



CANADA

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 67/27

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT

Speech by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, at the International Day Luncheon of the Directors of the Canadian National Exhibition, Toronto, August 26, 1967.

...We are all aware of the rapid growth of interest in and concern for foreign affairs which has been taking place in Canada. The Government welcomes this public interest and we think that it deserves a continuing exposition of Government policy. Today, I should like to speak to you about some of the major areas of Canadian foreign policy and the ways in which we have been striving to achieve our goals in these areas.

Most Canadians are fully cognizant of the complexities of foreign affairs. In this field of human relations, as in others, "the truth" - to quote Oscar Wilde - "is seldom pure and never simple". What governments have to do - and what we have been doing in Canada - is to take a hard look at all sides of the many problems - and then adopt policies which will

- conform to the country's basic principles
- reflect domestic realities
- have long-term validity, and
- take into account the position of other countries.

Among the objectives underlying Canadian foreign policy are world peace, the rule of law, the dignity of man, economic growth and the preservation of national unity. Canadians are generally agreed on this. Today I should like to discuss some policies we are pursuing in order to achieve these underlying objectives. The list is long - foreign aid, NATO, peace-keeping, arms control, China, Vietnam - but it reflects an important point about Canada's involvement in and attitude toward the world. Increasingly, we are becoming concerned about problems in all parts of the globe through the United Nations, through our participation in alliances, or through bilateral relations with many countries. We are concerned about the whole gamut of relations among countries, whether they be political, economic or cultural. And we are particularly concerned with the opportunities for a positive contribution to the solution of international problems in all these areas.

The first major area of foreign policy that I would like to mention is under-development and foreign aid. Some have argued that, even if development is a problem in the poor countries, it is not Canada's problem and that we need not become involved. To my way of thinking, no point of view could be more short-sighted; the needs are so great and the alternatives to rapid growth so unacceptable that more, not fewer, resources must be channelled to the less-developed countries. Canadians have acknowledged the need and have responded positively to the idea that Canada has a significant part to play in the development of the "third world". Over the past two decades, our country has built up an aid programme which this year will exceed \$300 million in equipment, expertise, training and commodities. We have active programmes around the world in Asia, Africa and the West Indies. You may be aware of the fact that some other aid-giving countries have been levelling off their contributions or actually allowing them to decline. In the face of this movement, we have even greater responsibility to set an example by maintaining, out of an expanding economy, the upward trend of our foreign aid.

We are doing just that. It is the Government's firm intention to increase our aid budget significantly in the next five years. We are committed to raising our contribution to one per cent of our gross national product by the early 1970s. In dollar terms, we can look to annual expenditures of over half a billion dollars within five years.

It will be our intention to undertake these substantial increases without impairing or endangering commitments or important initiatives in other areas. It would be the height of irresponsibility to sacrifice -- as was suggested in a recent criticism of Canadian foreign policy -- our policies on the whole spectrum of world problems (and especially those associations and commitments directed towards collective security) in order to satisfy one requirement. Canada has, and will continue to have, a balanced foreign policy, which takes into consideration all the relevant issues.

Another major concern of Canada is the preservation of peace and security in the nuclear age. Some people have argued that world conditions are such that Canada could reduce radically, or even dispense with, its military contributions towards collective and co-operative defence arrangements.

As to NATO, no one would deny that significant changes have taken place in the years since the alliance was founded. Europe has recovered economically and is better able to provide for its own defence; in addition, tension in Central Europe has declined, bringing some improvement in East-West relations. Yet we should do well to remember:

- (1) That there is no peace settlement in Europe and no immediate prospect of one;
- (2) that a prime source of tension -- the division of Europe, and more particularly of Germany -- continues;
- (3) that the U.S.S.R. is militarily stronger than it has ever been in the past and retains massive forces in Eastern Europe; and
- (4) that, despite its progress, Europe alone could not withstand a revival of Soviet political pressure, let alone the pressure of Soviet military power.

In other words, while there has been undoubted progress in Europe, we have not reached the point where the West can safely dispense with NATO's military strength for defence against aggression.

This does not mean that NATO countries will not be prepared to join the countries of the Warsaw Pact in measures calculated to reduce tension further, in any way that could bring about a mutual reduction of forces. In this and in other ways, NATO can make an important contribution to the growth of confidence necessary to reach a mutually agreeable settlement in Europe. This will help in "building bridges to the East".

How do we see Canada's role?

First - Canada will continue to work through NATO and through every other possible channel, bilateral or multilateral, for progress towards détente in Europe.

Second - Canada will contribute its fair share to NATO's collective defence needs, given that the security of Europe contributes to the security of Canada. If in this way we can help to maintain stability in the Atlantic region, it is surely to our advantage to do so.

Third - Canada has persistently advocated that the members of NATO examine the future purposes and structure of the Organization. We are in the midst of that examination now.

Fourth - The precise nature of our military commitment is not fixed. It will vary according to changing military requirements, to the contributions of our partners, to what we can best and most economically contribute. The level of forces contributed to NATO has traditionally been a matter for collective rather than unilateral decision. We continue to believe that individual contributions to the military strength of NATO should be the subject of consultation among the members of the alliance.

But, whatever the shorter-term requirements and patterns, the long-term goal in NATO remains to reach a settlement between East and West such that NATO, in its military aspect, may no longer be essential to our security.

Another security issue is the question of renewing NORAD (or the North American Aid Defence Agreement) in 1968. The Government is now studying the future of NORAD. There is one point which should be emphasized now because it is apparently not widely understood -- that is, that NORAD is an air defence arrangement, which does not now - nor would its renewal - in any way entail or imply a commitment by Canada to accept or participate in any American anti-ballistic-missile system which might be deployed for space defence at some future date. We hope, of course, that the United States will succeed in persuading the U.S.S.R. to accept a moratorium on ABM deployment, so that the question of North American arrangements will not arise.

Recently, there has been some confused criticism of the conception of peace-keeping and Canada's role in United Nations activities in this field. The position of the Canadian Government on this question is clear -- we recognize that peace-keeping and efforts at "peace-making" should be pursued

simultaneously. Peacekeeping forces contribute to the restoration or creation of conditions within which political settlements may become possible and meanwhile help prevent a deterioration in the situation. Our objective in supporting United Nations peacekeeping activities has been to buttress the ability of the organization to hold the ring while the parties to a dispute attempt to settle their differences. We have, however, always taken the position that the parties should meanwhile make every effort to reach a settlement. Instead of belittling peace-keeping because of the problems which United Nations forces have encountered (for example, in the Middle East), critics should devote their energies to suggesting ways to strengthen the UN's ability to discharge its primary responsibility for peace and security and to ensure that future UN forces will have better terms of reference for carrying out their mandate.

Canada has not simply been playing a passive role in the peacekeeping field. From the creation of the first force, Canada has made a concrete contribution by participating in most peacekeeping operations. We have also sought whenever possible to promote movement by the parties towards a settlement.

I am convinced that Canadians want us to go on making a contribution to UN peace-keeping in spite of the undoubted difficulties - and certainly in spite of the claim of one observer recently that peace-keeping is a "vestigial" Canadian interest. To my mind, far from being "vestigial", peace-keeping is a forward-looking idea, which has proved its usefulness. This is certainly not the time to turn away from the United Nations and back to international conditions as they existed earlier in this century.

When new peacekeeping forces are required (and one does not have to be a prophet to predict that crises will arise in future), I am sure that Canadians will wish the Government to be ready to respond, if we are requested to participate and if the decision of the Security Council makes it feasible and appropriate for us to do so.

Recently, one observer of our external relations thought that Canada should, as a new direction, assign a high priority to disarmament and non-proliferation. I was amazed not at the goals themselves but at the idea that anyone could suggest that Canada has not attached fundamental importance to these goals. Canada is dedicated to the goal of general and complete disarmament and we have participated actively in every international disarmament forum and in every disarmament effort since the Second World War in attempting to achieve that end. Despite political impediments, some progress has been made in the initial steps of limiting armaments - for example, through the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the Outer Space Treaty. Canada played an active part in the achievement of both these international accords and was among the first signatories. On the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we have not only refused to develop these weapons ourselves but have contributed to the discussions that have, just two days ago, resulted in the tabling of a non-proliferation treaty in the Geneva disarmament talks. In the future, as in the past, we shall pursue every possible avenue to reach agreement on the reduction and eventual abolition of armaments.

In China today, we see anarchy and xenophobia, the source of which seems to be more the product of purely Chinese facts than of pressures or attitudes outside China's borders. Whatever the cause of current conditions, however, the task of learning to live with the Chinese has become more difficult. It is

not easy at the present time to establish diplomatic relations with Peking, when every Chinese action is a negation of those principles and customs which over the years have allowed continued meaningful contact between governments.

Last year in the United Nations General Assembly, I outlined what the Government considered to be a reasonable basis for seating Communist China, but there was insufficient support for this idea to warrant submission of a resolution which could be brought to a vote. Although there is obvious difficulty in resuming any initiative at this moment in the light of the present situation on the mainland and in Hong Kong, there has been no change in our views as to the need for a reasonable and just solution of this problem. The proposals made by Canada at the last Assembly for representation of both Peking and Taiwan in the General Assembly and for the participation of Peking in the Security Council as a permanent member remain valid as the most practicable solution to the problem.

Concerning the war in Vietnam, Canadians have -- and have had from the beginning -- one basic aim -- to see the end of hostilities. As a result, the Canadian Government has worked unceasingly to find ways in which this aim might be realized. It must be realized, not only because of the tragic cost to the Vietnamese people but also because of the danger which continued fighting holds for world peace.

A basic guide-line in our approach has been that, to be helpful, any suggestion or initiative must have some prospect of acceptance by the parties themselves. It has been with this point in mind that we have explored the possibilities with both sides and tried to put forward some points that could provide the basis for the creation of an atmosphere in which a dialogue might be undertaken. Particularly, we have sought a means of easing hostilities, including both the end of the bombing and the end of infiltration into the South, as a prelude to wider agreement. In addition, Canada has tried to keep open the possibility of the International Control Commission playing a role in paving the way for a peaceful settlement or in helping to implement the settlement. We have also indicated that we should be prepared to give sympathetic consideration to proposals for an international presence in Vietnam as part of the settlement process.

So far, neither Canada nor any other country or person of goodwill has hit upon a formula which both sides could accept. But the tragic consequences of the war demand that we persist in doing what we can to find a solution. I can assure you -- we shall persist.

I should now like to summarize my remarks on Canada's contributions to peace and development, but you will understand that I have been dealing with some but not all the important areas of Canadian foreign policy:

First - In our growing economy, the Government is expanding its foreign-aid programme, which should approximate 1 per cent of gross national product annually within the next five years. Our dedication to foreign aid must not, however, detract from other imperatives of Canadian policy.

Second - We are seeking détente between East and West and the maintenance of peace through the United Nations. As we draw closer to these objectives, we

shall be less dependent upon regional defence alliances for collective security. Meanwhile, NATO and Canada's contribution to it must be responsive to changing circumstances.

Third - Peace-keeping is an important means of contributing to the preservation of peace; we support it as a conception and as a positive role for Canada to play abroad.

Fourth - We are dedicated to the goal of disarmament and arms control and shall continue to participate in international efforts to achieve this goal.

Fifth - The present internal turmoil in China does not make it easy to establish relations with that country. We shall not abandon our view that the United Nations should adopt a rational approach in favour of China's membership.

Sixth - We want an end to the war in Vietnam and shall persist in our efforts to seek ways of bringing about a cessation of hostilities and a permanent settlement.

In each one of the issues that I have been discussing, Canada has a policy which is forward-looking and positive. In each case, Canada, as an affluent and mature nation, has been making an effective contribution to world peace and world economic development.

Canada's policy is balanced, responsible and based on reality. But it is no less imaginative for being balanced, no less independent for being based on reality, no less far-sighted for being responsible.

S/C