

*Government Orders*

The members of the OAS and Canada in particular had high hopes of seeing renewal in Haiti and we are still determined to enable it to again become part of the community of democratic nations. The measures of economic and commercial isolation that we are referring to today were part of the international community's strategy to force the perpetrators of the *coup* to negotiate in good faith with the democratic forces of Haiti.

It must be borne in mind that the United Nations Security Council is the only body with the power under international law to compel its members to implement measures ranging from political and economic isolation to blockading and the use of force. As a regional body, the OAS does not have this power. Its resolutions do have a moral and therefore political force but they are, nonetheless, no more than recommendations.

As I have already explained, the measures recommended by the OAS are recommendations only and engage only its 34 member countries. From the outset it was fully understood by us that they would not have a universal application. It should be added that most of the economic and trade relations between Haiti and the countries of our hemisphere were still going on. The embargo, although only partial, had a real effect on the Haitian economy and on the usurers' ability to manage the country.

As soon as resolution 191 was adopted by the OAS, it was brought before the UN. On October 11, 1991 the Secretary of State for External Affairs delivered a lengthy speech to the United Nations, denouncing the *coup* in Haiti. She rightly appealed to the international community, pointing out that whenever a democracy fell by reason of a *coup d'état* it was the duty of the United Nations to intervene to protect its cherished principles. She urged all countries to join with the OAS in its efforts to restore constitutional stability in the region.

Let me now bring to mind the speech delivered to the United Nations on November 24, 1992 by our ambassador, Mrs. Louise Frechette, in support of General Assembly agenda point 22, entitled *The Democracy and Human Rights Situation in Haiti*.

After calling to mind the new resolution on Haiti adopted by the UN on November 10 by the OAS, Mrs. Frechette expressed her satisfaction with a productive co-operation underway between the United Nations and the OAS concerning Haiti in both the political and humanitarian aid sectors.

Calling for an intensification of this co-operative activity, Mrs. Frechette affirmed that the new resolution, asked Secretary General Soares to seek the assistance of the United Nations and its Secretary General in order that special attention might be brought to bear on strengthening the trade embargo on Haiti, especially with regard to petroleum products and arms. I can hardly emphasize enough the importance that the Government of Canada attaches to this question.

I strongly encourage all the member states of the United Nations to join us to strengthen the international measures likely to assist democracy and restore legitimacy in Haiti. As far as Canada is concerned, we think that the Security Council should not hesitate to seize itself of the issue of Haiti.

Bringing Haiti back among the democratic nations is an act of justice and one whereby democracy will be strengthened in the western hemisphere. Canada attaches so much attention to the subject of democracy because it lies at the heart of the concepts of progress and the security in the region.

Not only is the proposed amendment unnecessary, as I have already pointed out, but the Special Economic Measures Act provides no authority to adopt it.

An amendment to the Special Economic Measures (Haiti) Ships Regulations must be based on the authority conferred by section 4 of the act. That section authorizes the adoption of regulations and orders related to the restriction or prohibition of activities that involve a direct relationship between Canada or Canadians on the one hand, and the state subject to sanctions on the other.

The relationship between Canada and states other than the one subject to sanctions is not a proper matter for orders and regulations under section 4. In brief, the proposed amendment is beyond the scope of the regulation making power conferred by the act.