



# Statements and Speeches

---

No. 84/10

## CANADA, NATO AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Notes for Remarks by the Honourable Ray Hnatyshyn, Government Leader in the House of Commons, at the Thirtieth Annual Assembly of the Atlantic Treaty Association, Toronto, October 9, 1984.

...In expressing my appreciation for the Council's [Atlantic Council of Canada] work, I realize they have not been aided by two developments. Several North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) officials who would normally have been with us today are at an important meeting of alliance defence ministers in Italy. Canada has recently had a general election and many of us are relatively new to the challenges of the ministry. The Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Right Honourable Mr. Clark, and the Minister of National Defence, are otherwise engaged. However, the support of our government for the North Atlantic alliance, and the ideals it represents, has been made quite clear, and I am here today to emphasize that basic point....

Canada was a founding member of NATO, a voluntary association of sovereign and democratic nations which became the first multilateral military alliance to span the Atlantic in time of peace. The participation of Canada and the United States was a new departure — the first time that we in North America pledged ourselves to the peacetime defence of others. For Canada's part, that commitment, made 35 years ago, remains as strong as ever.

I might say — without being indiscreet — that, as one of his first acts in office, Mr. Clark recently wrote Lord Carrington to reaffirm that commitment. NATO, Mr. Clark said, is the cornerstone of Canadian security policy. Canada is a Western nation, committed to the ideals of individual and collective freedoms. On these principles we shall not compromise.

Canada saw NATO originally as more than a military alliance. We saw it as the foundation of a transatlantic community. We saw it as a means to prevent the forceful domination of the world by one country or group of countries. And we envisaged an alliance which would be more than reactive to the pace of developments elsewhere in the world. We sought, and we seek today, an alliance that is prepared to take initiatives in shaping a more peaceful and secure world.

To do this, our alliance must be more than the aggregate of our combined armed forces. It is true that, for 35 years, NATO's strategy of deterrence has been effective. We must continue to ensure that it is. But as Lord Carrington has recently said, our deterrent strategy must be firmly anchored within an over-arching political framework. The alliance must possess "political brain as well as military brawn".

Canada — working together with its partners — seeks an alliance which can bring to bear the full force of its collective political, economic, defence and moral suasion. Our democratic ideals and freedoms speak for themselves. We should be confident of them. In seeking a more peaceful world we should, above all else, build upon the essence of Western values and principles.

---

How can we do this? Your assembly has as its theme "NATO: New Opportunities". There are many opportunities for us if we wish to be bold. Yet there are also many challenges and we must together deal with these challenges — some new, others long known — if we are to be able to respond to the opportunities.

Since 1949, Canada has placed great emphasis on NATO's non-military dimension. It is this theme to which I would like to devote some attention today. For it is in this area that several challenges lie. I hope that, over the next few days, you will consider what I have to say. I would welcome, in turn, knowing the views of you who represent all alliance member countries.

The North Atlantic Council, in 1956, approved the Report of the Committee on Non-Military Co-operation in NATO; what has become known — quite aptly, I believe — as the "report of the three wise men". If I may, I would like to draw upon one of its principal conclusions. If there is to be vitality and growth in the concept of the Atlantic community, the relations between members of NATO must rest on a sound basis of confidence and understanding. Without this, there cannot be constructive or solid political co-operation. It is easy to profess devotion to the principle of consultation in NATO. It is often difficult to convert this profession into practice.

Now, that report was based on the North Atlantic Treaty, and the Treaty contains four non-military provisions: on consultation; on democratic beliefs; on promoting conditions of stability; and on economic collaboration. These principles remain as important today as they did in 1949, a tribute to those men and women of wisdom who shaped the Treaty. Have we collectively remained faithful to these principles? If not, what more can we do to make them meaningful? It is you, those vitally interested in the alliance from outside government, who can make a valuable contribution to this discussion.

I would briefly like to highlight three elements of NATO's non-military character which I would ask you to consider.

First, effective collective action — emphasized as so important by the three wise men — requires a consensus within the alliance. This consensus can only be fashioned among our governments through thorough, frank and timely consultation. We may not always agree, as allies, on specific steps. That is both a virtue and a burden of democracy. But that should not hinder discussion. We should at least be prepared to consider all points of view and to try to harmonize essential objectives. After all, we share one paramount goal — the prevention of conflict. This should be the touchstone of our deliberations and nothing should mask its importance.

Second, the allies should not hesitate to discuss all essential issues. I have said that, to achieve its goals, the alliance must concert its political, economic, defence and moral values. Prevention of conflict cannot rest alone on arms control or military strength. We must develop comprehensive approaches and consider all vital issues which touch upon our security. Defence and deterrence cannot be isolated policies. They must be an integral part of a broad security policy.

Third, national consensus is vitally important to the effectiveness of the alliance. We must seek better to enjoin our publics, to develop public confidence in the wisdom of our policies and actions. This is particularly true for a generation of younger people who have had no direct experience with conflict. NATO has kept the peace for so long that our very success presents us with a major problem — how to convince the younger generation of the virtues and necessity of collective security. We must be frank with our publics, engage them in the debate, seek to more effectively explain what NATO means.

Similarly, we must be able to assure those whose support we seek that each NATO member participates fully in the decision-making process — that the burdens of collective defence carry with them benefits, including the right to have one's voice heard. We can only do so if there is, and if the public perceives, effective on-going consultation.

While maintaining the strength of our deterrent, we must continue to encourage dialogue and understanding with those who may not share our values, to help reduce the possibilities of conflict. The public image we present to the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe is as important as the public image we present to our own peoples. The reason for this is clear.

The allies must illustrate unequivocally the strength of the transatlantic partnership and our collective solidarity. Others should know they cannot divide us on principles. We should move forward, building upon the words of last year's Brussels Declaration and the recent Washington statement on East-West relations. These words are not new. But they are often not appreciated in the West, nor clearly understood elsewhere. Our alliance threatens no one. None of our weapons will ever be used except in response to attack. We do not aspire to superiority, neither will we accept that others should be superior to us. We respect the legitimate security interests of others, as we expect them to respect ours.

Ten years ago, alliance foreign ministers gathered in Canada and issued the Ottawa Declaration. One of the principal paragraphs of that Declaration proclaimed the continued dedication of each member of this alliance to the several principles of democracy, respect for human rights, justice and social progress.

That paragraph, perhaps more so than any other, serves to distinguish the NATO countries from those of the Warsaw Pact. More even than that, the dedication contained in that paragraph represents the fundamental strength of this alliance. This freedom and this democracy, which unite us in their defence, must be the source of our resolve. Without common resolve — yet, equally, without full understanding of the goals of this alliance — we cannot force from our peoples automatic acceptance of the NATO credo.

The strength and credibility of this alliance depend upon its political, every bit as much as its military, character. We must not forget that.

I well realize that I have posed questions to which some of the answers have been elusive. I make no apology for this. Alliance governments have long been comparing notes on what is meant by truly effective consultation, on how to master the challenges of public communication, and on ways of developing more comprehensive approaches to the issues of international security. Perhaps in your discussions you can help us find the answers....

---

S/C