



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 66/31

## CANADA, FRANCE AND WORLD TRENDS

Address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs,  
the Honourable Paul Martin, at the Annual United Nations  
Seminar at the University of Western Ontario, June 27,  
1966.

I should like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your invitation to speak at this annual Seminar and to extend my best wishes to the high-school students who have assembled here from various parts of Western Ontario.

You are concluding your year's work by far-reaching discussions of world affairs. The subjects under review here - the United Nations, Canada's role in that organization and in world affairs generally and, this year in particular, France and its place in the world - would require several speeches if I were to cover them all carefully.

I have chosen, however, to speak about Canada, France and some world trends in order to comment on some current developments of particular interest and to suggest ways of linking the various subjects you have been studying.

### Canadian Role in World Affairs

The foreign policy of any country and the extent of its activity in world affairs are determined partly by the inescapable conditions of its very existence and partly by the free choice of certain relations and by the decisions made in response to particular international developments and in response to the wishes and interests of its people.

Considering Canada's political origins, location, economic necessities and bilingual and bicultural character, we might say that the absolute minimum of external activity for us would involve relations with Britain, the United States and France and promotion of trade and immigration, even where we have no additional interests.

In fact, our activity in world affairs has gone far beyond that minimum. Whether one considers membership in organizations, range of diplomatic relations, trade and other economic activity, scale of participation in wars or contribution to initiatives towards peace, it is obvious that Canada has chosen a significantly active role.

It is true that some of these activities are now what one might call normal for a developed nation in an increasingly interdependent world. I believe, however, that, over and above any trend of the times, we have chosen as an essential ingredient in an independent foreign policy a considerable degree of activity directed towards the creation of a more stable, peaceful and prosperous world.

This aspect of our policies has been particularly apparent in our commitment to peace-keeping activities in the United Nations and in our strong support for the survival of a multi-racial Commonwealth, in our contribution to the founding of NATO and our emphasis on the possibility that it might provide the foundation of an eventual transatlantic association which would lead to political and economic co-operation as well as defence co-operation. We could not expect to make a decisive intervention in world problems alone, but we believed that a strong effort in company with others at the appropriate times would both give expression to our Canadian views and would serve the interests of the world community.

We have referred increasingly to our "middle-power" role. It is not easy to divide nations into categories in these terms. It is not easy to define the ingredients, military, political or economic, which make up "power" or diplomatic effectiveness in international affairs. Nevertheless, it is clear that Canada has in a moderate degree some of the attributes which have always supported international activity and these, combined with traditional or newly-acquired associations and with a strong belief in the efficacy of collective action, have enabled us to play a constructive part in world affairs.

#### World Trends

Our contribution in this area was, until fairly recently, made against a background of a relatively fixed relation among the super-powers and great powers. The United Nations could do little with respect to the central problems at issue between the blocs which emerged as the result of the power relation and clash of ideologies after the Second World War.

The United Nations did, however, react to this situation by attempting to overcome, to some extent, the inability of the Security Council, composed of the great powers, to act as it was supposed to do under the Charter. The greater role of the General Assembly in peace keeping, for example, and the personal initiatives of the Secretary-General were responses to the desire of the majority of members to act for peace. Canada made its contribution, along with other medium powers, in situations in which the great powers could not act.

General international conditions have, however, begun to change in the past few years in the direction of what many commentators call "polycentrism", or the growth of more centres of power, influence and political initiative in world affairs. The process is a complex one and I shall only remind you of some of the contributing factors.

In the early 1960s, most of the remaining colonies in the world became independent and it became clear that the new and unaligned nations were not going to choose either "East" or "West" in the ideological sense.

The full reality of the nuclear stalemate between the super-powers, as it affected localized clashes of interest, became apparent in the Cuba crisis in 1962. The necessity which was subsequently recognized of pursuing a safer course towards some accommodation of interests led to the partial test-ban treaty of 1963 and related agreements. The Sino-Soviet dispute and the manifestations within the Communist nations closely associated with the Soviet Union of a slightly more independent course in domestic and external affairs have changed the situation to some extent within the Communist world. These developments have, of course, scarcely altered the fundamental political coherence and unity of action within either the Soviet or the Chinese sectors of world Communism.

The members of NATO are genuinely sovereign states accustomed to stating different points of view within the general framework of the alliance which they have created to serve common interests. The changes in world relations are leading to reassessments on their part of the role and structure of the alliance.

In general, it may be said that, as a result of these world trends, there are separate and continuing debates going on in different spheres about the advantages of collective action or of individual assertions of interest or initiatives. We are too much involved in these questions to pass judgments; we can only ask some questions. Is the restiveness among some nations a sign of recurring nationalism or of desire to work towards new alignments or new arrangements within groups to correspond to changing world situations? Can we distinguish in practical terms between the different types of motivation for regional and other collective arrangements that have grown up in the past 20 years - immediate defence needs, long-term advantages of pooling some resources and efforts, the trend towards supranational organization, the search for world collective security?

#### France

At this point, I turn to the second of the two nations with which you have been particularly concerned in the Seminar, and which happens to be our second mother country. French attitudes towards world problems, including questions of the type I have mentioned, have been of particular interest to other nations.

France has long held, and still holds in many respects, the position of a great power, closely influencing the course of events in Europe and in other continents. It has been one of the great colonial powers, and the nations in Africa and elsewhere which were French colonies retain very close economic and cultural links with France and have close political contacts. As a Permanent Member of the Security Council, for example, and as one of the four Occupying Powers in Berlin, France has been at the centre of the major developments in world affairs and in European developments following the conclusion of the Second World War. As a founding member of NATO, occupying a central position in Western European security arrangements, and as a major force in Western European economic co-operation, France has helped greatly to lead that continent back to security and prosperity.

In recent years, the settlement of the Algerian conflict, the impressive advances shown by the French economy and the achievement of greater political stability, with the great energy and patriotism of President De Gaulle, have led France to take a particularly active role internationally. It has extended and deepened its relations with other parts of the world, contributed greatly to the economic development of its former African and other colonies and, in seeking to develop more normal relations with East European states, has paid particular attention to the problem of how to end fundamental tensions threatening world peace.

#### Relations Between Canada and France

Canada has made a particular effort since the beginning of 1964 to strengthen and extend its traditionally friendly relation with France. We have done so for a number of reasons, and I should like to emphasize the range of our initiatives to avoid giving any impression that I am speaking only of cultural or linguistic matters or the naturally close connection between French-Canadians and France.

Our efforts to develop the relation more fully in a number of fields began with the visit which the Prime Minister and I made to France in January 1964. I can testify not only to the cordiality with which we were received but also that our desire to co-operate and build new bridges between Canada and France was sincerely and warmly reciprocated by President de Gaulle and by authorities at all levels. That this desire remains strong is regularly manifested to us in our daily contacts with French officials.

It is, of course, a fact of Canadian history that French-speaking Canadians have always had a particularly close relation with France, arising from traditions, language and culture. In recent years we have realized the need to have Government policies reflect more adequately than in the past the bilingual and bicultural nature of our country. The impulse given by what we have come to call the "quiet revolution" in Quebec has played its part in this process. In addition, English-speaking Canadians have, I believe, come to understand the value to Canada as a whole of developing and maintaining permanently a broad association with France as an integral part of our national heritage, comparable to the special ties with Britain, the Commonwealth and the United States, from which we have drawn benefits for so many years.

I should like to mention some specific manifestations of this deepening relation. Last year we entered into the first general cultural agreement with France. The agreement is intended to develop cultural, scientific and artistic exchanges between our two countries and to promote the teaching and use of French. Under this agreement, several important projects have already been undertaken. The Toronto Symphony has visited France, and the Théâtre de l'Egrégore of Montreal has gone to France and Switzerland. One hundred scholarships have been given to French students to study in Canadian universities and about a similar number have been given by France to Canadian students. French teachers in increasing numbers have come to Canada at the invitation of our universities.

In the economic field you will have noted the reports in the press in recent days about the Canadian economic mission in France. This mission, led by the Minister of Industry and Defence Production, Mr. Drury, and comprising a number

of Canada's leading business personalities, has been making high-level contacts with French businessmen and studying ways of increasing the flow of trade, investment and technology between our two countries. The work of this mission is complemented by that of the Franco-Canadian Economic Committee, which met in Ottawa last autumn and is to meet again this year to develop means of increasing economic co-operation between our two countries, both bilaterally and on the international level.

One subject discussed by the economic committee was the possibility of co-operation in providing assistance to French-speaking less-developed countries. Though still on a modest scale compared to our aid to Commonwealth countries, our economic assistance to these countries has in recent years been expanded through the establishment of a special programme of assistance to the 21 countries of Africa that use French as their official or as a second language. Our diplomatic representation in that part of the world is being further extended this year by the opening of embassies in Dakar and Tunis.

In France itself, of course, we opened, in 1965 and 1964, Consulates-General in Bordeaux and Marseille which are contributing to the development of Canada's connections with the important regions which these cities represent.

Last autumn, French and Canadian parliamentarians, wishing to make a contribution of their own to the growing number of contacts between our two countries, met in Ottawa to found the Canada-France Inter-parliamentary Association. The Association had its first regular meeting in Paris a few weeks ago, and will meet alternately in the two capitals each year. As in the case of the Canada-U.S. Inter-parliamentary Group, and of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (Canada has been a member of both these bodies for several years), the activities of the new Canada-France Association aim essentially at developing between parliamentarians of the two countries a mutual understanding of each other's preoccupations and activities.

Canadian and French diplomats constantly consult in their common search to find just and effective solutions to the problems which burden today's world. The French Foreign Minister and I have made a practice, since the Prime Minister's visit to France, of meeting twice yearly to discuss not only bilateral questions but also those of worldwide importance; we met once again at the beginning of June in Brussels, before the NATO ministerial meeting. We now look forward to meeting next time in Ottawa, in September, when we shall have the pleasure of welcoming M. Couve de Murville to Canada.

I regard the continued development of our relations with France and other French-speaking countries as of vital importance for Canada at this stage of our national development. Internally, this process, if successfully carried out, should consolidate our national unity and help to define our sense of purpose as a country.

The strengthening of our relation with France is also an eminently desirable part of our active international role as a middle power. It should reinforce our position in the world by creating new channels for our influence, favourable opportunities for trade and more extensive contacts from which to improve our understanding of world trends. With a double heritage from two great civilizations, Canada has many opportunities in relations with countries which share this heritage in one form or another to play a useful role.

The value of this role may be perceived, for instance, in the fact that these two communities now include dozens of newly-independent countries, which are in the process of developing their political and economic institutions and their relations with the outside world. Our economic assistance programmes in both French-speaking and Commonwealth African nations provide one good example of this role.

The relation with France is particularly important at present. France has become very active internationally at a time when some of the familiar aspects of the world political landscape are changing significantly. France has become the proponent of certain views about the possibilities of détente, about the necessities for changes in relations between blocs, about the relations between the United States and Europe and about arrangements within NATO.

The Canadian Government has regretted the French Government's withdrawal from the integrated military structure within NATO. We should have preferred that there be consideration of proposals for reorganization and reassessment of objectives in the NATO Council rather than the unilateral decision France has taken. We believe there is a continuing need for the integrated military structure of NATO, while Soviet positions remain unchanged and their forces in Eastern Europe become stronger than ever. At the same time, notwithstanding France's withdrawal from NATO's military organization, we believe every encouragement should be given to their stated intention to remain in the alliance.

At the meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council early in June, Canada made a particular effort to help preserve the unity of the alliance, and I believe that its continuing value and resilience were demonstrated. We hope that co-operative military arrangements can be worked out between France and the 14 nations that have decided to maintain the integrated military structure. We hope that the unity of the alliance with respect to its ultimate political task of facilitating a European settlement can be fully assured.

With the attention of the world focussed on the visit of President de Gaulle to the Soviet Union, I think that one of our greatest hopes would be that the additional understanding of Soviet viewpoints and of the prospects for improved relations derived by the French President from this visit will help to illuminate the path towards a reconciliation of the two halves of Europe.

The balance between individual initiatives and co-ordinated effort in international affairs at present is not always easy to maintain. It is the purpose of the alliance to furnish an opportunity for consultation so that policies may be co-ordinated with the hope of achieving agreed goals. This is not to suggest that the contributions individual nations could best make to world peace should be limited or tied to the judgment of others. It is rather to say that members of an alliance owe it to the collective purpose of the alliance and to their partners to consult together regarding the object of their national endeavours. We hope that France will regard this consultation as part and parcel of its continuing participation in the alliance....

I have outlined in general terms some of the considerations about world affairs and about the roles of Canada and France in the world which are relevant to various themes in your seminar. I have pointed to a heritage shared by Canada and France to which we are paying renewed attention. What I should like to emphasize in concluding, however, is not the unique connections between our two countries but the common tasks which they share with others.

President de Gaulle has, in keeping with the noblest French traditions of liberty and a cosmopolitan culture, shown the most profound and realistic concern for a restoration of Europe as a whole with the barriers dropped and the individual nations and cultures engaged in normal contacts and exchanges. We share this concern. Canada is, after all, the heir not only of traditions derived from its British and French origins. It is, in a different manner and in a most significant way, also the heir of cultures representing almost every region of Europe. And so is its neighbour the United States.

We have been deeply involved in European affairs and have given the most specific commitment to the maintenance of security in that continent which a nation can give. We want nothing more than to work with France, with Britain, with the United States and with all the other nations concerned to end the division of Europe and so take a great step towards lasting peace in the world.

---

S/C

les

ours

inu-