

Statement

Secretary of
State for
External Affairs



Déclaration

Secrétaire d'État
aux Affaires
extérieures

No. 93/7

AS DELIVERED

AN ADDRESS BY
THE HONOURABLE BARBARA McDOUGALL
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
TO A SEMINAR ON
CANADA'S AGENDA FOR
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

OTTAWA, Ontario
February 8, 1993

I want to welcome all of you and thank you for agreeing to join me for discussions tonight and tomorrow on Canada's agenda for peace and security.

These discussions could not be more timely.

Every day, the "New World Order" seems to fall further into disarray. Somalia and the Balkans are stark visual images that have already scarred our future memories of this decade. The return of murderous quarrels in Angola, India and Pakistan; the excuse of religious dogma for widespread, vicious attacks against other ethnic groups and women; and strife in parts of the former Soviet Union provide us with almost universal evidence of the incapacity of human beings to live up to the ideals of peace and harmony that they themselves have helped to establish.

The international community and its institutions were seemingly caught off guard by the rapid and widespread descent into instability that followed the end of the Cold War. No doubt, as the Berlin Wall was enthusiastically knocked to the ground, there were entrails to be read, portents of disintegration to come.

Was the international community not paying attention? Did it ignore warning signals that could have led us toward policies and actions of a different kind? Possibly, but I, for one, regard those brief few months of relaxed international tensions as a different kind of portent -- a brief vision of what our world can be like if we truly accomplish what we thought we had achieved then -- a new level of stability, harmony and hope.

The question the international community is wrestling with now in this period of volatility is, where do we go from here? And the situation Canada happily finds itself in is that our expressed perspective, our skills, and our steadfastness to our own ideals may be what the world needs in the face of these dauntingly complex challenges.

As we begin our discussions here today and tomorrow, one thing should be clear: Canada's commitments to the United Nations, to multilateralism and to peacekeeping are not at issue. We will continue to be activists when it comes to peace and security, especially through the UN.

The real focus of this seminar must be a hard look at how we can best support the UN and other organizations in achieving and maintaining peace and security in the world.

We cannot ignore the rapid and profound changes that are taking place in the world, nor can we pretend that these changes do not have significant implications for Canada and the international community.

For some 40 years the developed world concentrated its attention, its energy, its ingenuity, on managing superpower rivalry. The goal was to avert another world war and, in that respect, we were successful.

But, the legacy of our efforts during the Cold War is mixed. It has left us with a number of serious problems, not the least of which are vast arsenals of strategic and conventional weapons. But more positively, it has left us with sophisticated alliances and global crisis management systems -- possibly somewhat too primitive -- to address the new reality.

In recent years, some of the worst excesses of the Cold War era have been addressed. We have worked hard to make real progress on nuclear non-proliferation, arms control, verification and confidence-building.

The signings of the START Agreement and the Chemical Weapons Convention offer glimmers of hope that we are headed in the right direction.

But, we have more -- much more -- to do, especially in light of the diversity and magnitude of the new challenges we face.

Today, the international community is called upon to intervene in a multitude of localized or regional conflicts caused by ethnic and religious hostility, the re-emergence of virulent forms of nationalism, famine and the abuse of human rights.

It was with these new threats to international peace in mind that the UN Secretary-General put forward his Agenda for Peace. I have, at every available opportunity, including at the UN General Assembly last year, expressed Canada's support for this report -- the most comprehensive since the Charter -- because I believe that it maps out creative and effective approaches to international peace and security.

I know that many of you are familiar with the Agenda for Peace, so I will not go into great detail about it tonight. The background paper provided to you goes into much greater depth. However, I do think it is useful to recap briefly the distinct approaches the Secretary-General has outlined, if only to ensure that in our discussions we are all using the same vocabulary.

First, peacekeeping -- something we are very familiar with in this country, thanks to Lester Pearson. Peacekeeping usually involves military and civilian operations that are carried out with the consent of the parties to a dispute. It may also include assistance to resolve the dispute, such as the missions in Angola and El Salvador. But even this basic definition has been expanded in recent initiatives -- for example, with the provision of military escorts for humanitarian aid in the former Yugoslavia.

Second, **peacemaking**. Peacemaking involves diplomatic action such as the London Conference on Yugoslavia to prevent or resolve conflicts. Some people tend to confuse this with enforcement.

Enforcement is military action, such as the Gulf War and the operation in Somalia, to enforce an end to a conflict without the consent of the parties involved.

Next is **preventive diplomacy**, which is diplomatic action to prevent disputes from turning into conflicts, such as our recent efforts in Kosovo. Another example is South Africa, where Canadians are part of a joint Commonwealth/UN effort to build confidence and trust among domestic parties who are trying to build a new post-apartheid South Africa.

Finally, the Agenda for Peace talks about **peacebuilding**. This is post-conflict action to build and support structures that help to prevent a recurrence of violence or conflict.

In our discussions about these approaches and the role Canada should play, we must address a number of developments and issues that may restrict our abilities to contribute to the peace process, now and in the future.

For example, there are now an unprecedented number of UN missions for peace, and others are possible under the aegis of regional organizations such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE).

Another factor, which must be kept in mind, is that peace missions today are riskier than ever. The classic precondition of a complete cease-fire has given way to new political realities in complex situations such as the former Yugoslavia and Somalia.

In many situations, we just cannot wait any longer for the beginnings of political settlement before acting, nor can we allow ourselves to be held hostage by factions that see no advantage in peace. Intervening without being invited by all parties to a dispute has made the job of attaining peace riskier, both politically and militarily.

The fact that such intervention is riskier does not make it less necessary or desirable. Sometimes, we must act to put an end to morally reprehensible practices. In other cases, we are trying to stop human rights abuses. At times, we also may wish to prevent localized conflicts from engulfing other countries or regions. But, no matter what the motive is, when troops are sent uninvited into a territory, the chances for injury or even death increase.

I assure you -- we approach this with no scales on our eyes and only after thorough analysis, particularly by our military.

Another very serious consideration, as we look at the future of peacekeeping, is cost. The price tag for Canada's assessed contributions to the UN has grown sharply from \$8 million to almost \$90 million annually -- in other words, more than a tenfold increase in a few short years.

Add to that the costs associated with maintaining several thousand troops in various missions abroad, as well as the costs, for example, of civilians acting as electoral observers and the costs of the RCMP in various peace operations, and the price tag is even higher.

But, there is more.

Peacekeeping costs are like icebergs -- the costs for soldiers and supplies are only the tip, while under the surface is a whole other range of costs. For example, even the most modest contribution of troops abroad must be backed up logistically and otherwise by resources at home.

Clearly, whether future peacekeeping missions are fully funded or not, our financial obligations are growing and will continue to grow. We are already bumping up against resource ceilings for our involvement in missions.

Our financial constraints force us to think hard about the reasons we are involved, and the objectives we want to achieve. Other difficult questions also present themselves.

Is there a pay-back to Canada for shouldering our fair burden -- and more -- of the costs of peace and security? Should there be? Does our involvement serve broader national interests? What are they?

These questions lead us into other areas that reflect the changing needs and requirements of each new peace mission -- needs very much associated with the human dimension of each operation.

As the Prime Minister remarked at Harvard University in December, "There is a need to bolster the capacity of the United Nations to respond to humanitarian and political emergencies."

Fundamentally, we cannot lose sight of the fact that international initiatives to restore and maintain peace and stability must take into account and respond to the desperation and suffering of the individuals who find themselves trapped in an area of conflict.

Weapons cannot simply be replaced with other types of weapons; forces with other types of forces. The cycles of violence and hatred must be broken with new forms of intervention.

And this will place increasing demands on the UN and other organizations and their members to reshape current systems for dealing with hostilities and crises. The United Nations is already under considerable pressure to adjust to these new realities -- and we must work with the UN in making its organization and its systems more responsive.

There was a time when peace operations -- whether they involved peacekeeping or enforcement -- were essentially military operations. But, when you consider expanded activities such as preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peacebuilding, a much wider range of people, expertise and resources is required.

Consider for a moment the operation in Cambodia: in addition to soldiers, there is a need for legal experts, medical personnel, civil servants and other civilians.

We can expect this demand for civilian agents for peace to grow.

Fortunately, in recent months, some of the traditional inhibitions that used to prevent other countries from participating have disappeared.

An increasing number of permanent members of the UN Security Council, many Third World countries and other countries with constitutional restraints, such as Japan and Germany, are now more willing to play an active peacekeeping role. Russia and Ukraine both have troops that can and are being made available for peacekeeping.

It will be important, as the participant base is broadened, to ensure the highest possible standards and uniformity of purpose.

These recent developments have important implications for the management of Canada's role in international peace and security. While holding firm to our commitment to the UN and other multilateral peace and security efforts, we must ask ourselves some direct questions and consider the available options for how best to adapt our commitment to the new realities.

For example, in light of the increasing number of countries willing and able to provide troops for peace missions, we might consider how to increase and improve our ability to provide planning, training, command and logistical support.

We could place greater emphasis on Canadian participation in the front end of operations -- that is, in the planning phases -- where expertise is needed by international organizations and where our involvement could be as effective but less resource-intensive.

We could also place a greater emphasis on training. Since we virtually invented peacekeeping, why not put our experience and expertise to good use, helping other countries who are new to the field?

We might also consider placing greater emphasis on our participation in preventive actions and preventive diplomacy. It was a report by Canadian Ambassador David Peel that led to the creation of a special CSCE mission to Kosovo.

The idea would be to focus our involvement increasingly on the knowledge and skill dimensions of peace and security activities.

No one suggests that it will be easy in a world where deeply felt hatreds dominate in many regions, and where democratic values are only superficially understood in others. And the international community may have to re-examine its traditional definitions of sovereignty in order to take preventive action where trouble is looming.

But we must get on with the task. The lives of millions of people around the globe rely on our abilities to find new ways to deal with old problems.

Canada has contributed human and financial resources to every peacekeeping mission since the founding of the UN.

Can we continue to do so, taking into account our finite resources and the rapidly expanding demands? How do we reconcile our pride in our past involvement in peace and security, and our stake in the future of peace and security?

With these heavily loaded question in mind, I look forward to a vigorous and frank exchange of views with you tomorrow.

Support for peace and security operations has been, and continues to be, a pillar of Canadian foreign policy. It has given us not only a distinctive role in the world, but also an influence in international relations that goes well beyond the normal reaches of a middle power.

That's why your ideas -- Canadian ideas -- are important, not only in this room, but in places around the world.

Lester Pearson, in his Nobel Prize lecture in 1957, remarked quite pointedly that:

"The grim fact is that we prepare for war like giants and for peace like pygmies."

I would like to think that we, as Canadians, at least have learned some lessons over the past 35 years.

By discussing how we can best serve the cause of peace in the years to come, there is no guarantee that we may become "giants," but at least we can avoid the alternative!

Thank you.