

# Statement

Secretary of  
State for  
External Affairs



# Déclaration

Secrétaire d'État  
aux Affaires  
extérieures

93/43

AS DELIVERED

**AN ADDRESS BY**  
**THE HONOURABLE BARBARA McDOUGALL,**  
**SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,**  
**TO THE**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE**  
**ON EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE**  
**MAIN ESTIMATES REVIEW**

**OTTAWA, Ontario**  
**May 27, 1993**

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee:

Today, since this may be my last appearance before you and to put my department's estimates in context, I would like to share with you some thoughts on what has happened over the past two years during the time I have been Minister of this portfolio.

It would be an understatement to say that it has been a period that has been challenging and unsettling for many people, but I think it has also provided us with opportunities for dealing with the future in ways that were unforeseeable several years ago. I think, however, that as Canadians we can be extremely proud of our role in dealing with these tumultuous times and in shaping the post-Cold War agenda. Despite the unpredictability and fluidity of events, our current foreign policy, based on co-operative security, sustainable prosperity, and securing democracy and respect for human values, accurately responds to the priorities facing the international community in the 1990s, as well as Canada. Therefore, I think we are well positioned to continue to play a leadership role in this period.

I do not suggest that we have had all the answers to all the questions. But we do have a framework for building a comprehensive and global approach for the promotion of Canadian interests and the resolution of conflict, and those values and those objectives that we have outlined are indeed being echoed now more than ever by others in the world.

If we look back at our record over the past two years, and at the decisions that we have taken to respond to the new international environment, we can clearly see these priorities reflected.

Perhaps the most significant development in the past two years has been the recognition of and the renewed respect for peacekeeping, in all of its forms, as the preferred option for resolving conflict.

We have worked vigorously to ensure that our policies and our operations have kept pace with the changes that have taken place in the nature and number of demands for peacekeeping missions. In February, I hosted a meeting of experts to hear a number of views as well as the latest information from the field on a wide range of peacekeeping activities.

Over the past few weeks I have visited Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Somalia, to see first-hand what is going on and to hear directly from our Canadian peacekeepers and our allies about the current status of our missions.

One of the most difficult challenges has been the sharp increase in the number of peacekeeping missions. Canada is currently engaged in 15 peacekeeping missions, providing approximately 10 percent of the world's peacekeepers. As the number of UN operations has grown, our assessed contribution has grown

proportionally to exceed \$90 million. Peacekeeping will cost the United Nations US\$3.7 billion this year. Not only have the costs and the number of operations increased, but so too their nature, their scope and the risks involved.

The complexity and the difficulties of the conflicts facing the international community are nowhere better illustrated than in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The absence of an enduring ceasefire, the hatred and the atrocities committed on all sides to this conflict, profoundly challenge the traditional approach to peacekeeping. While trying to prevent further casualties, we must also deliver humanitarian assistance and relief to besieged populations. We must also deal with the treatment of war crimes and crimes against humanity. And all this, on a multilateral, co-operative basis.

As on many occasions, Canada has broken new ground. Canada was the first country to call for UN intervention in the Yugoslav conflict. The first battalion into Sarajevo in support of the humanitarian mission was Canadian. A few weeks ago, it was 150 Canadian soldiers who helped secure the first, as then unproclaimed, safe haven in the small Bosnian town of Srebrenica.

Canada has campaigned vigorously for the establishment of an international tribunal to prosecute war criminals. The UN has just adopted a resolution establishing an ad hoc tribunal for this purpose.

The war in Bosnia must be stopped, and an equitable settlement must be negotiated. Unfortunately, that solution has so far eluded us.

The Washington statement calls for further humanitarian assistance, effective sanctions on Serbia-Montenegro and the closing of the Serbian-Bosnian border. It seeks the rapid establishment of a war crimes tribunal, containment of the conflict, and warns Croatia against assisting Bosnian-Croat forces—something I myself had done when I was in Zagreb recently.

I want to make it very clear that, for Canada, the Washington statement is only an interim step. Today, while this issue is being debated in the Security Council, we have been in touch with our people in New York to ensure that this point of view is put forward very strongly. The Washington statement supports the Vance-Owen process and plan. What we are pressing for is something more explicit and, in the debate leading toward another resolution, that there is consideration of next steps in the implementation of Vance-Owen. These remain vital to a peaceful and just settlement.

The safe areas called for in the Washington plan of action, monitored by UNPROFOR [United Nations Protection Force] troops protected by U.S. air power, can be a useful short-term step to protect the civilian populations on a temporary basis. But the real goal must be a fair, long-term solution. And we are making it clear in New York today that, as far as Canada is concerned, the Bosnian Serbs cannot -- nor can the Croats -- keep territory taken by force.

We support fully the containment of the crisis. The presence of U.S. ground troops in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and an increased international presence in Kosovo, would be extremely significant steps to that end.

The difficulty faced by the international community in developing a concerted approach to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and to the infinite complexity of the Balkans should not deter us from continuing our efforts. To give up now would be to encourage further conflicts of the same nature and will lead to widespread disillusionment among states struggling with democratic reforms.

Canada has done its part to help, but the challenges still ahead of us require a collective effort. All UN member-states must live up to their responsibilities in this conflict, or we will send a signal to others that aggression, violence and hatred are condoned or at least left unchallenged by the international community.

Canadians should feel vindicated by our commitment to a philosophy of multilateralism and collective security. We have been steadfast in our resolve through good times and through bad. The Canadian approach is now being adopted by a growing number of countries. The UN is being given a second chance, as the Security Council regains its authority and is able to act decisively on key issues of peace and security. This means that the UN can play a central role in preventing and managing conflicts, providing member-states provide it with the resources and support -- financial and otherwise -- to proceed along its new course.

Much of this new approach is contained in the UN Secretary-General's report, "Agenda for Peace," an approach I heartily endorsed last September in my speech to the UN General Assembly. Canada played an important role in the development of this document, and we have already taken steps to address some of the Secretary-General's concerns. In addition to our participation in ongoing peacekeeping missions, we have provided experts to assist the Secretariat in developing a viable stand-by program. We are now discussing the provision of stand-by forces with the UN. Canada is also sponsoring a major UN program to develop that

body's capacity to provide logistical support for peacekeeping operations.

We are also addressing several other issues, such as the urgent needs both at UN headquarters and in the field to ensure professional operation, and the establishment of a clear command structure, standard procedures and a fair degree of interoperability between national forces.

There is another important lesson that the international community will have to learn -- and that it is how to disengage from an operation before its presence becomes part of the problem rather than part of the solution. Our decision to withdraw our troops from Cyprus, after more than two decades, is the result of just such an assessment, and, before committing ourselves further in Bosnia or any other place, we should specify the conditions under which an operation can be terminated.

I should note my pleasure at the appointment of my colleague, the Right Honourable Joe Clark, as the UN Special Envoy to resolve the situation in Cyprus. And I am sure that this Committee will share my enthusiasm for this appointment and wish him well in his undertaking.

Another important illustration of how the priorities of Canadian foreign policy have been translated into concrete actions is to be found in our assistance program to Central and Eastern Europe and the former U.S.S.R. Our efforts are concentrated on helping these countries make the difficult and critical transition toward democracy and a free-market economy. We remain conscious of the security risks and of the potential human tragedy that could unfold if the economies and the nascent democratic regimes emerging in these countries should founder.

But we have been steadfast in our attempts to assist this important region of the world. We took an early lead in pledging and delivering financial, technical and humanitarian assistance. We did not hesitate in April, at the Vancouver Summit, to double the amount of our assistance to Russia. We are one of the highest per capita contributors in the world. Our faith in what is going on in Russia was borne out in the results of the recent referendum, which indicated support not only for President Yeltsin but for the reform package, which was something that was not widely foreseen. I think the reform process has put down more roots in Russia than perhaps had been expected. The collective response of the G-7 [Group of Seven leading industrialized] countries was doubtless instrumental in reassuring Russian voters that there was some light at the end of the tunnel, but mostly it is their own efforts that are going to make economic development and democratic development succeed.

In 1991, while visiting Warsaw and Prague, I spoke to my counterparts who were expressing some security concerns and wanted to improve their relationship with NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization]. The promotion of increased security relations and dialogue between NATO and the "new democracies" is something for which Canada can take some credit. This was first put forward in a formal way by Prime Minister Mulroney in September 1991. It is now a reality. The North Atlantic Co-operation Council has already played an important role in allaying some of the security concerns of these countries and in harmonizing a once heavy military culture with the norms of a democratic system.

The CSCE [Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe] has also experienced some important changes, with its membership growing from 35 at the beginning of my tenure to 52 today. It is a somewhat unwieldy group, but its responsibilities and its activities have also expanded substantially. Many of the measures for conflict prevention and conflict resolution put forward by Canada prior to the adoption of the Paris Charter in November 1990 have now been adopted by the CSCE. When some people make the argument that the CSCE is ineffective because of its lack of success to date in the Yugoslav conflict, they should look at some of the other areas where it has had a little more success and has improved its mechanisms. CSCE human-rights missions in Ukraine, Moldova and Belarus, and fact-finding or observer missions in Kosovo, Macedonia, Sandjak, Vojvodina and Nagorno-Karabakh have had a preventive effect: they have not contributed to a final solution, but these missions have curbed some of the excesses and helped to manage difficult conflicts. We have participated actively in these missions.

During the same period, Canada has been a key player in the Organization of American States (OAS), whose annual General Assembly I will be attending in 10 days. We have been deeply involved in attempts to bring democracy back to Haïti, for example, and I can testify both to the difficulties and to the progress being made, both of which seem to move together. Hemispheric security is seriously discussed in the OAS, and subjects, such as non-proliferation and the control of conventional weapons, are also on the agenda.

In the Asia-Pacific region, where we pioneered the North-Pacific Security Dialogue, the process appears to have taken hold. In the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), security will be on the agenda this summer for the first time.

By addressing the issue of regional security, we are at the same time addressing the security concerns that are sometimes used to justify the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We are strongly pursuing the comprehensive non-proliferation strategy set out by the Prime Minister last year. First and foremost, we

have been taking the lead toward achieving universal accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and its indefinite extension at the NPT Extension Conference in 1995. In parallel, we will continue to encourage the nuclear weapons states to conclude a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Other international developments also pose the threat of further international instability. The combination of mass poverty and overpopulation in parts of the developing world can only add to the current migration pressures. The problem will get worse if the demographic trends of the developing world continue. With 95 percent of the world population growth taking place in these countries at an annual rate of 2.1 percent, the number of asylum seekers arriving in Western countries, which already increased nearly tenfold in the last decade (from 90 000 to 850 000 in 1992), could reach 50 million in the next 10 or 20 years!

In Canada, I believe that we have established a standard for other nations to follow in this area. But the quantum jump in the size of this problem will require continued international vigilance and creativity, if we are to avoid major problems further down the road.

We must also deal with the environmental consequences of the growth in world population. The protection of the ecosystem is a universal problem that was addressed in considerable depth at Rio de Janeiro. Canada played a constructive role in consensus-building at this important meeting and pressed for the adoption of an Earth Charter. We must now continue in our resolve to protect the physical nature of our environment.

These problems are particularly acute in Africa, the continent I just left. I fully agree with my colleague, the Honourable Monique Vézina, who said in her statement to this Committee on April 21, that "Canada will not abandon the most disadvantaged continent, in order to benefit the countries of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union." Despite a reduction in the overall budget of the international assistance envelope, Africa will still receive 45 percent of our bilateral assistance. Again, we are doing our share and more: we are still in second place among the donor countries of the G-7 in terms of ODA/GNP ratio.

I would argue that in the last three or four years, we have learned to spend our money more wisely. In focussing our development assistance on promoting respect for human rights, the strengthening of democratic institutions and values, and the establishment of responsible and responsive governments and administrative infrastructures, we are addressing the root causes of present and future instabilities. This approach may be less visible, less glamorous, but I believe that it is the most critical for building long-term stability.

There is progress being made. Of the 183 states now in existence, more than 40 percent could be considered as fully democratic, while 22 percent have authoritarian or dictatorial regimes. The others are only partially free. This means that more than 50 percent of the world population is now living under democratic regimes, compared to 35 percent only 10 years ago.

What is even more encouraging is that, according to current assessments, the situation is improving in 14 of the "partly free" or "not free" countries, while it is worsening in only nine countries. If it is true that democracies do not go to war against each other, we are surely making progress in making this world a more stable place.

Having just returned from South Africa, where a multiracial democracy is slowly, painfully but very definitely emerging—I was encouraged by my latest visit—I understand from first-hand discussions the sacrifices and the suffering necessary to build a democracy when different traditions, cultures and institutions have to be put in place.

These developments do not take place overnight, and certainly not in a country like South Africa.

It is true that, in times of economic duress, we might be tempted to pass the torch to someone else. It is true that we have to put our own house in order, and, unless our economy is competitive and prosperous, it will be difficult to maintain our standing on the international scene.

But I do think that constructive multilateralism must remain a fundamental of our foreign policy and we must not retreat from it. As a middle power, we cannot afford to play high-level power politics or to be squeezed by a system of blocs. But we must continue our efforts and investments to maintain our international profile and influence.

Here, I want to pay tribute to the dedication and the professionalism of the men and women of the Canadian Foreign Service. Highly praised abroad, often *mal aimé* at home, they go about their duties in the long-standing tradition of their profession.

There are budget cuts, redeployment of staff, redirection of scarce resources, but these professionals rise to these challenges as they do to others.

There is a great degree of creativity and imagination in the department, and every night the "lights burn bright" here at headquarters and at posts abroad, as foreign policy, like the economy, is now a 24-hour-a-day business.

We have changed our approach to "doing business" by using some of the latest developments in high-tech communications. But diplomacy still requires people—and good people—"on the ground." I can testify to that from my own trips abroad.

Let me say as well that this week I think we've seen another success: that is, the success of the election in Cambodia, where the people of that country have expressed their faith in themselves and in their country by coming out in unprecedented numbers, despite the potential dangers and risks they faced. Here was a place where multilateralism and years of work paid off. I think Canadian professionals had a role in that.

And diplomacy, in all of its aspects, still requires a strictly unique Canadian view. And that is why I continue to be very proud of what we have accomplished as a country, as a government, and as a department, over the past two years in this field. I believe that our legacy will well serve Canadians and the world for many years to come.