

Government Orders

taken before these resolutions of the United Nations, I had already read into the record this morning, and I will repeat, that it was the August 2 UN resolution which condemned the invasion of Kuwait. It was the August 6 UN resolution which instituted sanctions against Iraq and occupied Kuwait. It was August 9 which condemned the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq. It was August 10 when Prime Minister Mulroney announced the intention of the Government of Canada to respond to this crisis by deploying the three ships, the *Athabaskan*, *Terra Nova* and *Protecteur* to the region, and announcing at that time that with the understanding that it would take time to prepare the ships to sail and time additionally to arrive there that there would be opportunity for the debate which we have been having here since Monday on this issue.

I think that it is important that the condemnation that is being made of our government should at least try to be factually based. The government does not apologize for the swiftness of the response to this crisis. The fact is that efforts at the United Nations, and generally through the international community, were moving in tandem. I hope, although he only confined himself to discussing future possibilities in the last several moments of his speech, he could in his response pick up, for example, the point I was outlining about having a United Nations standing peacekeeping force, some of these ideas. Let us, on something as important to this country and this world as this current crisis in the gulf, try to stop scoring parliamentary points and look at the broad outlines of what is possible for future Canadian policy.

I would welcome the response of the critic for the New Democratic Party on some of these future actions because I know in bringing to this subject his concerns, he will want, as all of us will, to look ahead to the future and try and see beyond an attitude about the Americans or the Soviets or anyone else in the region, that we look here at what we are doing as an independent country, a charter member of the United Nations, seeking, in a difficult circumstance that to date is being well managed, to find a positive role to ensure that the peace that is tenuous but is still holding can in fact be held.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to respond to the hon. member's question. I am sure that it was inadvertent but, of course, in his chronology he overlooked a very fundamental point. While the resolutions to which he referred which were adopted by the Security Council prior to August 10 in fact did impose sanctions, it was not until August 25 that the Security Council adopted a resolution which in fact authorized the use of minimal force to enforce those sanctions.

It was the meeting of the Prime Minister with the President of the United States, George Bush, on August 6, followed by a meeting of the NATO countries on August 10 in Brussels, which led to the decision to send troops. That decision was not just pursuant to the United Nations—and indeed it was not pursuant at that point to any United Nations resolution, because it was not until two weeks later that the United Nations authorized that; fortunately most other countries that have troops in the region now did in fact wait for the United Nations—but rather it was for the second mandate.

It is often overlooked that there are two different mandates that this government is operating under. One is purportedly under the United Nations, and indeed at this point under the United Nations, but the second is this vague mandate of deterring aggression which is completely separate from the United Nations mandate. I would hope that the parliamentary secretary would recognize that and recognize that as of August 10 there was no United Nations resolution authorizing the use of force or troops to enforce sanctions.

The hon. member suggests that we look to the future and to what role the United Nations might play effectively. I agree completely with him. I certainly welcome the suggestion of a United Nations peacekeeping force. I think that is a very positive suggestion and one that I hope Canada is actively pursuing in the Security Council.

However, I remind the hon. member—and I would welcome his comments on the point—that there exists now a body under the framework of the United Nations, and I am speaking of the military staff committee, which is in a position to move and to co-ordinate, particularly under articles 42 and 43 of the charter, military action by the United Nations. Is Canada actively pursuing this