

*Government Orders*

action against another country to serve the self-interests of our own country.

While I say I fully support the condemnation of Iraq in this particular case, at the same time, I have been and I was in the beginning extremely concerned by the fact that Canada's response in sending three ships to the area was done at the request of the United States in the first place, and not by the United Nations. The immediate action by the government to send three ships, no matter how grave the attack on Kuwait was, was done at the request of the United States. That concerned me very much. It was troublesome.

I was also concerned for many weeks—this has been pointed out by many members on this side of the House—that when the government made the decision to send those ships to an area where war might very well break out, it did not immediately recall Parliament. Again, I do not think that the government should ever do that again. Whenever our military forces are sent to any area of the world, it should involve the Parliament of Canada in the decision. It may have been able to convince us in August that it was the right thing to do, but we should have done it with the approval of Parliament and not by the government alone. The government was at fault for not doing that.

One reason that it was incorrect for the Government of Canada to send those three ships in the first place at the request of the United States alone is that it undermines our credibility as a peacekeeping nation. Canada has had a long reputation as one of the outstanding peacekeeping nations in the world. We participated in almost every peacekeeping operation. Our former Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, was awarded the Nobel prize for initiating UN peacekeeping forces. When we respond to a situation like this without doing it through the United Nations, I think we undermine that credibility.

Despite those early misgivings, things turned out better than I originally had hoped for, because soon afterwards the United Nations Security Council did pass a resolution authorizing mandatory economic sanctions against Iraq. It also authorized the use of military forces to enforce the economic sanctions.

That was a great step forward for the United Nations, because it was the first time I believe that it was able to

use Article VII of the UN Charter to enforce a decision of the Security Council. Now we have a situation where I think 150 countries support the economic embargo, 150 countries support the resolution of September 24 in the United Nations, and there are 25 nations which have military forces in the gulf area.

All that is to the good, but I must say there are still some very serious questions that have to be answered. Of course, one of them is that, while the forces that are there are operating under the mandate of the United Nations resolutions, it is still very unclear as to what is the command with respect to those forces.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the UN Charter provides for a Security Council military committee which is to supervise the use of forces under Article VII of the Charter, but that is not being done at the present time. The United States has been reluctant to place its forces under such a command. We have a situation right now where, legally the lines of command are unclear, but in fact, we know that the United States is calling the shots, and I do not think that is acceptable. While there has been a stand-off in the Gulf area between the multilateral forces stationed in the Gulf and in Saudi Arabia and the Iraqi forces in Kuwait, with no further military action, it is always possible with that large build-up of forces that military action could take place.

I was present at the evidence before the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence just a few days ago. There was testimony by some witnesses that war is inevitable. That, I found, was a very depressing analysis of the situation and I hope it does not take place, but many experts believe that sooner or later this situation will develop into outright fighting.

There are four possible goals for those forces in the Gulf area. The first one, of course, is to enforce the sanctions against Iraq as has been authorized by the United Nations and is acceptable and legitimate. Others, however, are talking about the use of the forces to protect Saudi Arabia if there is an attack on Saudi Arabia by the Iraqi forces.

Again, one could legitimize the use of the forces in that instance because they would be protecting a sovereign country against an invasion. That would be legitimate in the short period under Article 51 of the UN Charter, but if the UN is being consistent, I am sure it