

be examined on its own merits and in light of the level of direct Canadian interest.

A careful judgment must be made as to the results that can be achieved. In some instances, a bilateral expression of Canadian concern about a situation may bring about positive change; in others, it may cause a negative reaction and do nothing to help the very persons or groups about which we are concerned. At times it is useful to make public the fact that we have interceded with a government. At others, it is counter-productive. We have had some limited success, I might note, in dealing bilaterally, and in the context of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, with Eastern European countries on humanitarian matters relating to the reunification of families. On the other hand, our efforts on broader human-rights issues, when dealt with bilaterally or within the CSCE context, have met with minimal success. Our broader human-rights concerns in relation to Eastern Europe may be better advanced by challenging Eastern European countries on the basis of the legal obligations they have assumed as parties to the international human-rights covenants. Their performance in terms of civil and political rights is, as is ours, thereby subject to scrutiny by the Human Rights Committee established under the terms of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. They and we must also report regularly on our progressive realization of the economic, social and cultural rights defined in the other covenant.

Action in the United Nations cannot be divorced from action outside the United Nations. Canada's relations with some countries are limited or, indeed, nonexistent, and there are, therefore, few possibilities for quiet diplomacy. I have in mind the cases of Uganda and Democratic Kampuchea. In the first case, our action at the Commonwealth heads-of-government meeting was followed up with pressure for action in the Human Rights Commission. In the second, after an on-the-spot enquiry carried out by Canadian officials among Kampuchean refugees, we provided a detailed report to the Human Rights Commission and called for action. I then spoke out in strong terms in the United Nations and called for action both by the General Assembly and by the Human Rights Commission. We had concluded that the self-imposed isolation of the Kampuchean Government made it essential to take unusually strong steps. We felt compelled to urge the international community to pay heed to the tragic situation prevailing in that beleaguered country.

We are keeping a close watch on the situation in Kampuchea and, as a member of the UN Human Rights Commission, will continue to seek a full investigation of the situation and corrective measures. In the interim, it is interesting to note that the Kampuchean Government has invited the Secretary-General to visit Kampuchea. We hope it is a sign that it has accepted the validity of international concern about the systematic murder and repression of its citizens. We shall continue to spare no effort in multi-lateral forums and in our bilateral contacts with influential countries in the area — countries such as China — to urge them to exert their influence in the interest of improving the situation in Kampuchea and in the whole Southeast Asia area.

---