

Statement

Secretary of
State for
External Affairs



Déclaration

Secrétaire
d'État aux
Affaires
extérieures

90/63

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**"THE PERSIAN GULF, INTERNATIONAL ORDER
AND CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY"**

SPEECH BY

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JOE CLARK,

AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO

LONDON, ONTARIO

October 26, 1990.

A drama is unfolding in the Persian Gulf. It is dangerous and we do not know how it will end. But how it ends will have crucial consequences for international order and for a Canadian foreign policy dedicated to shaping that order to meet our interests. The consequences could be positive; they could be negative. One thing is clear: they will be enormous.

This is not a movie. This is a situation where war is possible. If it comes to war, there will be thousands of casualties -- soldiers, men and women, children. There is a real risk that weapons of mass destruction will be used. There is a real possibility that the conflict could spread beyond the Persian Gulf. There is a certainty that the international economic order will be dealt a damaging blow. Energy prices for Canadians and everyone else will go sky-high. And we should not rule out the possibility that young Canadian soldiers -- women and men -- will not return to this country for celebration but will stay there for burial.

As Canadians blessed with prosperity and peace for so many years, we tend to think that serious wars don't happen any more -- not the kind of wars which harm us, or our neighbourhood or our interests. When we see combat and bombing on the television news, they are other people's wars.

What may happen in the Gulf is not about other people. Canadians are there. Canadian interests are engaged. The global economy and political structure are at stake. Neville Chamberlain said of Czechoslovakia, before another war, that society was "a far away country of which we know little." Well, Chamberlain was wrong then and we know the consequences. We cannot be wrong again. In this modern world, Kuwait is not far away. It is right around the corner.

The invasion of Kuwait by Iraq has given rise to a rare united front of nations, who demand that Iraq withdraw and respect Kuwait's sovereignty. That view is not a partial view, not the view of a few. It is the view of East and West, North and South, Arab and non-Arab, Muslim and non-Muslim. Sanctions have been imposed by near-universal consensus. The enforcement of those sanctions has been agreed. Military forces from 25 nations are in place to enforce UN sanctions and to deter aggression. Forces from Argentina and Australia, from Syria and the United States, from Egypt and England.

But the world does not want war. The world wants justice for Kuwait and order for the region and the world. So just as we have joined from the outset in the effort, by so many nations, to deter aggression and enforce sanctions, so too we have sought avenues for a diplomatic solution. We have worked at the Security Council to ensure that what is done in the Gulf is done under the explicit auspices of the United Nations. What Canada seeks -- what the world seeks -- is not to blow Iraq up but to get Iraq out. But let there be no doubt about it: getting out of Kuwait is what Iraq must do.

What would it say about the new international order we claim exists, now that the Cold War is over, if the world were unable to reverse this naked act of aggression? What message would that send, what *carte blanche* would it give?

And if we succeed here, that would itself be a strong signal that the United Nations can and will behave as nations which are united.

But the drama in the Gulf goes beyond the specifics of that region or that conflict. It points to the price we all pay when diplomacy doesn't work, when foreign policies are not effective in preserving order, when geopolitical fault lines are allowed to persist, to widen and, inevitably, to erupt. The crisis in the Gulf is both a threat to international order and a chance to build that order. We are at a crossroads -- in the Gulf and elsewhere -- a crossroads where foreign policy has never been more important to our future as a country and as a world community.

I want today to talk about the importance of foreign policy.

The Cold War distorted the way we viewed the world. Our preoccupation with Europe made us ignore other problems, other regions. And it may have made some believe that with the collapse of the Berlin Wall, foreign policy has lost its role, that irrelevance has been the price of success.

But what is happening in the Gulf today is not just about that region or about oil. It is about order; an order that foreign policy tries to build; an order that is more important than ever, and is crucial for Canada.

Building an order which is peaceful and prosperous, which allows Canada and others to live in freedom with justice, is what

foreign policy is about. That order and that policy are not optional for a nation like Canada.

Other countries have been less dependent on international order. They have been able to impose order on others or they have been able to isolate themselves. But those have not been choices for Canada. Our land mass has always been too vast, and our population too small, to defend ourselves by ourselves. So we have sought to co-operate with others, through alliances, to defend Canada. And we have sought to build an international system where threats to Canada do not arise.

Similarly, we are a country of traders, dependent on trade for over 30 per cent of our GNP. We have always had to sell to others to prosper. And because of that we have sought open access and open markets, rules which are just and fair for all -- whether through the GATT negotiations, the Free Trade Agreement, the Cairns Group on Agriculture or the emerging Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation.

Canada's dependence on that international order is not declining. It is increasing. The global village, like other villages, can be a place of co-operation or of conflict.

And never have the costs of conflict been so high or their sources so numerous. So, never has the need for co-operation been so great or the costs of failure so clear. Forty years ago, or four hundred years ago, nations could debate whether or not their country's interests could be preserved by acting as if the rest of the world did not exist. Not one has that luxury any more.

Consider some questions.

In a world of trade dominated by the European Community, the United States and Japan, how does Canada survive without rules of trade?

Who can envisage a cleaner global environment secured without nations acting together?

Who can resolve the international debt crisis without give-and-take between the developed and developing countries?

Who can stop the international drug trade without contemplating concerted action by suppliers and users alike?

And who can see an end to regional conflicts, such as in the Persian Gulf, without co-operation and understanding within those regions and outside?

On all these issues, national action is both more necessary than ever and more futile unless pursued in partnership with others. The challenge is clear. We either work together and succeed or we work separately and fail. It is the role of foreign policy to meet that challenge -- on so many issues in so many places -- not just to keep peace, but to build order.

Some Canadians see foreign policy as a luxury; a set of activities to be pursued in times of plenty and discarded when times are tough. Other Canadians see foreign policy as misplaced idealism, as the pursuit of values abroad which we have no business advancing and which others will not accept. Those perspectives are dangerous, short-sighted and wrong. When times are tough an effective foreign policy is more necessary, not less. And if we do not choose to advance our values abroad, other values will take over and Canadians will be forced to live with an order we do not like, an order which does not meet our needs. Or we will be forced to live with no order at all.

Foreign policy today is about finding fault lines. It is about finding them, facing them and fixing them.

It is about the fault line of development. Too many people see development assistance as something which soothes the conscience, as charity, as a sort of contribution to a global soup kitchen. And certainly development assistance has been a way for Canadians to say they care, to let others share in our luck.

That is why thousands of Canadians donated time and money to the victims of drought and famine in Ethiopia. That is why for decades Canadian children have collected for UNICEF at Halloween and Canadian doctors went to Mexico City after that city's earthquake. That is why Canadians have sent missionaries to China, food to Africa, and blankets and blood to Armenia.

That is one reason for ODA. But underdevelopment is a threat to Canadian security and prosperity. It is a threat to international order. It is a fault line which must be fixed.

Look at the environment. Although most of the pollution which contaminates the globe today comes from the developed world, that will change dramatically in the future. As the developing countries industrialize, they are often faced with a terrible choice: to develop and pollute -- or not to develop at all. The thought of a China or an India or a Brazil repeating the environmental mistakes we have made is a nightmare. The efforts of Canada to reduce our own pollution in Canada will be virtually meaningless if developing countries choose to embark upon a course of development without concern for the environment. There is evidence for that even now, and it extends beyond the Amazon and the rain forests of Asia. Chemicals long banned in North America are showing up in the Great Lakes. Those chemicals come from the developing countries of Latin America, carried by winds that know no borders. And mothers' milk in the Canadian North is poisoned by PCBs, that cross the North Pole from the Soviet Union, a society which is also developing.

Look at the international drug trade. It is a fact that drugs are grown in the most impoverished rural areas of developing countries. It is also a fact that those countries will not be able to solve their drug problem unless they are able to engage in other profitable economic activities. Those alternatives will only exist if those countries can develop their economies to the point where such choices are present. That means development.

Look at the crisis of international debt. That crisis will only be solved when debtor countries can stand on their own feet economically and generate their own wealth for their own populations. That means development.

Look at the challenge of international trade. We tend to look at Europe and the United States and the Pacific Rim as the basis for our prosperity. And they are. But in the future, the markets of the Third World will account for more and more of our trade. Output in developing countries is rising at a rate 1 1/2 times the rate of industrial economies. By the year 2000, 84 per cent of the world population will reside in developing countries. By the year 2025, there will be 400 cities in the Third World with a population in excess of 1 million. In India alone, there will be an additional 250 million middle-class consumers by the year 2005. That's larger than the current population of the United States.

Canada pays a price when Third World economies are weak. That price is expressed in Canadian jobs and Canadian markets. Poor people don't buy products. From 1981 to 1987, Canada lost \$24.2 billion in exports to countries that used to buy from us but cannot now, because of debt or drought or low commodity prices or high energy costs. That represents 130,000 jobs in Canada. If we can't manage the problem of international debt, 200,000 Canadian jobs will be foregone over the next 10 years.

That's what development assistance is about -- fixing the development fault line, the fault line that threatens our environment, takes away jobs, feeds the drug trade, and provides fertile ground for terrorism and regional conflict. That's what CIDA does and that is what Canadian foreign policy is about.

There is another fault line. The fault line of environmental catastrophe. The fault line which says that even if we have peace we may be poisoned. Protecting the global environment is not a frill. It is a security problem for this decade and the next century. That security problem -- that fault line -- is a foreign policy priority for Canada.

And yes, that means conferences and communiqués and conventions. Cleaning up the environment requires national action but it also requires international commitment. That's because the global environment is global. So Canada hosted the meeting in Montreal in 1987 which produced the Montreal Protocol, the first effective agreement to control and phase out the CFCs which are depleting the ozone air. That agreement was made more stringent this year and it is the best example yet of an international environmental law to manage that threat to our international order.

And we are active now preparing for the 1992 UN Conference on the Environment and Development, a conference which will be run by a fine Canadian, Maurice Strong, a conference which can be a watershed in fixing the environmental fault line. We are actively pursuing a proposal for a world Forest Convention which will, hopefully, lead to standards and action to preserve the forests which produce the air we breathe. We are pursuing an initiative taken by the Prime Minister at the Houston Summit last year, and agreed to by our partners, to develop a global strategy on land-based sources of marine pollution. A meeting will take place in Canada next summer to develop that proposal so that it can be ready for 1992.

Those proposals on pollution address issues which are vital not only for the health of Canadians but for their prosperity. The Maritime provinces and the West Coast of Canada depend on the fishery. But fish will not survive in water which is poisoned. Eighty-five per cent of marine pollution comes from land. That is why Canadian diplomats are seeking action on that issue.

Forestry is a \$42-billion industry in Canada. We are the world's largest exporter of forest products and have the third largest stands of forest in the world. Canadian industry will suffer if it does not become sustainable. And it will suffer if other countries do not share the standards we impose on ourselves.

Finally, there is the fault line of trade. Trade on which Canada depends more than just about any other developed country. Trading systems which don't work or which decay or which treat partners unfairly not only cost jobs and dollars. They can feed political conflict and discord.

So our diplomats are working against the clock to come up with a GATT agreement which will successfully conclude the Uruguay Round. That effort is about something simple, the fact that trade depends on rules, rules which are clear and fair, which are observed, rules which open markets and create jobs. At stake are thousands of jobs -- \$600 billion in annual trade in services alone and \$1 trillion in government procurement.

The negotiations are not easy. Everyone wants other countries to open their markets without opening their own. But the consequences of failure are worse: protectionism; trading blocs which are exclusive rather than complementary; blocs which divide regions just as they have divided nations, which can threaten peace as well as prosperity.

And there is the fault line of democracy and human rights. What Eastern Europe shows to the world is that development cannot take place without democracy and democracy cannot take place without development. Eastern Europe has removed the old excuses that democracy and human rights are a luxury for the few. That lesson is being learned in Asia, in Africa and in Latin America. The development of democracy and human rights abroad is no less a security requirement than the old tasks of managing military balances and alliances.

So our diplomats abroad are working in the OAS, in the Commonwealth, in la Francophonie, in the UN, at the CSCE and through NATO to build democracy and ensure that human rights become what the term says: rights that come from being human.

Those issues -- those fault lines -- are what foreign policy is about. But it is also about people, Canadians who are travelling, and people -- immigrants and refugees -- who seek to come here and contribute to our prosperity.

In 1988 alone, 203 immigration officers abroad issued visas to 152,889 immigrants. Those immigrants declared their intent to bring \$6 billion into this country. In 1989-90, business immigration brought in \$4.7 billion in investment, investment which is estimated will create 13,400 jobs. And our embassies abroad issued 625,000 visitor visas to Canada in 1989. Those visitors bring dollars to Canada for a tourism industry which is increasingly crucial to our economic success.

The Department of External Affairs operates the second largest, and perhaps most geographically diverse, program for refugees in the world. Our officers abroad, whose decisions may be a matter of life and death for the applicants, act daily to help the innocent victims of war or disturbance or starvation to come to this country.

And our consular officers abroad constantly take care of Canadians who confront difficulty while outside this country. Let's look at last week. It was a typical week for our consular service. Our embassies in Kuwait and Iraq were finalizing the evacuation of close to 600 Canadian citizens. In Lisbon, our embassy was helping 43 Canadian senior citizens, 30 of whom were in three different hospitals following a serious bus accident in the Portuguese countryside. In Rwanda, civil strife was spreading and our mission there assisted in the evacuation of about 150 Canadians from that country. In Venezuela, 16 Canadians were arrested in drug-related police actions. They are in prison and our embassy there is in contact with them. Finally, as a result of the problems with Worldways Airlines, 2,000 Canadians stranded abroad had to change their plans. Our embassies helped bring them home.

I started with the Gulf and I want to conclude with it. For there too, behind the headlines are the fault lines. There is the

fault line of a region which has yet to establish an order, a region where another conflict between Arabs and Israelis remains unsolved. There is the fault line of trade and economic interdependence, emphasized by our dependence on oil and the cost to our industry of the loss of markets in the Gulf. There is the fault line of development, demonstrated by the devastating effect of this crisis on the developing world and on the new democracies of Eastern Europe. There is the fault line of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, a problem we have yet to address with sufficient energy. There is the fault line of the grotesque trade in conventional weapons, a trade which keeps societies poor and which makes war more devastating when it occurs. There is the fault line of terrorism which could be triggered if conflict comes from this crisis. And there is the fault line of potential enmity between Arab and non-Arab, a fault line which could be exposed in the aftermath of a Gulf war, triggering embargoes or terror or dislocation.

The Gulf has its own characteristics, its unique features. But it exposes another type of gulf, the gulf which still exists between our aspirations and our achievements. A gulf which Canadian foreign policy seeks to close.

They won't make movies about diplomatic conferences. They won't write novels from diplomatic communiqués. They won't compose lyrics from the proceedings of the GATT or the CSCE or the OAS or the UN. But that's the point. We can't tolerate a world which provides fodder for fantasy. What we want is a world which works. And that's what Canadian foreign policy is about.