

Government Orders

members and its support for the organization has always been strong.

Mr. Speaker, I see that my heart-felt remarks are driving out of the House our colleague who was so upset earlier because we did not have a quorum.

Lester B. Pearson was the driving force behind the peacekeeping efforts to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the preservation of world peace and security. But it is not always good enough to intervene after the dissenting parties have found a compromise which calls for supervision. What happens when one of the protagonist is too weak to defeat the invading forces? Obviously that is a case where there is a need for United Nations protection.

If somebody attacks your neighbour, takes over his house and holds captive a visitor who happened to be there, you will immediately conclude that the neighbourhood is no longer safe and you will undoubtedly want to correct the situation. Canadians have always been the champions of the rights of others, not only because they support justice but also because they have utmost respect for the principle that breaching the rights of a person is tantamount to attacking and threatening those of others.

Law and order are essential to the well-being and peace of a community and its neighbours. And so it goes for each nation and for the international community as a whole. The United Nations is an organization which is essential to protect the international community.

Were we to remain passive or at best indifferent if a country invaded its neighbour, particularly a weaker neighbour, we would undermine the very foundation of international justice, to the detriment of all. Were we to make one exception on the pretense that the country invaded is thousands of kilometres away or that it does not deserve our consideration, we would be throwing our doors wide open to anarchy.

In the early years the United Nations was never able to exercise full influence. The cold war divided the world and thwarted the efforts of the United Nations, yet in spite of that—perhaps more by chance than as a result of enlightened management—it did successfully intervene in Korea.

We now have an opportunity to call upon the U.N. to play the role for which it was created, and that is make the world safer for all countries—large or small, strong or weak, rich or poor. This action—the will to object to undue use of force—involves a risk, with all the consequences and costs that go along with it. If we fail, as has

happened in the past, the potential danger and the price to be paid will be even greater.

The United Nations reacted quite properly to the Iraqi act of aggression. Canada was involved at the Security Council level and has tried to maintain the remarkable consensus of all those who wish to see Iraq abide by the decisions of the Council.

It has been several months since the Iraqi invasion, and many official representatives of various countries, including Canada, have sought ways to make Iraq see reason. However, Iraq remains unmoved and the hostages are still being held.

So far, the UN has proved its mettle but has failed to reach its objective. Even the vigorous application of global sanctions decreed by the United Nations and the presence of a multinational force on its doorstep have failed to persuade Iraq to change its course.

We do not want to go to war against Iraq. We merely want it to abide by UN decisions that have received universal support. Mr. Speaker, anyone who took Latin in high school is familiar with descriptions of Roman military strategy, which included a basic principle expressed as follows: *Si vis pacem, para bellum*, which means: If you want peace, prepare for war. That is more or less what is happening today. In its actions and decisions, the UN has always tried to avoid provoking hostilities, but at the same time, Iraq should be well aware of the firm resolve of all who support the United Nations in this crisis.

The UN is a highly valued institution which Canada holds in high esteem. If we fail the UN now, it will be at the peril of the global village to which we all belong. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that in the final instances, the House will support the motion before it today.

[English]

Mr. Gilbert Parent (Welland—St. Catharines—Thorold): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short comment on what the former speaker was mentioning and to pose a question to her, if she would accept it.

The hon. member said: “If you want peace, you should prepare for war”. There is another truism that we must face and it is that there are very few nations in the history of man who have prepared for war and readied their weapons who have not actually used them. As a matter of fact, in the history of man, there have not been any weapons developed that have not been used in war. It would seem to me that it is always better to dialogue, to speak, than it is to take lives.