

# STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY  
OF STATE  
FOR EXTERNAL  
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE  
D'ÉTAT AUX  
AFFAIRES  
EXTÉRIEURES.



86/70

Notes for a speech by the  
Right Honourable Joe Clark,  
Secretary of State for  
External Affairs, at the  
University of New Brunswick

FREDERICTON

November 24, 1986.

There has always been some continuity to Canadian foreign policy. However, we came to office believing that the former government had nurtured too narrow a view of the country, and in foreign affairs, as in other fields, we are pursuing initiatives that had not been priorities for Canada before. Let me talk about one of them today.

We are accustomed to thinking of our French and English heritage in relation to the European cultures they reach back to. It is time for Canada to give more attention to the developing countries they reach out to. We are a unique country in the world, and ought to build on all our assets.

We belong to two international families - the Commonwealth and La Francophonie. The Heads of Government of both organizations will meet in Canada next year - La Francophonie in Quebec City in September; the Commonwealth in Vancouver in October.

These are more than alliances of language or tradition. They cut across the categories of wealth or colour or region which can divide the world. They allow us to exercise a status that is virtually unique to Canada - as a developed country, without colonial antecedents or ambitions, trusted by the developing world. That is important in diplomacy, as when we seek the form of agencies of the United Nations, or try to develop common policies to seek peaceful change in southern Africa. It is important in trade, as when we are able to get agreement on the inclusion of agriculture, or of services in the GATT. It is significant in establishing joint ventures, or securing development projects, as Canadian entrepreneurs have discovered in Africa and the Caribbean.

The unique capacity of the Commonwealth has been demonstrated in southern Africa, where the tensions generated by apartheid are boiling over. Those tensions will be resolved only by a change of policy in Pretoria, or by an escalating violence through the region. Obviously, it is far better to have change without violence, but that will not be easy. Among other things, it requires some agency that can reach both sides, urging moderation on black leaders and groups, building pressure against apartheid. The Commonwealth is the agency most able to play that role, and Canada has chosen deliberately to base our policy against apartheid on the Commonwealth connection.

Obviously, we also use other instruments - sanctions, both mandatory and voluntary; direct aid to organizations who support the families of the victims of apartheid; scholarships to black South Africans; diplomatic initiatives to seek to influence the policies of our allies.

Canada alone has not much influence on South Africa. Our economic impact is small, compared with that of countries like Britain, Germany, France, Switzerland, Japan and the USA. Our moral and our diplomatic influence is best applied systematically, rather than wasted in one burst of drama. We have decided deliberately on a policy of step-by-step pressure, and upon the Commonwealth as a central means to make that work.

Here is what has happened so far.

At the Nassau Commonwealth Conference last year, Mr. Mulroney and other Heads of Government established a small group of Eminent Persons, to seek a dialogue between South African authorities and genuine leaders of the black opposition. Archbishop Ted Scott of the Anglican Church of Canada was one of that Group, and they did everything possible to create conditions for peaceful change. In the end, South Africa rejected that effort at peaceful change, but by their rejection demonstrated to the world the depth of their opposition to real reform.

In London, in August, Canada, India, Australia, Zambia, Zimbabwe, the Bahamas and Britain met to review the Eminent Persons report. Six of those nations, including Canada, agreed on a wide list of common actions against apartheid. All seven, including Britain, agreed on a narrower list. The impact of Britain's actions is greater because its economic ties with South Africa are strong. Britain's participation in the package of measures would not likely have happened at all without its sense of connection to the Commonwealth.

That leadership, by the Commonwealth, has now been followed by the European Community, the United States, and Japan, whose collective economic impact on South Africa far exceeds that of Canada alone. The private sector, in several countries, has joined that pressure, steadily withdrawing economic support from a regime which practices apartheid.

Now the challenge is twofold - to maintain the pressure, and find ways to help southern African countries who are the first victims of South Africa's retaliation, and its own sanctions. Many of the Front Line states are members of the Commonwealth - Zimbabwe, Botswana, Zambia. All are members of an organization called SADCC - the Southern African Development Coordination Conference. Canada now contributes more than \$100 million a year to the region, partly through SADCC. Last week, the chairman of that organization visited Ottawa to discuss future plans. We told him that we are committed to helping the region, and that we are prepared to provide immediate new financial and technical support. My colleague, the Hon. Monique Landry, will lead the Canadian delegation to the SADCC Annual Meeting in Botswana in February to discuss specific projects. She will invite Canadian business to join her.

Let me conclude these remarks by referring to one other aspect of our policy toward South Africa, and that is the degree to which we have sought to involve Canadians voluntarily in the campaign against apartheid.

We have provided a register of individual actions against apartheid by Canadian citizens, organizations or groups, and I presented a copy of that register to the Secretary General of the United Nations in New York in September.

Our sanctions respecting Krugerrands, bank loans, travel and investment have all been voluntary and have generally been successful. We adopt that voluntary approach for two reasons.

First, we believe it is better to only use force, including the force of law, when you have to. Second, actions taken voluntarily send a far stronger message to South Africa than actions which the law requires individuals or companies to take. It is important for Pretoria to understand that Canadian businesses, Canadian individuals, Canadian organizations oppose apartheid for their own reasons, not because the Government of Canada tells them to.

In Parliament, I expressed my disappointment at the decision of Falconbridge to increase its investment in South Africa, and look forward to their acting on their undertaking to divest of that holding. But the decisions to disinvest by Bata, by Alcan, by Dominion Textiles, and by others are stronger because they are voluntary. They tell Pretoria that apartheid is self-defeating economically, as well as unacceptable morally.

Several Canadian companies remain in South Africa. As long as they are there, the Canadian Government expects them to be good employers. We expect them to ensure that apartheid is at least eliminated in the workplace which they control. We think that our Code of Conduct for Canadian Companies operating in South Africa is a useful benchmark to work by. From their first reports on performance under this voluntary code, the 15 or so Canadian companies involved are doing a pretty good overall job of implementing the code.

I will be meeting again with Canadian companies still operating in South Africa, to discuss further actions that might be taken. In preparation for those meetings, I asked Archbishop Scott to consult both United States and Canadian companies that have already decided to divest themselves of their holdings in South Africa. He will be reporting to me shortly, and believes there may be room for new initiatives for Canada and Canadians to take.