

Statement

Secretary of
State for
External Affairs



Déclaration

Secrétaire
d'État aux
Affaires
extérieures

CORRECTED

91/10

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

**"CANADA AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE
POST-WAR PERIOD IN THE GULF"**

NOTES FOR A SPEECH BY

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JOE CLARK,

AT A LUNCHEON HOSTED BY

THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

AT THE HÔTEL DES GOUVERNEURS

**QUEBEC CITY, Quebec
February 8, 1991**

I am very pleased to be with you here today under the auspices of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. The Institute has earned the reputation over the years of being a leading forum for the discussion of the world's great questions and the issues that they confront our country with.

Nothing could be more normal under the circumstances than to pursue with you the indispensable dialogue which the government wishes to sustain with Canadians at a time when our country is passing through a crucial period in the history of international relations over the past 40 years.

It was with full consideration for the significance of its action that the government made the weighty decision to involve our forces in the fight. One must have the courage of one's convictions. When the international community unanimously calls for the defence of peace, and when the basic principles underlying the international order are involved, Canada must respond. As an architect of the UN system, we must fulfil our international responsibilities to the letter and must do our part to apply the principles upheld by the UN.

The forceful occupation of the territory of a United Nations member is unacceptable and violates the basic principles of the international order. Faced with the invasion of Kuwait, the international community had certain options, one of which was inaction and passivity. This would have been an unpardonable abdication, the acceptance of the outmoded notion of the power of the strong over the weak. An immediate, unilateral counter-strike by a limited number of countries would have amounted to a small group of countries appropriating the role of world policeman. These options were both unacceptable and would both have had disastrous consequences for the future of world relations.

With wisdom but not without some reticence, the community of states resolved to resort wholly to the United Nations to face this threat to its collective security. This was a great victory for the UN system and for countries like Canada, which have based their diplomacy on the construction of a credible, effective multilateral system.

Rarely have such unanimity and such determination been shown within the Security Council, and with the support of the vast majority of UN members. Let us not forget that countries as disparate as Pakistan and Argentina, Senegal and Bulgaria,

Australia and Spain have played an active part in the 29-country coalition established to apply the sanctions.

The diplomatic community has never, in the modern era, seen such a feverish and intense period as that between last August and mid-January. Every possible effort was made to avoid war. Every available means was sought to obtain the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait. The disappointing and painful recourse to force is the result of our having reached the limits of diplomacy -- not the absence of efforts to apply it. The blame for this failure can be placed squarely on the shoulders of the Iraqi President.

Why, you might ask, were the sanctions not prolonged? The answer is simple: we tried, but we had to face facts -- sanctions could not succeed where diplomacy had failed. For the entire period during which they were in force, he was also pillaging Kuwait, building up huge reserves for his forces and compelling the Kuwaiti population to take flight. Within a short time, the coalition would have liberated nothing but a desert and a few inhabitants in total subjection to Saddam Hussein.

No, the United Nations had no choice, under the Charter, but to use force in the interest of justice and thus begin an operation to restore peace and international security.

The Canadian forces are an integral part of this operation. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the men and women, Quebeckers among them, who are doing their duty with such a noble attitude over there. I know they can count on your confidence and your encouragement. Their commitment will be a source of pride and inspiration for generations to come.

The soldiers who are courageously discharging their mission are entitled to expect the politicians to do everything possible to prevent us from finding ourselves in such straits in the future. They are perfectly justified in this.

THE BUILDING OF PEACE

Paradoxical as it may seem, this war expresses the firm desire of the international community to build a better world founded on justice and the peaceful resolution of conflicts. This determination must go far beyond the restoration of Kuwaiti sovereignty. We have waited too long for this kind of attitude, this demonstration of responsibility on the part of the United Nations not to feel collegially committed to ensuring that this

new spirit also manifests itself in the search for long-term solutions to the enduring problems of the Middle East.

Canada is playing an active part in this undertaking. I would like to share with you today my thoughts on the matter, along with certain initiatives that the Prime Minister is announcing today in Ottawa and that Canada intends to pursue in the months ahead.

To begin with, we must, above all, be realistic. For Canada at this stage to claim to have the answers to the problems of the Middle East would be presumptuous. Why? Simply because it is first and foremost the business of the countries in the region to together find solutions to these problems once the war is over. No lasting solution can be imposed from outside. A commitment on the part of the countries immediately involved is essential to stability and security in this region.

This having been said, the task is a considerable one and will also require the co-operation of the countries beyond the Middle East. In fact, many of the causes of instability in this region, such as the central problem of the proliferation of arms, call for solutions that would involve the whole international community. We will also have to count on the mobilization of international resources, notably those of the United Nations, to respond to the humanitarian and security problems that have been aggravated by Saddam Hussein's adventurism.

Let us now look at what the post-war issues will be, and what kind of contribution a country like ours can make.

IMMEDIATE POST-WAR ISSUES

To begin with, three pressing questions will arise once the objectives of the Security Council resolutions have been achieved and the ceasefire has been established:

- humanitarian assistance will have to be provided to the civilian populations and to displaced persons;
- a peacekeeping force will have to be established;
- the damage caused to the environment by the huge oil slicks in the Gulf will have to be repaired.

1) HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

In terms of humanitarian assistance, we must continue the magnificent co-ordination and co-operation effort that the various international organizations have begun. These organizations (the High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross, UNDRO [the United Nations Disaster Relief Organization] and so on) have already done a tremendous job and continue to provide effective assistance. Canada has made a substantial contribution to these efforts, by channelling about \$16 million to humanitarian needs of the total \$77.5 million we have committed for economic assistance. We intend to continue our commitment without any a priori exclusivity. It will be necessary no doubt to help the Iraqi people and to respond to the needs of countries such as Turkey, Jordan and Egypt. However, we will have to mobilize the resources of the entire international community, especially countries that have earned considerable surplus oil revenues and those whose military commitment within the coalition has been limited.

2) A PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Moreover, the borders of Kuwait must initially be guaranteed by a peace-keeping force, ideally under the authority of the United Nations. Canada feels that this force must consist mainly of troops from the countries of the region. Their expertise, however, is limited. That is why Canada, which has a well-established reputation in this field, has offered its services to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and to the countries of the region to establish a training programme. In addition, we are prepared to participate both in the establishment of such a peace-keeping force and in the planning operations that its deployment requires. We are also prepared to co-operate with the United Nations in calling a meeting of experts in Canada with the responsibility of analyzing needs and identifying the various alternatives that are worth exploring.

It is of great importance to Canada that the United Nations, with its renewed credibility, play a central role in implementing postwar arrangements. Its involvement would point the way towards the new international order that we seek to consolidate.

3) RESTORATION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

On the environmental front, we must collectively tackle the clean-up of the damage caused by the insane dumping of unprecedented quantities of crude oil into the Gulf. A team of Canadian specialists is already on site and is busy planning this operation together with colleagues from many countries. But we must also look further ahead and examine how to strengthen present conventions on the use of the environment for military purposes. It may be necessary to negotiate a new instrument. We have already taken the initiative of contacting certain countries to pursue this project further. At the same time, we will examine the possibility of reinforcing the international mechanisms currently provided to respond to such emergencies.

MEDIUM-RANGE CHALLENGES: SECURITY IN THE GULF AND THE MIDDLE EAST

But these immediate post-war problems seem almost trivial compared to the challenges of establishing lasting peace and security in this region of the world.

The specific problems that arise will largely depend on the situation as it stands once the war is over. It is already clear that certain problems will be unavoidable.

1) A GLOBAL APPROACH TO SECURITY

First, let us consider security. While a peacekeeping force is a factor in maintaining equilibrium, it cannot in and of itself claim to fully guarantee the security of the Gulf states. Regional arrangements must thus be complemented by international guarantees which could take the form of international accords committing some of the countries in the coalition under the authority of the United Nations. Such multilateral arrangements would no doubt be more acceptable to the people of the region. In the same spirit, Canada feels that it would be preferable for these guarantees not to include the permanent deployment of foreign forces in the Gulf.

On a longer-range basis, however, these countries must work to establish mechanisms and structures that will enable them to resolve their disputes peacefully and contribute to greater trust among them. While the experience of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) cannot be transferred to this region as is, some of its lessons may offer promising avenues.

Several European countries are engaged in actively exploring this concept. After the war ends, they may propose the creation of a CSCM, a Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Mediterranean, which would also include the Persian Gulf region for this purpose. This is an ambitious project, and Canada is carefully monitoring its development.

In the same spirit, when visited recently by my colleague, Dr. Meguid, the Egyptian Minister of Foreign Affairs, we agreed on the importance of beginning immediately a study of post-war security structures. This would include a consideration of possible mechanisms to incorporate into a regional security structure. Border guarantees, a peaceful mechanism for the resolution of disputes, and the establishment of confidence-building measures would form the bases for this structure. Such a mechanism would also allow the discussion of non-military matters, as in the case of the CSCE's second and third baskets.

Such a global approach to security matters, based on the establishment of genuine dialogue among the various regional partners, would allow such issues as the development of democratic institutions in the region to be addressed. But if they are to have any chance at all of succeeding, efforts to achieve greater regional security and stability must courageously address the very roots of the problems that exist in the Middle East. These root causes are well known.

2) THE ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT

The thorniest issue involves relations between Israel and the Arab countries. After decades of conflict, the build-up of hatred and misunderstanding has been enormous.

No regional security plan can expect to succeed unless it is firmly determined to make progress toward a comprehensive, lasting, negotiated settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict, including the Palestinian question. Such a negotiated settlement must be based on Resolutions 242 and 338 of the Security Council. In this regard, even before the Gulf war, Canada let it be known that it favoured holding an international conference. While we should not exclude other options, a properly structured conference with reasonable chances of success could indeed be useful and contribute to the peace process.

3) ECONOMIC DISPARITIES

When faced with numerous conflicts, especially those involving less developed countries, Canada has always emphasized social and economic imperatives. This need is even more urgent in the Middle East. Reconstruction is doomed to fail if it ignores social and human dimensions and does not address economic disparities.

The region requires a new framework, which must be defined by the states that make up the region and the people who live in them. There can be no peace without prosperity, and no stability without justice either within states or between states. Democracy also promotes justice, prosperity and peace. Long-term security cannot be built solely on military structures and political agreements. Long-term security, in the Middle East as elsewhere, can rest only on genuine co-operation between states, marked by dialogue and confidence. It is in this context that I developed the concept of co-operative security before the most recent General Assembly of the United Nations.

Our role is to encourage the countries of this region to strive toward such an objective. For instance, after the hostilities have ceased, the Gulf states and indeed the entire Middle East might consider creating an organization for the purpose of economic cooperation. Such an organization, which might be affiliated with the United Nations and maintain contact with the major international economic and financial institutions, would help to ensure greater economic stability in the region.

LESSONS OF THE CRISIS

Finally, we must begin now to learn the important lessons of this conflict. We bear a considerable burden of responsibility. Over the years, to varying degrees, we have all helped to create a military apparatus in this region, especially in Iraq, that is beyond human comprehension. Military assistance in the region has exceeded economic assistance. This must stop. The governments most concerned are already making an effort in this regard.

To be credible, any peace plan must include strict measures to check the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the stockpiling of conventional weapons in the region. Multilateral negotiations have already begun regarding these crucial issues, such as the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and missile launching techniques. So far, however, their success has been limited owing to the lack

of political will or the conflicting interests of the various parties involved. It is urgent that we make further efforts to display a strong political will.

In this belief, Canada plans to promote a world summit on instruments of war and weapons of mass destruction in the coming months. This summit would become a showcase for a new political consultation. It would aim to develop a strict plan of action that would result in the adoption by 1995 of an integrated framework of systems of non-proliferation and control of weapons, including conventional weapons.

I have broadly outlined the views and initiatives that the Prime Minister and I will seek to promote in the coming months. We intend to intensify consultations between Canada and the countries of the region.

Canada and the world community must devote as much energy to winning the peace after the war that now must be devoted to fighting -- indeed even more.

If this war is to have any meaning, it must serve to build peace. It is on our ability to build this peace that we will be judged. We are aware of this, and Canada does not intend to spare any effort to meet this extraordinary challenge.