

# Statement

Secretary of  
State for  
External Affairs



# Déclaration

Secrétaire d'État  
aux Affaires  
extérieures

**92/10**

**NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY  
THE HONOURABLE BARBARA McDOUGALL,  
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,  
TO THE  
WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL**

**LOS ANGELES, California  
March 4, 1992**

Affaires extérieures et  
Commerce extérieur Canada

External Affairs and  
International Trade Canada

Canada

## **The Role of Values**

Vaclav Havel has observed that the end of Communism has brought to an end not just the 19th and 20th centuries, but the modern age as a whole. He characterizes the fall of Communism as a victory for life, human individuality and pluralism, over misplaced confidence in systems and social design. Our future lies not just in our abilities, but in the soundness and justice of our instincts and values. He refers to the defeat of Communism as a powerful signal coming at the 11th hour when we all know civilization is in danger.

I start with this point because there are notions around that the end of the Cold War is a signal that we can withdraw from the world, as if what happens in other places is now of concern only to the people who live there. This is seen in the rise of political fundamentalism in Canada, and it is certainly true in the current election race here in the United States.

## **The Need for Global Effort**

You don't need reminding that global economic recovery can only be achieved by global effort, that the ozone layer can only be mended if we do it together, or that other common dangers surround us.

Is nuclear terrorism any less believable now, given the kind of political changes we've seen since 1988? Is the fact that per capita incomes in Africa are lower than they were in 1960 a problem for North Americans? Will there be refugees from war and poverty-stricken areas? Will there be violent leaders of desperate people? Will there be other dangers?

Of course, there will. But there are also unique opportunities that our two countries and others must seize.

At the end of the Cold War, the world is poised before different possibilities of future history. The two extreme versions are a potentially catastrophic fragmentation into rivalry and disorder on the one hand and the responsible promotion of the best in human potential on the other.

## **Working Together**

In either version, countries and continents will be interdependent -- we will all be dragged down by waves of disorder or we will share the benefits of working together.

Just to be clear -- I do not mean that by working together we can solve every problem, ease every hardship, and create a perfectly predictable order through one more social design on a global scale. We can't. But we can create a framework for international co-operation based on the best of what we have

learned about people that will be in our own best interests -- economic and political.

The North American continent has to be a forge for that effort, drawing again from the values and hopes that brought people by the millions to the New World. Out of idealism, we should become that forge. But we must do so also out of profound self-interest, conscious that the multilateral route is the only way we can reach the sort of security we need in order to deal with our own problems at home.

Currently, economic problems are very much on the minds of political leaders in both Canada and the United States, and also in other Group of Seven (G-7) nations.

### **Economic Recovery**

Putting people to work is an immediate preoccupation, and we ought to know by now that we can't do it by competitive national policies.

We can't be afraid of competition. Canada isn't, which is why we are willing to extend our still young Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement to Mexico, despite some major irritants under the Canada-U.S. Agreement.

But, multilaterally as well as bilaterally, that competition has to be fair. It is time -- maybe the last time -- for leaders of the world's principal traders to agree to that, and to mean what they say.

Canada has been urging that the easing of barriers to trade envisaged by the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations must succeed in a way which is sensitive to the real lives and needs of our people -- both as workers and consumers. Our economic security can't be built in a vacuum. That is why Canada aims at measures to strengthen the economies of developing countries as well as our own, and developing countries will be beneficiaries under the Uruguay Round.

This is also why we urge multilateral organizations to turn to questions of political and now even environmental security measures as well as economic.

Recognition of the interdependence -- of countries, and of issues -- is what will provide security and predictability for ourselves.

## Democracy and Good Government

Our chances are greatly enhanced by the fact that the world is now near to a consensus on democracy. This is a great victory (not without its challenges, as we constantly remind ourselves) but a victory which we do not yet fully comprehend.

It is, in part, a question of promoting a shared value system.

Liberal economies based on the principles of the market cannot easily develop and thrive without political pluralism as well.

Aid -- humanitarian or economic -- to closed societies is money gone to waste, in support of governments that follow false priorities of personal prestige and grandeur. That is why our country is increasingly linking our developmental assistance to human rights and good governance.

It is also a matter of security. Real democracies are less likely to attack each other. They are less likely to overspend on weapons.

Finally, it is a question of effective political co-operation. Much has been written about the new effectiveness of the United Nations since the end of the Cold War. But it is not just because the Soviet Union -- now replaced by Russia -- doesn't any longer veto collective action. It is also due to the fact that around the table are representatives of governments elected to do the right thing -- not, as a decade or two ago, the thing which worked best for their bloc or ideology or regional bias -- but the right thing in terms of an increasingly shared view of right and wrong.

## Right Versus Wrong

That was the force of the United Nations decision to reverse Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

The eventual use of force to do this -- which, by the way, we all hoped and tried to avoid -- was not a power play by a country, or a set of specific interests. It was authorized by the Security Council as being sadly necessary if there was to be a defensible concept of right over wrong in international affairs.

Without that authorization, Canada and many other coalition partners would not have had the public support for participation in the force at all.

The UN action in Iraq was comparably popular both in this country and in Canada, but for somewhat different underlying reasons. In the U.S., it was seen as a victory for U.S. weapons technology.

In Canada, it was seen, rightly, as a victory for the United Nations and for right over wrong.

### The United Nations

Canada has always been a staunch defender and supporter of the U.N., and as the U.N. pursues its objectives with renewed vigour, the wisdom of that loyalty is clear. We have been calling for structural change at the UN to ensure that it is better equipped to deal with contemporary challenges.

Therefore, we're pleased that the Security Council, in an unprecedented summit level meeting just over a month ago, called for a report on how to strengthen the world organization's effectiveness. Since then, large peacekeeping forces have been designed for two of the world's most volatile trouble spots, Yugoslavia and Cambodia. They are costly, as some of your own Congressmen pointed out yesterday, but the alternatives are costlier. War is not cheap.

In some cases, as well, these operations may be dangerous. Canada, in agreeing to go to Yugoslavia -- we are the largest contingent in the force -- accepts the danger because we cannot accept standing aside to witness killing and destruction. We have to conclude sometimes that there are parties to such conflicts who will not reason, to whom sanctions or incentives are meaningless.

The problem is that Saddam Hussein, the Khmer Rouge, or out-of-control and overarmed bands of racist thugs seem to happen. I know -- I saw some nervous guns in Haiti shortly after the overthrow of President Aristide.

The United Nations is our best hope, but we have to work at it, and we have to fund it appropriately. It would help if many countries, including the U.S., would pay their bills.

But the UN is not our only instrument. The Organization of American States (OAS), including Canada, took a strong stand in Haiti and we must stand by our objective to ensure that democracy returns to that tragic little country.

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) also has a role. With effort, conflicts can be prevented beforehand. The sorts of conciliation and confidence-building mechanisms we are building in the CSCE can help to get at problems before the shooting starts.

The best news is that, as the numbers of democracies increase, there is an easier consensus as to what to do. Tyrannies can no longer take refuge in their presumed right to do whatever they want within their own borders. A doctrine of humanitarian

intervention is beginning to emerge, largely because consensus on human rights now appears at least possible.

### **The United Nations and Democracy**

The most effective form of conflict prevention is the promotion of democracy. The United Nations and other bodies do this by monitoring and aiding the electoral process.

But take care; democracy is more than elections. It is a process, a culture even, that incorporates accountability, an independent judiciary, freedom from censorship, a tolerance of minorities and a sense of pluralism.

These are not easy for everyone to learn. We have to extend our help to countries building these reflexes into their cultures and not simply walk away the day after the election.

Of course, we must react strongly to abuses. But we need to get at the hearts of people before the abuses occur.

### **The Ex-U.S.S.R.**

For many years, our security was seen only through the prism of the intentions and capabilities of the U.S.S.R. Today, Russia and other republics in the Commonwealth of Independent States are allies in our efforts to build a democratic world.

What has not changed is that our own security is still dependent on their realities because if they fail in their own efforts to build democracy our security will diminish.

In the immediate crisis, the multilateral community has helped; and, Secretary of State Baker, by convening a co-ordinating conference that included nations who have rarely graced the tables of donor countries before, did all of us a service.

At the same time, the new countries will continue to need us for some time to come. I have assured them that Canada will continue to be there. To date, Canada's assistance in dollar terms is about 40 per cent that of the U.S., and it was in California last September that my Prime Minister urged the world community to take these republics into its international systems.

This is more than ever necessary. Though the winter is not over, the Russians, Ukrainians and others have taken some tough economic decisions and their peoples have borne it stoically so far. We have helped them past the food crisis for now. They are in for the long haul, provided they can have the hope of real benefits. We have to be there for them in ways that work -- the

provision of business skills, co-operation on projects, political support for their newly democratic institutions.

#### **Ex-U.S.S.R. Arms**

To build a safer world, the U.S. has accepted its special responsibility to work with the Russians and other C.I.S. countries to build down nuclear weapons secured in the territory of the former Soviet Union. There is no more urgent need -- but still, there are other dangers.

It is international co-operation which will help to employ and challenge the ex-U.S.S.R. nuclear and missile scientists and engineers. Plans to do so are in the public domain from both Germany and the United States.

Together, we can help the Russians and other former Soviet countries construct export control regimes to keep their technology and software out of dangerous hands. But we also need to construct a new world regime to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile technology. This is world security problem number one, and our Prime Minister has called on all nations to tackle it head on.

#### **Nuclear Non-Proliferation**

If it can co-operate in no other area, the world must have a program to end nuclear proliferation. Canada advocates five specific steps.

One, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) initiated in 1968 must be extended indefinitely when it expires in 1995. This treaty, which creates legal obligations on the part of non-nuclear weapons states not to acquire nuclear weapons, has specific obligations for declared nuclear weapons states -- the five permanent members of the Security Council -- to do their part to reduce the nuclear threat.

The two of those who had not signed -- France and China -- now indicate that they will, thus improving the political climate for attracting other non-signatories, among whom are Brazil, Argentina, Algeria, India, Pakistan and Israel.

But we must not forget that Iraq had signed and yet pursued a secret nuclear weapons program for years. So the second point is to stop the cheating.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna is a United Nations agency whose role is to monitor the compliance of NPT signatories with safeguards against the diversion of nuclear materials to weapons use. The problem is that inspections are

limited to declared reactor sites. Secret sites are secret. The most frequently inspected countries are those that need it least -- Japan, Germany and Canada.

What we need is a system of "challenge" inspections, with recourse to the Security Council for authority if necessary. To do this, the IAEA will need more inspectors. For this, the IAEA will need more money and Canada is prepared to pay up. Let's remember that Canada -- very early in the postwar period -- had the basic capacity to develop nuclear weapons. We chose not to then and we choose not to today. We urge others to do the same.

Third, the countries able to supply the materials, technology, and know-how need tighter supplier controls. Full scope safeguards must be a condition of any supply. In my view, adherence to the NPT ought to be another condition. A strengthened missile technology control regime is a necessary complement.

Fourth, we have to build the sort of regional peace and security regimes which will give some of the non-signatories to the NPT the political basis to join. That is happening between Brazil and Argentina.

In Europe, the Helsinki Summit in July of the 48 members of the CSCE -- we two North Americans and 46 Europeans and climbing -- will strengthen the security regime for Europe.

But there remains a real problem in South Asia that your country is trying to resolve.

In the Middle East, a lasting peace settlement is the only security guarantee. The Middle East peace process, once again brokered by the U.S., in which Canada has a sensitive role dealing with refugees, is moving in that direction.

As for outlaw countries such as North Korea, Iraq and any others aiming at nuclear weapons, they must be cajoled, squeezed, isolated and made to pay economically. Rest assured, the United Nations won't let Saddam Hussein off the hook -- he can play for time, but his weapons manufacturing facilities are coming down.

Fifth, the developed world has to realize it's dependent on the political will of others if we are to stop nuclear proliferation. Nuclear co-operation for peaceful use has to be more available, on tightened terms of safety.

These five steps then need our support and other steps may need to be considered.

This issue -- ending the threat of nuclear proliferation -- moves to the heart of our security concerns and only global co-operation will solve it.



It is not only nuclear weapons, however. Chemical and biological weapons must also be eliminated. And so must plain old guns. Our Prime Minister -- just over a year ago in the midst of the shooting in the Gulf War -- called for better rules regarding conventional weapons. He pointed out that the permanent five had provided most of the weapons being used by Iraq, against us. He called on the U.S. to take strong action. And I'm happy to report that there is now a realistic proposal before the UN to increase transparency in trade in conventional weapons.

In our multilateral world, there is one final area where the need for international responsibility is clear -- the protection of our environment. In the Gulf War, Saddam Hussein introduced a new mechanism for destruction -- "environmental terrorism" -- which, when added to the already mindless or careless acts of destruction to our non-renewable resources, creates an even more pressing challenge to the nations of the world to come together to protect our natural habitat.

Canada's commerce, culture and heritage is closely connected with nature. We are proud that our two countries produced an excellent example of bilateral co-operation when we signed the Acid Rain Treaty. But we must involve more nations in such co-operative efforts.

Initiatives such as Agenda 21 and the Earth Charter, which will be discussed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) meetings in Rio de Janeiro, in June, will provide specific goals and standards of action for signatory nations.

The UNCED meetings will be an important step in the task of healing our planet. But the human energy and processes that come out of Rio must be sustained if we are to avoid permanent and critical damage to our natural environment.

Let me conclude, then, by calling on America to continue its leadership role in looking outward to achieve our common objectives. I have outlined six areas -- economic growth; democratic development; keeping the peace; disarmament upheaval in the Commonwealth states; and the environment -- where our goals will only be met by international co-operation. This does not mean, as Havel Vaclav underlined, seeking common denominators or reducing everything to a single common equation.

It does mean rehabilitating human action and the human spirit. These are the values on which our new world society is based. Both of our countries -- and particularly the U.S. -- must continue to rely on those instincts and build those efforts outward.