Canada's Role in World Affairs*

David M. L. Farr**

Canada's Position in World Politics

Canada is a relatively small country (25 million people) possessing an immense land mass (an area second only to the Soviet Union) and with the world's ninth largest economy. Unlike many countries in the world, she came to independence peacefully and gradually. She formed no enemies in the process, nor did she experience any deep resentments. Thus her world outlook ever since has been based on a peaceful acceptance of the status quo. She is a democratic federation, with a liberal and pluralist view of politics. Her position on the globe has made her secure and she has willingly entered alliances with her neighbour and friends to re-inforce that position. Since the end of the Second World War her security has been diminished by the fact that her location in northern North America places her between two antagonistic superpowers. Their intercontinental missiles and bombers, if ever used, would pass directly across her territory or strike her cities. This fact, combined with an abhorrence of war drawn from costly participation in two world conflicts, has made her an ardent champion of disarmament and a firm believer in co-operation among nations. Although a pioneer in nuclear research, early in the atomic age she renounced any desire to become a nuclear weapons power. These features of her life and outlook shape her foreign policy. They confirm Pierre Trudeau's judgment, "Canada is not in the big league, and we should not pretend to be so in our foreign policy."

---

* This article is based on a lecture delivered on October 19, 1987, at Sophia University, Tokyo.

** Professor Emeritus of History, Carleton University, Ottawa.

The Emergence of a Canadian Foreign Policy

A foreign policy for Canada was slow to emerge. In the 1930's the country acquired from Britain the right to conduct relations directly with other states but its leaders were cautious in taking up an active role. Canada was small in population, she had pressing economic tasks at home, French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians disagreed on the goals of a foreign policy. But, in spite of these conditions, she was not an isolationist state. In 1914 and then again in 1939 she went to war in defence of the Western European community whose values she shared.

The Second World War transformed Canada into a confident nation with a stronger economic base. It gave her, temporarily, a high position among allies and enemies devastated by the war. Above all it convinced her that international co-operation and collective security were necessary to prevent a recurrence of the ghastly tragedy that had recently overwhelmed the world. An effective world organization was a starting point. Countries must see it as their duty to contribute their resources and talents to the solution of international problems. Under Lester Pearson, diplomat, foreign minister and prime minister, Canada used her status as a "middle power" to play a conciliatory and mediatory role in world politics. The climax of Pearsonian diplomacy came in the Suez crisis of 1956, when Canada was able to secure the United Nation's sponsorship of a peacekeeping force to be placed between the warring parties in the Middle East. Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts and made Canadians proud of their contribution to the preservation of world order. The Pearson years also saw Canada take steps to promote the growth of a multi-racial Commonwealth, with a majority of Asian and African members. They also witnessed the country's endorsement of a North Atlantic security alliance designed to bolster democratic regimes in Western Europe and to check the spread of international communism. Finally these years saw the delicate management of relations with Canada's dynamic neighbour, the United States, through the patient exercise of "quiet diplomacy". The United Nations, the Commonwealth, NATO, the

United States : these were the cornerstones of Canada's external policies.

Pearson stepped down as prime minister in 1968, to be succeeded by a younger man, Pierre Elliott Trudeau. Trudeau determined that a fresh look should be taken at the traditional principles in Canada's foreign relations. In a world characterized by detente, was it appropriate to give so much emphasis to defence and collective security? Was there still a place, in an expanded UN dominated by regional blocs, for a middle power's mediatory diplomacy? Were not economic and environmental questions becoming the staples of foreign relations? Should Canada's policies be less reactive to external circumstances and more attuned to the country's national interests? These questions were raised, and answers suggested, in a review of foreign policy that was published in 1970.[1]

The Trudeau government proceeded to cut back on Canada's contribution to NATO in the following years and to hold steady on its expenditures on the country's armed forces. It gave an emphasis to the protection of Canada's environment in the fragile Arctic region and around the country's coastline. It created new agencies and spent more money on development assistance. It helped to mediate, within the Commonwealth, on issues that threatened to alienate African members from the rest of the association. It widened the scope of Canadian foreign interests from its emphasis on the North Atlantic world to a concern with the Pacific rim countries (especially China), Southeast Asia, Latin America, the Soviet Union and the English and French-speaking states in Africa. Above all, it endeavoured to make external policy a force for national unity by embracing subjects with which French-Canadians could identify.

Trudeau was prime minister of Canada for fifteen years. In 1984 the Liberal government of his successor was overturned by a massive Conservative victory at the polls. Brian Mulroney came to power, his party holding 211 of the 282 seats in the House of Commons. The foreign policy of the present government of Canada is built upon the foundations laid by Pearson and Trudeau but it contains some departures. Its record and aspirations must now be examined. The organization followed corresponds to the policy themes set out by the Trudeau

and Mulroney governments.[2]

Canada-United States Relations

The relationship across her southern border is the dominant one in Canada's thinking about the outside world. It affects all her external policies and touches the life of every Canadian. The United States is not only the world's strongest economy but she possesses the most powerful military force in the world. She is also the most vigorous country of English speech in the world, in the forefront of the transmission of ideas, technology and mass culture. The impact of American values is a fact of life for almost every society in the world. Canada is a near neighbour, an exposed neighbour, of this superpower. Not only does she have to contend with the superpower's global policies but she has to manage her own intimate relationship with her.

This bilateral relationship is unique in the world. Not only is Canadian-American trade the largest between any two countries but the personal contacts are unparalleled across any other border. There are more than 30 million border crossings each year, a figure greater than the entire population of Canada. There are links to the south in every field of Canadian life—business, education, sports, tourism—the list is endless. The very fact of this enormous interaction creates a constant succession of problems to be resolved. Some of these arise from the working of international forces, some from domestic pressures to change the rules for an industry or an occupation, some from the success of one country's industry imperilling the operation of an industry in the other, some from shared geography and an environment that cannot be separated, some from technological changes, and some from United States policies aimed at other countries but also affecting Canada. Sometimes these bilateral issues can be solved with the advice of joint tribunals set up to deal with specialized subjects but more often they must be tackled by direct negotiations. This can be done by a government department in Ottawa talking to another in Washington or by the Canadian embassy talking to the State Department. Increasingly, dispute resolution has meant putting the Canadian viewpoint to the United States Congress, which is taking an ever-larger role in the

making of American foreign policy. In most of these instances, Canada must act alone, although she sometimes finds allies in domestic interests in the United States which may be seeking the same result.

The co-ordination of policy by Canada is crucial but difficult to ensure in view of the range and complexity of the interests involved in the United States relationship. Advanced discussion of impending problems is useful but it cannot always be assured. Canada, although the smaller country, has some weapons to protect her own interests which can be used in a serious situation. These are the flows of trade and investment across the border. United States investment is found in many sectors of the Canadian economy: many Americans derive their livelihood from the fact that Canada is the Uited States' largest market. Thus the American government has to take note of its economic stake in Canada and of the welfare of its own citizens when it contemplates action against Canada. As a result of this constant interplay, it is not surprising that Canada is sensitive to what it perceives as heavy-handed actions or intrusions into Canadian affairs by the United States. The perennial Canadian concern is to balance the practical advantages of interdependence with the United States against the political need to assert Canada's identity as a separate state in North America.

Consultation between Canada and the United States appears to be taking on a more structured form in recent years. Shortly after he became prime minister, Brian Mulroney journeyed to Washington to meet President Ronald Reagan. The two leaders agreed to hold annual meetings in each other's country and these have been held regularly since 1985. Since 1982 the Canadian minister of foreign affairs and the American secretary of state have met every three months to review irritants between their two countries. Through these sessions information has been exchanged and positions explained on a long list of bilateral issues. These range from trade protectionism to acid rain to northern defence to the seaward extension of maritime boundaries to global issues such as East-West relations. The list is endless but so it has been since the beginning of the relationship. The most critical test of Canada's resourcefulness has always been how to live distinct from, but in harmony with, the United States.

International Trade

Ever since colonial times Canada has derived much of its income from its ability to sell its products abroad. The returns from export trade provide 30 per cent of Canada's national income, a figure which makes the country a leading world trader on a per capita basis.[3] There are certain features of Canada's trading position which are disturbing and which have been the subject of the government's attention. For instance, Canada is a major seller of both raw materials and manufactured goods. But almost all the manufactured goods (principally automobiles and parts) go to the United States as part of the 77 per cent of Canada's exports that go to that market. With Canada's other trading partners the commodities sold are raw materials, semi-processed goods and food stuffs. These items, for instance, account for 96 per cent of Canada's exports to Japan. This is a condition Canada wishes to correct in order to bring about a more balanced mix of commodities in its export trade.

Raw materials, traditionally the backbone of Canada's export trade, also face serious problems under current world trading conditions. Canada's resources, drawn from mines and forests, are becoming more expensive to exploit as more accessible locations become depleted. Developing countries are coming on the world market with large supplies of resource materials produced at very low costs. Agricultural subsidies, in the United States and in the European Community, are undercutting some of Canada's traditional markets for grains and livestock. These factors have contributed to a worrying decline in demand for Canada's natural resources. Governments and business have raised the cry that the Canadian economy must become more competitive internationally. There has been some progress recorded towards this goal but it must also be remembered that at the same time Canadians desire to maintain their level of personal incomes and high standard of living. To make competitiveness compatible with this objective will require management and technological competence of a very high order.

To gain its trading objectives, the Canadian government is pursu-

ing a program of trade promotion with great vigour. Some years ago, the trade commissioner service was removed from the Department of Trade and Commerce and incorporated into the Department of External Affairs. Today, about one-third of the personnel at External Affairs are concerned with trade promotion and economic policy work. A diversification of Canada's markets is underway, although the heavy preponderance of exports to the United States has, as yet, not been affected. The United States is still Canada's largest and fastest-growing export market but countries around the Pacific rim are taking a larger proportion of Canada's exports than older European trading partners. In 1982, for the first time, Canada's two-way trade across the Pacific was greater than the volume of her trade across the Atlantic. This condition has been repeated each year since, with Japan, Korea and Taiwan, Canada's largest markets in Asia.

Throughout the forty years of its history, GATT has received Canada's strong support. Canada has participated in each of the seven completed rounds of trade bargaining sponsored by GATT and has derived important benefits from the trade liberalization which has resulted. As a negotiator, Canada feels more at home and has been more successful in pursuing her objectives in a multilateral setting such as GATT provides. In multilateral negotiations she can find allies and strike deals that would not be possible if she were acting alone. Yet there are problems in relying on the GATT procedures to achieve meaningful tariff reductions. One lies in the fact that great trading powers such as the United States and Japan, and massive trading blocs such as the European Community are coming to negotiate between themselves and then offer the results to the smaller nations. These are not always favourable to a country such as Canada. A second problem is the slow pace of GATT negotiations and implementation. In the case of the recent Tokyo round of GATT, for instance, it took six years to conclude the negotiations and eight years to implement their results.

In spite of these disadvantages, Canada continues to use GATT as a means of forwarding her trade objectives. She spent a good deal of time in laying the preparations for the eighth round of GATT discussions, the Uruguay round, which received final approval in January

1987. This is to be the most complex round of trade negotiations ever undertaken under GATT auspices. Not only is the difficult question of agricultural subsidies to be taken up (a subject for which Canada lobbied hard to be placed on the agenda) but other topics such as trade in services, trade-related investment and aspects of patents and copyright figuring in international trade are to be examined. This will clearly be a difficult negotiation for Canada and the world's trading nations.

To complement the negotiations under GATT, Canada is also pursuing negotiations with the United States to conclude a long-term comprehensive free trade agreement. The increasing impact of United States' protectionist moves brought about this initiative, which has its roots in 130 years of Canadian history. Although about 80 per cent of Canadian-American trade is already on a duty-free basis, important duties remain and there is always the possibility that a duty-free provision will be withdrawn. There is also the tendency for United States interests who feel threatened by foreign competition to apply for countervailing duties from the United States International Trade Commission. The arbitrary imposition of such duties has caused adjustment problems to several Canadian industries such as softwood lumber, shakes and shingles and potash during the past year. It is estimated that United States countervailing duties have affected about $6.5 billion worth of Canadian products from every category of commodity. A free trade agreement would provide binding duty-free provisions and, happily, would enable a joint mechanism to be created which would adjudicate Canadian-American trade disputes. The negotiations began last year and are scheduled to be concluded in October of this year. It is impossible both to predict the shape of a future agreement and to determine whether or not it will gain approval from a Canada which has not made up its mind about the costs and benefits and a United States in which protectionist forces are in the ascendancy in Congress.

In the making of international economic policy the summits of the seven industrialized nations and the specialized meetings of finance ministers associated with the summits are important forums for discussion. Canada was invited to participate in the economic summit meetings and has played host to the sessions once. Next year the

economic summit will meet in Toronto. A year ago Canada was invited to join in the discussions of the Group of Seven finance ministers, another body in which she could put forward her views and receive the opinions of the strongest economic powers in the world.

Development Assistance

Canada has seen support for development as a central feature of her foreign policy effort. It recognizes the interdependence of the contemporary world. Prosperity in one part of the earth cannot be assured if there is deprivation and misery in another. Similarly, instability in one region may threaten the peace and order in anotner.

The reasons for Canada's commitment to development are to be found in the humanitarian impulses of the Canadian people. This is a more important motive than those associated with attaining trade or influence through the provision of development assistance. It goes back to the sentiment which sent missionaries, teachers and medical personnel from Canada's shores in the nineteenth century. It touches also the objective which underlies Canada's network of social services: that its benefits should be freely and equally available to all Canadians, regardless of their status or location. As Mr. Trudeau's foreign policy review put it: "A society able to ignore poverty abroad will find it much easier to ignore it at home; a society concerned about poverty and development abroad will be concerned about poverty and development at home."[4]

Over the years, Canada's contribution to development assistance for the Third World has been considerable. Among the seven leading industrial powers participating in the economic summit, she ranks third in the ratio of official development assistance (ODA) to her gross national product. Her ODA, in recent years, has amounted to about $70 a year for every Canadian. The sum provided comes to a total of $2 billion a year. As a proportion of the gross national product it stands at 0.5 per cent, a level the Mulroney government is determined to raise. By 1990 the government hopes to bring the proportion to 0.6 per cent and by 1995 to 0.7 per cent, the figure recommended almost twenty years ago as a desirable target by a World Bank Commission under

Lester Pearson.

How is Canadian development assistance distributed? In its geographical range it goes in equal measure to Africa and Asia, each with 42 per cent. The remainder (16 per cent) goes to Latin America and the Caribbean. The division of aid within African countries shows how development assistance has been shaped to reflect Canada's bicultural society. Half goes to anglophone countries in Africa, half to francophone. Within this distribution, it is provided that about 80 per cent of Canadian assistance goes to the poorest countries of the continent. The aid is also distributed according to occupational and economic priorities in order to enhance its effectiveness. The sectors which have been identified by the Canadian government for emphasis are agriculture, energy and human resource development. In the last sector, special attention is paid to the vital role of women in development.

Almost half Canada's development aid (45 per cent) consists of direct bilateral transfers in which it is specified that two-thirds must be in the form of Canadian content. Although this proportion has been criticized by some aid agencies as being too high, it provides a direct benefit to Canadian suppliers and thus serves a practical political reality of self-interest. 37 per cent of Canada's assistance is distributed through multilateral organizations such as the United Nations and the Commonwealth. Another 10 per cent goes to the voluntary sector, which has proved in recent years to be a most effective channel for the delivery of assistance. Government support, combined with private support, makes possible some 4,000 development projects administered by 400 non-governmental organizations. Business is also involved, with 2,000 businesses operating in 100 countries which have private and public backing from Canada.

The Canadian government is also very conscious of the obstacle debt repayment presents to the economic growth of Third World countries. In recent years this responsibility has consumed more and more of the export earnings of the developing states. The government has recommended that many debts contracted by Third World countries be cancelled by the lenders. Recently it has acted on this advice by stating that Canadian development assistance would be placed on an all grant basis. It declared a moratorium on the repayment of ODA from

all African countries south of the Sahara. In September, at the francophone conference held in Quebec City, it wrote off $325 million in debt for seven African countries. There is every indication that it will do the same for Commonwealth African countries in similar circumstances when the Commonwealth heads of government meet in Vancouver in October.

Immigration and Refugee Policy

Canada makes a distinction between its immigration policy, which is based on economic and social factors governing the country's capacity to absorb immigrants, and its refugee policy, which is an outgrowth of humanitarian sentiment. Immigration, to use the government's words, grows by a "moderate and controlled" rate, its limits set by immigration planning levels which are adjusted each year. The levels are based on the immigrants' contribution to economic growth, the humanitarian desire to see families in Canada reunited with their relatives and the long-term goal of overcoming the projected decrease in Canada's population that will occur at the end of the century. For 1987 the planning levels have been set at 115,000 to 125,000, with an effort being made to reach the higher level.[5] Whether these levels can be met is an open question. Annual immigration in recent years has rarely exceeded 90,000 people a year, the lowest levels since the early 1960's and a far cry from the 400,000 people who entered Canada during the height of prairie settlement in 1913.

What is interesting about Canada's immigration flows is the change in their composition. The old emphasis, pronounced for many years, on immigrants from Western and Central Europe and the Mediterranean countries has been replaced by flows from Asia. Asian countries, especially Hong Kong, India and Vietnam, now account for almost half Canada's immigrants, twice as many as from Europe. The United States and Caribbean countries make up the next largest groups.[6] The change is partly due to "colour blind" immigration criteria introduced in the early 1960's which assigned points based on their background and training as the basis for an immigrant's entry into Canada. The fact that there is now an "entrepreneurial category" by

which individuals who can bring capital to Canada are assured entry has also helped to increase the numbers from a country such as Hong Kong.

Refugee arrivals are less predictable, if only because conditions of political instability appear in one corner of the world, then move to another. Poland was a large source of refugees in the early years of the decade but it has now declined, to be replaced by Central America. Vietnam has been a constant source of refugees, although not at the 1975-80 levels when 60,000 Indo-Chinese "boat people" were admitted into Canada.[7] Central America is now contributing a larger share of refugees. What is unmistakable is that the number of refugees on the move is increasing alarmingly and that more of them are being shunted on from the country of their first refuge to a second or a third. Canada's system for determining the validity of refugee claims is breaking down as the numbers swell. In 1981 there were 3,450 refugee claims, in 1986 18,000 and this year it is projected there will be 25,000. The result is a delay of five years or more in determining refugee status. One reason for the growth in claims is the number of people who are abusing the refugee system to gain entrance into Canada. The government has promised to deal sternly with those who violate the procedures and has introduced legislation to make determination less cumbersome and much speedier. Other refugees come with government or voluntary support with the result that it is estimated that Canada's refugee total is about 20,000 a year. In addition to accepting the displaced and persecuted, the Canadian government makes available large sums of money for the transportation and language and job training of refugees. Other expenditures go to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees and the Red Cross, to be spent on refugee camps abroad. For this effort in providing refuge to the victims of the world's conflicts, the government and people of Canada were awarded the Nansen Medal in 1986.

Human Rights

A comparatively recent addition to Canada's diplomatic inventory is a concern for human rights. The interest in this subject is not unlike

that relating to development efforts. Canada has a high standard of human rights at home and wishes to express these standards in her foreign policy. She believes human rights represent universal values and that countries are justified in pointing this out to others if those values are abused. Thus she has spoken out, over the years, concerning violations of human rights in many corners of the world.

Canada has worked through international agencies to address the problems created by human rights violations. The United Nations has possessed a Human Rights Commission since 1945 and Canada has been a member of it on several occasions. The Commmonwealth has also set up a human rights office. Voluntary agencies such as Amnesty International have an influence on official human rights policy and the Canadian Parliament has recently created a Standing Committee on Human Rights to keep a watch on the subject.

The great problem with human rights on the international level is that there is no enforcement mechanism. Countries have a punitive power in that they can withhold development assistance in the case of states which have persistently abused the rights of their citizens. Thus Canada suspended external aid to Idi Amin's Uganda and to Guatemala because of serious human rights violations. She has also endeavoured to use resources to promote an awareness of human rights and to encourage the establishment of mechanisms to shore-up human rights in countries where this is possible. This has meant helping in creating democratic election procedures, representative institutions and trade unions. This course of action presents many difficulties and performance is hard to measure but it is one to which Canada plans to give more attention in coming years.

Canada's most active concern for human rights violations has been centred on the system of institutionalized racism in South Africa known as apartheid. Here Canada's forum has been the Commonwealth, with its noble declaration of principles of racial equality enunciated in 1971. The fact that the so-called "front-line states" around South Africa are members of the Commonwealth makes that association an appropriate place to consult on economic sanctions against South Africa. Although Great Britain objected, the Commonwealth adopted a plan of sanctions at its meeting in Nassau, the

Bahamas, in 1985. Commonwealth countries called on South Africa to take steps to terminate the state of emergency declared in the country, release Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners, lift the ban on the African National Congress and commence a dialogue with various elements in South Africa leading to a non-racial and representative government. Since 1985 Canada has pursued these objectives by various means with, it is admitted, meagre results.

Another area of Canadian concern in the human rights field has been Central America, where revolution and outside intervention have created conditions of disorder and bloodshed. Canada has received annually in recent years 9,000 refugees from Central America, mainly from El Salvador and Nicaragua. It has also given its diplomatic support to the initiatives of the Contadora group of countries (Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama), which has opposed outside intervention in Central America and attempted to promote dialogue between the contending parties. Afghanistan is another country eliciting Canada's sympathy in its present difficulties. Medical help has been supplied to Afghan refugees in Pakistan but humanitarian measures have been difficult to carry out in this distant region.

Canada's Defence

The present defence policies of Canada link two of the Mulroney government's foreign policy objectives: peace and security and sovereignty and independence. The principal purpose of Canada's defence forces is to protect the country's sovereignty, that is to maintain surveillance and control over its vast Northern territories and its coastline on three oceans. Sovereignty may be considered another way of saying "nationalism" and nationalism is a powerful sentiment in Canada today. Thus it is difficult for nationalists, even though they may be unhappy with the size of the defence budget or the place of the military in Canadian life, to criticize the government's defence policies. The policy of the Mulroney government in defence differs sharply from that of the Trudeau government. It has returned to the view that NATO is central in the constellation of Canada's external policies. It is determined to make clear that Canada is an unshakable member of the

Western alliance opposed to the Soviet Union. Trudeau may have postulated Canada as pursuing an independent course between the Western and Eastern camps but this is not Brian Mulroney's position. Canada is a member of NATO, which both protects her and offers her a chance to exert influence in the Western alliance. In effect Canada sees the world in 1987, at least in its military dimensions, as it is seen by Washington, London and Paris.

The Mulroney government's Defence White Paper of June, 1987 left no doubt regarding the basis of separation between East and West. In a summary of the paper it was stated that the two groups of states are "divided on how politics should be conducted, society ordered and economies structured. They are divided on the value of personal freedom, on the importance of the rule of law and on the proper relationship of the individual to the society. In this struggle, Canada is not neutral."[8] The test of strength with the Soviet Union brings Canada into a close relationship with her historic mother countries, Britain and France, as well as with her great neighbour, the United States, which leads the alliance. As an ally Canada has more opportunity to influence United States global policies than if she were a disinterested neutral. It has been said that Canada's influence in Washington, limited as it is on certain questions, gives her a higher standing in discussions with other states.

Canada's armed forces in 1987 stand at 84,000 regular personnel and 25,000 reservists. This is a small advance in the size of the force from the Trudeau years. The defence establishment faces four principal tasks which have not changed significantly over recent years.

1. To maintain a surveillance of Canada's North and her coastline, the longest of any country in the world. To provide domestic security, such as aid to the civil power, and to carry out search and rescue operations in and around Canada.

2. To assist in the protection of the United States' strategic deterrent (based on diversified nuclear forces) through Canada's membership in the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD).

3. To uphold Canada's NATO commitments related to the defence of Central Europe but also including the protection of North Atlantic

sea routes.

4. To supply forces for peacekeeping missions which are endorsed by the government.

There is no question, in 1987, that Canada's forces are spread very thinly over these tasks. On land they suffer from serious equipment shortages and an inadequate number of combat-ready soldiers. At sea they have too few ships, submarines and minesweepers. In the air they experience shortages of transport planes, maritime patrol aircraft and modern armament. This is not surprising for during a quarter of a century they have undergone a serious decline in their proportion of the federal budget. In 1962 defence expenditures amounted to 25 per cent of federal expenditures; in 1986 the figure was only 10 per cent. As a percentage of the gross national product defence expenditures have fallen from 4 per cent to 2 per cent over the same period.[9]

Shortly after it came into office the Mulroney government began to implement its campaign promise that more would be done to strengthen Canada's armed forces. It increased the size of the NATO contingent in Europe from 5,000 to 7,500 people. Later it cancelled the pledge, which it believed to be unsustainable, to send a Canadian brigade group and two fighter squadrons to re-inforce the northern flank of NATO in Norway. Instead, it directed that the Canadian effort in Europe was to be concentrated on the central front where the brigade in southern Germany would be backed, in an emergency, by a second stationed in Canada. It also announced that the county's reserve force would be increased to 90,000 and given more signigicant responsibilities.

More important for Canada's military capability is the long-term plan by the Mulroney government to spend $200 billion over the next fifteen years to purchase new equipment for the forces. There would be six new frigates, in addition to the six now under construction, for the navy. There would be 10-12 nuclear-powered submarines for Arctic and coastal patrols. There would be more anti-submarine helicopters and minesweepers. For the air force there would be six new long-range patrol aircraft for surveillance. There would be improved weapons for the CF-18 jet fighter and four new air bases in the North designed to improve the efficiency of this short-range aircraft. There would be new battle tanks for the army.[10]

The emphasis on North American defence embodied in these purchases arose from the existence of a new bomber threat from the Soviet Union, a threat that was compounded by the fact that low-flying cruise missiles could be launched over the Arctic or the oceans from these bombers. Canada and the United States agreed in 1985 to upgrade their aging radar defence screen across northern Canada from Alaska to Greenland. The new North Warning System offered a much better perimeter defence radar having the capacity to peer over the horizon to pick up incoming aircraft and missiles. Eventually it would be linked to satellites looking down from space. The two countries also renewed for five years their collaboration in the integrated NORAD structure of air defence.

There exists a problem in North American defence, however, which the two countries have been unable to solve. This is the legal status of the Northwest Passage, the historic route that runs through the Arctic islands north of the continent. The United States claims the passage is an international strait, even though it has rarely been successfully traversed, while Canada asserts that it is part of the country's internal waters. The islands of the Arctic, comprising 2.4 million square miles, are acknowledged by all countries to belong to Canada. Around them Canada has extended her territorial sea from three to twelve miles. The question of the ownership of the Arctic waters did not arise until 1969 when, with the development of oil drilling in northern Alaska, a United States oil company decided to investigate the use of the Northwest Passge for the movement of oil. The strengthened tanker Manhattan made a transit through the passage which Canada protested vigorously. The next year the Trudeau government enacted severe pollution control legislation to safeguard the fragile ecology of the icy Arctic waters. In 1985 the United States again challenged Canada's Arctic sovereignty by sending a government icebreaker, the Polar Sea, through the passage. Again Canada protested that her permission should have been sought beforehand. This time she supported her protest with plans to back up her claim to sovereignty. Straight baselines were proclaimed around the Arctic islands to extend Canada's territorial sea, more aerial surveillance of the area was provided and naval manoeuvres were scheduled for the Eastern Arctic.

Most importantly, the government announced that it would build a class 8 icebreaker, capable of moving through the thickest ice, to give the country a presence everywhere in the Arctic.[11]

The low world price of oil has discouraged further northern oil exploration for the time being, so it is unlikely the Arctic seas will be used for commercial navigation for some years. There is concern, though, that Soviet submarines regularly visit Canada's Arctic waters. The United States and Canada continue to discuss the legal status of the Northwest Passage. The United States' unwillingness to acknowledge that the strait might fall within Canadian jurisdiction derives from its fear that a concession here would set a precedent for other disputes concerning navigable straits. Perhaps the best solution for the problem would be for Canada to allow passage of its Arctic waters by American vessels in return for an American acknowledgment of Canada's territorial rights over the strait.

Disarmament and Arms Control

Canada's defence efforts are complemented by a responsibility to promote disarmament. This goes back to the end of the Second World War when Canada's research into the development of the atomic bomb gained her a place on the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. At this time Canada decided to forego the acquisition of nuclear weapons, the first "nuclear capable" country to do so. Although Canada possessed nuclear weapons later through military cooperation with the United States and deployed them both in Europe and North America, she gave them up in the early 1970's and has had nothing to do with them since. In nuclear disarmament efforts Canada has suggested a comprehensive set of arms control measures. It has given particular attention to the problem of verification, conducting research into seismic technology for detecting low-yield nuclear tests at a facility in the Northwest Territories. It has also strongly resisted the spread of nuclear weapons through upholding the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968). As a supplier of nuclear materials it has taken a leading role at suppliers, conferences and in the International Atomic Energy Authority to develop safeguards to prevent nuclear materials from being

used for the production of atomic weapons.

In the field of conventional arms Canada has been active in United Nations conferences, in the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction meetings in Vienna and in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. In the latter meeting she has put forward measures to help create a "climate of confidence" across the Iron Curtain. Proposals have included an expansion of scientific and cultural exchanges, the free movement of people and ideas and more stress on human rights. Its criteria for such measures is that they be significant, politically binding and capable of being verified in an adequate manner. It has supported a global ban on chemical weapons and joined with other countries in pressing for an agreement that there will not be an arms race in outer space. On the controversial Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) of President Reagan, the Mulroney government is cautious. It recognizes that as the Soviet Union has conducted strategic defence experiments in space, it is only prudent that the United States do likewise. However, Canada believes that this research must comply with existing treaties prohibiting all but basic research on defensive systems.[12] The Canadian government has refused to join with the United States in joint research on the SDI, although it has not forbidden private groups in Canada from bidding for SDI contracts.

Mediation and Peacekeeping

Canada's role as a moderating element in international disputes represents one of the best-known of its international functions. The country's historical experience has helped to give it qualifications for this task. As a North American country Canada was far removed from most of the world's trouble spots in the post-1945 years; the Middle East, Southeast Asia and Eastern Europe. It had never been a colonial power; indeed for much of its history it had been a dependency within a great empire. Thus it was not regarded suspiciously by countries recently liberated from colonial rule. These factors gave Canada a disinterested position in disputes between many states.

These disputes, often leading to armed conflicts, have been numerous since the end of the Second World War. While there have been no

hostilities between European countries for the last forty years, it is estimated that there have been 160 wars in other parts of the world during the same period. Canada has offered her services to resolve some of these conflicts. In some cases she has simply taken part in fact-finding missions, in other instances she has been a go-between or a mediator. She has come forward only where her presence appeared to have the potential to be useful and where she possessed experience appropriate to the nature of the problem. She has preferred to serve in operations sponsored by the United Nations, believing that a multilateral setting offers the best means of resolving disputes.

The best-known role which Canada has played in pursuing a mediatory function is that of a peacekeeper. Here her forces are interposed between the parties to a dispute to ensure that the conditions of a cease-fire are observed. Peacekeepers by nature need to be seen as thoroughly objective and it is for this reason that most peacekeeping forces have been drawn from non-aligned countries. But Canada, although a country firmly linked to the West, has been asked to serve on every United Nations peacekeeping mission established since 1945. She has also served on two independent commissions supervising the peace in Indochina. Over the years she has built up skills in communication and transportation that have been especially valuable to peacekeeping operations. Some of her tours of duty as a peacekeeper have been extensive. Some have been frustrating. But they have served a purpose. In Cyprus, for instance, she has provided over 500 troops for over twenty years to separate the warring Greek and Turkish factions. Her presence in Cyprus has prevented bloodshed on the island. It has curtailed the possibility of a war between two NATO allies that would have weakened the effectiveness of the alliance. In this case, peacekeeping in Cyprus has had a moderating effect far beyond the shores of the island.

For a variety of reasons, although regional conflicts continue, the United Nations has not been invited to help in their resolution. There has been no United Nations peacekeeping force established outside the Middle East since 1965. Canada deplores the failure of countries immersed in regional conflicts to seek the mediatory services of the United Nations. It stands ready to take part in any future peacekeeping

ventures where its participation might be useful.

Notes

1 *Foreign Policy for Canadians* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer for Canada, 1970). Relations with the United States, which were not treated in the original review, were discussed in "Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future" by Mitchell Sharp, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in *International Perspectives* (Ottawa: Autumn, 1972), pp. 1-24. A statement on defence policy, *White Paper on Defence*, was published during the same period (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1971). The best discussion of the process by which the policy review was conducted is in Bruce Thordarson, *Trudeau and Foreign Policy: A Study in Decision-Making* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1972).

2 The foreign policy objectives of the Mulroney government are set forth in three reports.

(i) *Competitiveness and Security, Directions for Canada's International Relations*, a paper prepared for discussion by Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1985).

(ii) *Independence and Internationalism*, Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on Canada's International Relations (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1986).

(iii) *Canada's International Relations*, Response of the Government of Canada to the Report of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons (Ottawa : Supply and Services Canada, 1986).

Much of the contents of this paper is drawn from these publications.

3 *Trade Negotiations, Securing Canada's Future* (Ottawa: External Affairs Canada, 1987), p. 4. This publication, issued as background material for the Canada-United States free trade negotiations, contains valuable information on Canada's position as a world trader, as does *Competitiveness and Security*.

4 *Foreign Policy for Canadians: International Development* (Ottawa, 1970), p. 9.

5 *Annual Report to Parliament on Future Immigration Levels* (Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada, 1986), p. i.

6 *Immigration Statistics, 1984* (Ottawa: Employment and Immigration Canada, 1986).

7 *Independence and Internationalism*, p. 106.

8 *Challenge and Commitment, A Defence Policy for Canada, A Synopsis of the Defence White Paper* (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1987), p. 3.
9 *Challenge and Commitment*, p. 9.
10 Statement by Perrin Beatty, Minister of National Defence, in the House of Commons, 5 June 1987.
11 Statement by Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, in the House of Commons, 10 September 1985.
12 *Canada's International Relations*, p. 13.

Additional Sources

The best and most recent account of the historical development of Canada's external relations are the two volumes by C.P. Stacey: *Canada and the Age of Conflict*, I, *1867-1921* (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1977) and II, *1921-1948, The Mackenzie King Era* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981). The "golden age" of Canada's internationalist diplomacy is well described in John W. Holmes, *Canada and the Search for World Order, 1943-1957*, I (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), II (University of Toronto Press, 1982). The same author has written a stimulating account of Canada's relationship with the United States: *Life with Uncle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981). This work has recently been translated into Japanese by Kazuhiko Okuda (1987). Statements of the foreign policy goals of the Trudeau and Mulroney governments are found in the official publications listed in the references to the essay.