



CANADA

# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 67/5 ASPECTS OF CANADA AND UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICIES

Speech by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, February 25, 1967.

It is an honour for me to be here this evening, to address this second Inter-Collegiate Conference on Canadian-American Relations.

I should like to congratulate the organizers of this conference for their initiative and determination in drawing together students and faculty members from universities in Canada and the United States to discuss the foreign policies of our two countries. Through your formal discussions, and your social contacts, those of you who have the privilege of participating in this conference can do much to bring about a greater awareness, and a deeper understanding, of the relations between our two interdependent but distinctive North American peoples.

There is no surer evidence of the intimate and lasting friendship which characterizes the relations between the Canadian and American peoples than gatherings of this type, marked as they are by frank discussion and free exchanges of views.

Tonight I wish to speak to you about various aspects of the foreign policies of Canada and the United States as they appear to a Canadian foreign minister.

It is axiomatic that the foreign policy of a country is an expression of what it conceives to be its national interest. To say this is not to deny that there are wider international interests with which the national interest of any given country may be identified. Nor is it to deny that the national interests of two or more countries can be the same in certain instances.

In an increasingly interdependent world, where electronics are bringing peoples closer together into what a distinguished Canadian scholar has described as a "global village", and where we are all faced with the challenge of learning to live with the inconceivably terrible means of destruction which modern technology has placed at our disposal, the national interests of all countries must inevitably be closely identified with the preservation of peace.

Nevertheless, it would be a serious mistake to conclude from this that what one country conceives to be its national interest will necessarily hold for another country. And, even in cases where full agreement can be reached between countries on where their interests lie, there may still be differences as to the best ways of pursuing them.

I agree with the wise and penetrating observations on the distinctive Canadian approach to foreign policy made recently by an outstanding former Canadian diplomat, Mr. John Holmes:

"Obviously, our policies are going to be determined not only by our stature but our geography, our historic associations, and by our own national interests. Like all countries, we are unique, and we are more likely to be zealous and effective in our foreign relations if we have a national style. Into our approach to world problems should go our own experience -- our English and French cultural heritages and our broad ethnic background, our own experience in the path to self-government, our continental resources, our Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic exposures".

In many fields of human activity, Canadians and Americans have become accustomed to ignoring the border which divides our two countries. On the whole, our lives have been greatly enriched by the ease with which we have been able to co-operate and share experiences. But the task of maintaining close and friendly relations between our two countries will not be furthered by glossing over the fact that Canada and the United States are independent national entities, each with its own distinctive ways of translating national interests into policy.

Respect and understanding for the other's point of view is the only basis for a continuation of the harmonious relations our countries have evolved over the years, and which we can rightly be proud to hold up as an example to the world.

Among the factors which shape our foreign policies, three areas of contrast between the United States and Canada can be distinguished:

- (1) The super-power status of the United States, which arises from great wealth and large population, as opposed to the smaller size and more limited power of Canada;
- (2) the bilingual and multicultural nature of Canada, as opposed to the more homogeneous make-up of the United States;
- (3) the revolutionary origins of the United States, as opposed to the evolutionary development of Canada.

There is abundant evidence of the influence which these factors have on the formation of foreign policy in our respective countries. This will be seen in the various international issues I will be speaking of this evening.

The history of the world in this century has been characterized by attempts to arrive at forms of international organization which will ensure lasting peace and security for all countries and peoples, while at the same time permitting the greatest possible degree of national freedom and independence. We have finally arrived at a point where resort to war in this modern age can have catastrophic consequences.

With modern sophisticated weapons available to many states, local conflicts can rapidly escalate into major wars with repercussions far beyond the original scene of conflict. Behind such conflicts lurks the awesome threat of confrontation between the great powers, with their devastating nuclear arsenals, and the spectre of nuclear warfare, which cannot lead to victory but only to relative degrees of defeat. Fortunately, this is a fact of life which most responsible powers have recognized, although they have not yet been able to translate their awareness into terms of comprehensive arms control.

In the circumstances in which we find ourselves, we should be thankful that the United States, the most powerful country the world has ever known, has been so willing to recognize the need for effective international organization, through the United Nations and other bodies. Much that has been accomplished could not have been achieved if it had not been for the "decent respect for the opinions of mankind" which is referred to in the Declaration of Independence and continues to inspire American policy-makers.

Canada, like the United States, is deeply concerned with the preservation of its national identity and independence. Not possessing the enormous strength of the United States, Canada has perhaps felt even more compelled to seek guarantees for peace and security through international organization. In contributing to the development of effective international machinery, we have served our own interests, as well as those of the world community of which we are a part.

Canada's pursuit of this policy goes on at many levels, and in many ways. At the immediate practical level, it is manifested by the presence of Canadian personnel in peace-keeping forces and truce-supervisory groups around the world: in the Middle East, in Cyprus, in Kashmir, in Indochina. In the wider context, it can be seen in Canada's unremitting efforts to encourage progress towards arms control and ultimately, we hope, towards effective disarmament, and in the creation of more effective procedures for international peace-keeping operations.

Complete success has often proved extremely elusive. We have learned that quiet, patient work, often in difficult circumstances, is required, and will continue to be needed for many years to come.

Nowhere is the effort more urgent than in the continent of Asia. Canada, no less than the United States, recognizes that what is happening in Asia today is of great importance for the shaping of an orderly and peaceful world.

There can be no question that a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Vietnam is almost universally desired -- and not least by the United States. There must be no let-up in the search for an agreement as to how this can be brought about, and on what conditions a new and lasting settlement can be based.

Canada has a direct involvement in Vietnam, although it is of an entirely different nature from that of the United States and came about for entirely different reasons. Under the Agreement on Vietnam which was signed at Geneva in July of 1954, Canada undertook a quasi-judicial role as a member of an International Commission, consisting of Poland and India along with ourselves, to supervise the implementation of the cease-fire arrangements agreed to at that time.

Unfortunately, the Geneva arrangements failed to bring to Vietnam the peace and stability which their authors envisaged. Gradually, over the intervening years, the situation has evolved into a new military crisis and the world community is again confronted by a serious threat to peace which is tearing that unhappy country apart.

As far as Canada is concerned, our policy toward the conflict can be summarized broadly as follows:

- (1) A solution by military means alone to the kind of problem underlying the present crisis is not possible.
- (2) An equitable and lasting settlement can only be achieved by peaceful means, that is through a mutual accommodation of interests through negotiations.
- (3) It is imperative that such negotiations be entered into as soon as possible, and to this end responsible members of the international community must do everything within their power to see whether they can help create conditions in which such negotiations can become a reality.
- (4) As the only international body with established links with both sides, the International Commission collectively, or its members individually, may be able to play a constructive role in facilitating the beginning of a continuing political dialogue between the parties, and, it is to be hoped, of negotiations.

In the final analysis, of course, the settlement of any conflict or any dispute depends on the terms which the parties to it are able to agree on between themselves. But before they can agree peaceably, they must begin to discuss peaceably. If, through its membership in the International Commission and through its close relations with the United States, Canada is able to make some contribution to the process of translating military exchanges into arguments across a negotiating table, I think we shall have adequately served, and, indeed, furthered, some of the deepest interests and ideals our two countries share.

The difficulty in bringing Communist China into any meaningful discussion of how to end the conflict in Vietnam has only served to emphasize what have for many years impressed us as the dangers which can arise from the exclusion of a major world power from international councils.

We recognize that the absence of mainland China from the United Nations is due, at least in part, to the attitude of the Chinese themselves, who have seemed to relish their self-imposed isolation. But we do not believe that the international community could afford in the long run to encourage that isolation. Without in any way losing sight of the very real difficulties which lie in the way of bringing Peking's representatives into the United Nations, we believe that it is wrong to continue the essentially negative policy which has marked United Nations discussions of this fundamental problem for many years.

It was for this reason that I proposed to the General Assembly last November what I should call an interim solution to the Chinese representation issue. I told the Assembly that I thought that we must take into account the realities of the political situation in the Far East, and that, until such time as the Taiwan Government and the Peking Government could come to some settlement of their jurisdictional claims, both governments should be represented at the United Nations. I also suggested that we might further face up to the realities by offering Peking the permanent seat on the Security Council.

I made these suggestions not with the idea that they would gain immediate acceptance but rather in the hope of opening up new avenues in the hitherto deadlocked situation. Depending on developments inside China, I should hope that further progress could be made towards a reasonable and equitable solution of this long-standing problem.

Although it is in Asia that the most immediate threats to world peace are to be found at the present time, we must not lose sight of the continuing need to find a more lasting basis for peace in Europe. Both the United States and Canada, which owe their origins and so much of their civilization to Europe, must be intimately concerned with the evolution of the situation there.

Canada, even more than the United States, has maintained its ties with Europe, particularly through our two founding countries, Britain and France. Canada was involved from the beginning in the two great wars in Europe, and it was only natural that Canada should also be involved from the beginning in NATO, the first collective defence effort in Europe in peacetime.

There have, of course, been great changes in Europe since the North Atlantic Treaty came into being 18 years ago. In part owing to the generosity and imagination of the United States, the countries of Western Europe have restored their war-torn economies and have achieved a new prosperity, stability and self-confidence. With increasing prosperity, they have been able to assume an increasing share of the responsibility for their own defence; we welcome this trend, and hope it will continue. Meanwhile, largely owing to the success of NATO itself, the threat of military aggression in Europe has receded and the chances of restoring more normal relations between Eastern and Western Europe have much improved.

There were reasons enough for NATO to undertake a thorough re-assessment of its future role when the decision by France to withdraw from NATO's integrated defence arrangements made it urgent that the Organization adjust itself to the changing circumstances. Convinced that France had an important and enduring role to play in the alliance, Canada was particularly anxious to find ways of ensuring that France would continue to be as closely associated as possible with NATO. We are, therefore, gratified that suitable arrangements are being worked out to this end.

We are also pleased that NATO is tackling with realism the task of adjusting its conceptions and its machinery to the new demands of a Europe in full transition from the immediate threat of war to the promise of peaceful co-operation. Indeed, I consider that NATO has increasing importance as an organization which can contribute towards an eventual peace settlement in Europe.

It is our earnest hope that the day will come when NATO, as a defensive alliance, will no longer be needed. In the meantime, Canada cannot, any more than the United States, fail to be involved in arrangements for European security. Canada, along with the United States, will have to participate in the general conference on European security which we believe should be held when the time is ripe. Careful preparation will, of course, be required if such a conference is to be successful.

The trend towards closer relations between Western Europe and the Communist states of Eastern Europe is, we think, a hopeful development. Canada is itself seeking to strengthen its contacts with the countries in Eastern Europe. Last November, I visited Poland and the Soviet Union, where I had useful discussions with the leaders of those countries. My visit was only one of those made by foreign ministers of NATO countries in recent months. Through such visits, and in other ways, we hope that East-West relations will continue to improve.

We also hope that Germany, which lies at the heart of the problem of an eventual European settlement, will share fully in these efforts. We therefore welcome the recent initiatives of the Federal German Republic in seeking an improvement in its relations with the countries of Eastern Europe, and we hope that the latter, for their part, will show their genuine desire for a lasting peace by responding positively to these initiatives.

Canada's own experience as a nation leads us to believe that patient but determined efforts to achieve a genuine understanding with countries whose ideology and traditions differ from our own is the most likely path to a lasting peace in Europe.

I have been speaking of our joint and distinctive foreign-policy interests in Asia and Europe. In our own Hemisphere, we again find a situation where our differing traditions and interests have resulted in contrasting policies.

The United States, both because of its size and its own historical development, has always had a very great interest in Latin America. It has been involved in the inter-American system from the beginning. It has taken the lead in developing an imaginative approach to the social and economic problems which challenge so many countries of the Americas.

Because of our stronger traditional ties with Europe, Canada has not entered fully into the inter-American system, despite the fact that we are a Western Hemisphere country. Nevertheless, we have established our own links with Latin America, and we have endeavoured to preserve and extend these links as opportunities have arisen. We look forward to the further development of our relations in this direction in the future.

As an example of the influence of tradition on Canadian foreign policy in this Hemisphere, and in a modern context, I might mention our developing special relations with the countries of the Commonwealth Caribbean. In recent years, some of these countries have attained independence; others -- the smaller ones -- will next week become "associated states" with Britain. These changes have enabled Canada to give new meaning to its relations with the Commonwealth Caribbean as a whole, in what we hope will be a constantly evolving and mutually beneficial relation, unique but not exclusive.

I could go on to discuss our foreign policies in other parts of the world, for Canada, like the United States, has world-wide interests. We have, in Africa, special interests arising from our membership in the Commonwealth and our "Francophone" heritage. We share, in the Middle East, a desire to see Israel and its Arab neighbours live at peace, and we participate in the United Nations force, which is contributing to the achievement of this goal. We are contributing, in many parts of the developing world, to the enormous and demanding task of raising the standard of living.

From what I have said, it is evident that Canada's foreign policies are based on its own distinctive traditions, its own capabilities, and its own interests. The same is, of course, true of the United States. In many aspects of our policy, we find ourselves collaborating or co-operating with the United States. In other cases, we find that Canada and the United States are playing complementary roles.

When two countries, however close the relations between them, pursue their own policies in international affairs, there are bound to be occasions when differences of opinion, and, indeed, differences of interest, arise. In the past we have always found ways of ensuring that these differences did not affect the basic nature of our relations. I am confident that, so long as our relations are characterized by good neighbourliness, by mutual respect, and by genuine willingness to understand the other's point of view, we shall be able to resolve whatever differences may arise in the future.

A distinguished American diplomat, Mr. Livingston Merchant, has offered some practical comments on the value and scope of consultation between Canada and the United States, which I think are worth repeating:

"...It is in the interest of each of us to avoid official public disagreements with the other until early and intimate consultation in private has at least afforded an opportunity to resolve differences between us. If Canada, however, is to remain a voice respected in the world for its responsibility and independence, it naturally must retain the right to debate and discuss alternative courses of action publicly, and to differ by official pronouncement if private exchanges of view still leave us apart. In any event, each of us has the right to expect the other to accord to its views serious and understanding attention".

For Canadians to offer ill-informed criticism of United States foreign policy, without recognizing the enormous responsibilities which go with American power, and without recognizing the degree to which our interests coincide with those of the United States, would be a sign of immaturity and could have unfortunate consequences. It would, however, be equally immature of Canadians to accept unconditionally and without question the protection of our larger neighbour, on the assumption that what is good for the United States must necessarily also be good for Canada.

Canada is this year celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of Confederation. It is a time when all Canadians will be thinking about the origins of our nation, the achievements of our people, and the role our country can and must play in the councils of the world.

This great milestone in the evolution of Canada is not without significance for the United States. Concerned as they are with the burdens and responsibilities they have assumed around the world, Americans will, I hope, see in our centennial an occasion to recognize anew the value of Canada's distinctive, independent, yet friendly role in the international community.

The world of 1967 is a very different place from the world 100 years ago in which Canadian Confederation first took shape. The problems of foreign policy not only become more numerous but they take on many new dimensions, as the peoples of the world become increasingly interdependent.

In the task of building a world in which all peoples can find a full and rich life, there is no single path, no simple solution. The very effort of working towards a better world must attract the talents and energies of us all, for only those truly committed to the effort can ever find full satisfaction in the results.

In this spirit, let us, Americans and Canadians, join our efforts where we can. Let us not insist that there is no way but our own. Let us realize that our diversity, so long as it is tempered by respect and understanding, is a source not of weakness but of strength.