

---

It's imperfect. What we've got in Haiti as a result of UN intervention isn't very pretty either, but nevertheless you see the shift from one foot to the other: the balance, the centre of gravity is shifting. What are the implications for foreign policy for Canada, which has always been a fairly safe country that could pick and choose where it put its emphasis in foreign policy, compared let's say to Bosnia, which doesn't have a lot of options?

What can Canada do that is useful to itself and to the world if these assumptions are valid? A good example of what we can do to take advantage of these changed conditions is what we did do last year: the Canadian initiative that led to the signing of an international treaty banning the production, possession, sale or use of anti-personnel mines anywhere. Now mines are not disappearing everywhere just yet, because some people wouldn't sign the treaty. Most notably the Americans wouldn't sign it. But consider for a moment that Canada would take on and push through a project with security implications that the Americans didn't like. This could not have happened before about 1993, and our tactics were very straightforward: basically, we shamed other governments into coming along. We launched a publicity process in alliance with non-governmental organizations, pressure groups our Foreign Affairs people never even spoke to 10 years ago, and we outflanked the governments one after another. They're all unhappy about defying the Americans, but one after another they are forced by their own domestic and public opinion to come into line with this Canadian proposal to ban landmines. And the long-term strategy of course is to do exactly the same to the Americans, to use their own public against them.

It hasn't worked yet, but wait. Clinton would have signed the treaty just like that if he had been free to. His problem was he had Jesse Helms in the Senate, who is fairly Neanderthal in these matters, and there were some other things he had to get through the Senate last year and so he didn't sign the landmines treaty. But this is the use of global mass media to push through a policy we wouldn't have dreamed of attempting even five years ago. So there is recognition in Ottawa of the change, and a fairly intelligent attempt to exploit our position and the new situation.

In a way, the task is to bring the legal realities of the world into step with what I think are already the moral realities of this changed world. And now there are new ways of addressing this agenda. When you can address global public opinion, stepping around the individual national interests of individual governments, and get a consensus on something like banning landmines — that's interesting. That's new.

Finally, a cautionary note. In the navy, as some of you may know, they have a thing called "stand easy," which is a sort of coffee break, smoke break, whatever. And my story concerns a former naval person who died and, of course, went to hell. Arriving at the gates of hell, he was met by the duty demon, who took