

*Government Orders*

imposed economic sanctions and there was a commitment by a broad consensus of the world community to get behind it. Some 30-odd countries sent forces to the gulf to implement those sanctions. We really did believe that we were now turning the corner and that we were headed in a different direction.

Then, come November— I can recall the week well— first, there was an announcement by President Bush that he was doubling the forces in the gulf, from 200,000 to half a million. No explanation, but here they go. What was the reason? What was the rationale? Did he say then that sanctions had failed? No. He just said: "I am doubling the number of troops."

Then, the Secretary of State walked into the external affairs committee meeting and said: "Boy, sanctions are not good any more. They were great last week, but they are not any good this week. Therefore, we now have to contemplate the use of force."

What happened? What took place? What careful calculation went on in the White House, in the Department of External Affairs, and in White Hall to say sanctions were no longer working? They did not tell anybody, but that was clearly the demarcation line.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of something that is also very important about the Pearsonian tradition. Because of his experience, and because of the experience of other statesmen of his period through the League of Nations, when they came to be the architects of the UN Charter, they carefully prescribed the steps through the charter that one took if sanctions no longer worked.

Article 41 very clearly states that the United Nations has the right to establish economic sanctions. That is under the charter. It then states very clearly in Article 42 that the Security Council must decide that sanctions are no longer working and then consider other means. That is in the charter of the United Nations. Is that what has been followed by this government? Not a bit.

For all the patting on the back, the pounding on the chest, the raising of the flag, and the whistling of the tune about how we are supporting the UN, why are we abandoning the charter of the United Nations? Why are we abandoning the Pearsonian tradition? Why are we abandoning the lessons of the League of Nations that are

clearly written under that charter? It is there for a reason.

Mr. Pearson and others understood very well that there has to be accountability in decision making at the international level. There must be legitimacy of decision making. You do not turn over decisions to some other country to decide for everybody else. Especially as a statesman of a smaller power, he recognized that the best protection for small and medium sized powers, was not to let great powers use international institutions as their camouflage their subterfuge to be able to manipulate and change the rules of those organizations to support their own interests.

That is the Pearsonian tradition, not what the Prime Minister was talking about and not what the Secretary of State for External Affairs was talking about. The real tradition is written in the charter which this government is now preparing to short-circuit and not follow.

When they got up in the House with all this crocodile kind of rhetoric about how they are prepared to defend the UN, they were not prepared to answer the simple question of why had they evaded the charter of the UN.

Why were they not a voice last November and December when there was a resolution coming forward to insist that any power that wants to use force, that thinks it is no longer appropriate, should use the charter as well? Where was the voice of Canada? Where were the inheritors of the Pearsonian tradition when it was saying to the United States and other great powers: "If you want to use the United Nations, use it as set out in the charter. Don't avoid it. Don't evade it. Don't short-circuit it. Give it legitimacy and credibility."

That should have been the role of Canada. That should have been the inherent tradition of our leaders at the time, but, of course, they were too busy answering the call.

I do not buy this idea that we must adhere to it, because beyond Article 42 is Article 43. It states that if one uses force, then one establishes a UN command and starts planning it. Then one makes specific requests of countries. There is a series of very well prescribed procedures by which the United Nations will finally make a decision to use military action against an aggressor, none of which are being followed today and none of which are being adhered to by our country or by other countries in the United Nations.