

Government Orders

They knew, as in societies everywhere, rules will only be obeyed if they are enforced and that will, if they are not enforced, will become meaningless, and societies themselves cease to be peaceful for anyone. With the sorry history of the League of Nations behind them and, with the awful consequences of appeasement to guide them, they crafted a charter that would give the world the right and capacity to deter aggression and to reverse it by force, if necessary, when it occurred.

Those purposes permeate the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. But those purposes went unfulfilled for decades because a new war intervened—the cold war—a conflict which turned the United Nations into a mere shadow of what Lester Pearson and its other architects had intended.

So we had wars, dozens of them, conflicts which flourished, because the UN was frozen. With the easing of East-West tensions, old excuses have disappeared and new opportunities have emerged. An opportunity now exists to make the United Nations united, not simply in name, but in fact.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): That has been our accomplishment so far in the response to this crisis. No sir, I say to the Leader of the Opposition, this is not Cyprus. This is not Tibet. This is not an area where the United Nations failed, unless its members choose to make it fail. If we choose to make it succeed, we can make the United Nations succeed in this case.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Our accomplishment so far has been that the Security Council of the United Nations has worked as its architects had intended. The Charter of the United Nations has been acted upon. The process of seeking adherence to resolutions has been followed. We are approaching the moment where our words may have to become deeds. It is a difficult moment. It may be easier now to back away; to act not as we have resolved, but rather to retreat from our principles, to retreat from our promises.

To those who would have us back away, there are also troubling arguments and worrisome questions. Of what value would the United Nations be if we now said we were not serious?

• (1540)

After 12 resolutions, clear and unequivocal, do we say that after all, we were just bluffing? Do we say to future aggressors that all they need do is hunker down and wait us out? Are we hollow in our principles and in our words?

Does Canada, which is not a great power in the scheme of things, say that Kuwait, also not a great power, is expendable? Do we say there are rewards for the ruthless and prizes for the powerful? Do we attempt to justify a wrong by saying that we accepted wrongs in the past and did not act then? Do we say we can do no better than we have done, that the future will be as the past was: scarred by sacrifice, wedded to war?

We are contemplating the destruction of the United Nations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The right hon. member's time has expired.

[*Translation*]

I invite the right. hon. minister to conclude, unless the House allows him to continue. Is there consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): The right hon. Secretary of State.

[*English*]

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that extension.

I have just had handed to me the copies in French and English of the letter sent by the Prime Minister to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. If the House is agreed, I would like to lay them upon the table.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Clark (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, if we as Canadians say these things, we are contemplating the destruction of the United Nations and the international order that it now has the chance to build.