government is not concerned over the continuation of the dispute and the effect it is having in Cyprus and on the relations between two NATO allies. We believe, however, that the best way to help is to continue to give full support to the UN peace-keeping and mediation efforts in Cyprus.

QUESTION (11):

Can a country's foreign policy affect its domestic problems?

ANSWER:

The effects that the facts of life in Canada have on our diplomacy and our diplomacy has on our domestic problems are obviously closely linked. A foreign policy that enjoys the support of the large majority of the population, as ours does, is in itself a unifying factor. In the economic field it is a factor that clearly favours our wellbeing and, in the field of cultural relations, a source of reciprocal enrichment and influence.

I believe, for instance, that Canada's Commonwealth policy, on the one hand, and its policy toward French-speaking countries, on the other, which in both cases seek a tightening of existing ties, play an important and positive role in Canada's internal equilibrium.

QUESTION (12):

Does Ottawa think that Canada has a special role to play on the international chess board, as one of the top "secondary powers"?

ANSWER:

Certainly, and I think that I have already explained how and why. However, there is no particular niche reserved for us in the temple of history. The great powers occupy the front of the stage. The middle and smaller powers, for the most part, want to play a role beyond their frontiers. We have a store of friendships, of affinities, of practicalities, of unselfish acts, all creating what we might call a good name, that we have formed over the years. Our international policy will be effective in the measure that we know how to be witnesses and fair interpreters of international realities transcending our special interests. I think we should pursue our task without impatience but with vigour.

QUESTION (13):

What is the present Canadian policy towards the Organization of American States?

ANSWER:

The present policy of the Canadian Government remains that which I have described on numerous occasions in the House of Commons. The Canadian Government is very much interested in the activities of the OAS and is already a member of three of its agencies: the Inter-American Radio Office, the Inter-American Statistical Institute and the Pan-American Institute of Geography and History. Canada continues to follow attentively OAS problems by sending observers to some of the meetings of its specialized agencies. Early this month the Canadian Government, indicating thereby its increased interest in the affairs of the hemisphere, signed an agreement with the Inter-American Development Bank whereby Canada agreed to make available \$10 million to finance economic, technical and educational assistance projects.

With regard to the entry of Canada into the OAS, I believe that time must take its course. Canadian public opinion is more and more interested in Latin America. However, it is my belief that one should not place too great importance on the institutional aspect of our relations with the American states when, in addition to the links already mentioned, we maintain diplomatic relations with all countries of the OAS and have the opportunity of a continuing exchange of views on all questions of common interest.

QUESTION (14):

What is the current state of Canadian-United States relations and what was their evolution over the past 12 months?

ANSWER:

Regarding Canada's relations with other nations, those with the United States are both the most important, and the most difficult, as they cover such a range of subjects and interests. In any issues that may arise between our two countries, the role of the Government, as we see it, is to help create an atmosphere, a framework, in which consultation and co-operation can take place at all levels, governmental and non-governmental, with due respect to each other's rights and interests. Because we have kept this objective constantly in mind, progress has been made on a number of matters which a year or so ago were regarded as very critical. For example, shipping on the Great Lakes, which had been disrupted, began to move freely again. Negotiations concerning the Columbia River Treaty, which had been stalled, were resumed, and today work is about to begin on a large scale on projects which will bring to both countries the benefits of vast new supplies of low-cost hydro-electric power - and improved flood control in an area which, as we have seen during the past few days, is sometimes subject to devastating floods. In energy matters generally - electricity, oil, gas and so on - new opportunities for co-operation are continuously being examined. An intensive study is also being made of basic principles which might guide relations between our countries in economic and other areas.

Through the International Joint Commission, Canada and the United States have recently embarked on an investigation of the problem of the levels of the Great Lakes - a matter of vital importance to both countries.

Constructive discussions have been taking place with the United States over most of the past year about the trade in automotive products between the two countries. In these discussions good progress has been made towards a more rational and economic basis for relations between these major sectors of our two national economies.

The resolution, shortly after the present Government took office, of controversial issues regarding nuclear weapons has facilitated co-operation on North American defence matters. These matters were reviewed at the meeting of the Canada-United States Ministerial Committee on Joint Defence at Washington in June 1964.

Many consultations have taken place during the past year between the President and the Prime Minister, between Secretary Rusk and myself, and at other levels, regarding various world problems. We have not always agreed but we have tried to understand each other's point of view.

In sum, both countries are showing a capacity for dealing with the problems that confront them in an adult and sensible manner that augurs well for the future.

---

S/C