

And we require that order. We need a co-operative order in trade for our prosperity. We need a co-operative order in security since we cannot provide it ourselves on this huge territory in an age of nuclear weapons. Canadians need co-operative order because its absence would mean the power of the strongest always wins.

And to build that order, we must work with others. It is not an accident that Lester Pearson and others were so active in drafting the Charter of the United Nations and helping make it work. It is not an accident that Canada has been such a strong proponent of a reformed NATO, a new GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), a strengthened CSCE (Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe), an active Commonwealth, a more effective OAS (Organization of American States), a vital La Francophonie and an expanded structure of dialogue with the Asia-Pacific region.

And no other country in the world has been more active and persistent and generous in supporting the development of a United Nations system which works.

If the Persian Gulf situation is not resolved in the way the United Nations has demanded, if Saddam Hussein is allowed to keep the spoils of his conquest, then Canadians must accept a United Nations which will fail in the future, a United Nations which will be unable to deter or turn back future aggression, an organization seriously weakened in its ability to help develop countries or feed starving children or clean up the environment. The world has just begun to treat the United Nations seriously. This is not the time to stop.

In the Persian Gulf, the world has returned to the United Nations. It is not departing from the Charter. It is returning to it. And this is not contrary to peacekeeping. Peacekeeping was invented because the UN did not work, because the great powers did not want it to make peace, only to supervise truces. Those who invented peacekeeping -- Lester Pearson included -- lamented the inability of the world community to make peace. What the Gulf is about is returning to the principle that the best guarantee of peace is the guarantee that aggression will not be accepted.

The United States has returned to the United Nations. So too has the Soviet Union. And in so doing, national purposes have been modified, compromises have been made and consensus has been built. What possible incentive would any great power have in returning to that organization in the future, in making compromises, in seeking consensus, if now, after all this, one of the most naked acts of aggression in 50 years is allowed to succeed?