

Government Orders

tions auspices with a good command and control structure, I accept that we are evolving toward this.

I would like the hon. member to give the House the benefit of his experience and perhaps to make specific comment on whether he sees this as something that may pertain in a more orderly and more procedural manner in the future?

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, it brings to mind that none of us are quite sure right now what is going to happen in the world. We have the end of a traditional conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States base groups. We have the conventional armies being pulled back on the European fronts. We have had long discussions and some new agreements on the nuclear arsenal. It really is a shift between those two powers.

I personally am very optimistic. I wish the Soviet leadership all the goodwill in the world to overcome the difficulties in its economy and all policy areas where it is lagging behind. It just needs a lot of support from the world right now.

As we resolve this conflict— and perhaps this is where some of the academics can help us understand—we will find that the regional conflicts can have the same degree of troublesome hostility that we once associated only with the great powers.

We are dealing with Iraq which has not only the capabilities of a large and well trained army that has survived a seven-year fight with Iran, but it also has chemical warfare. It may have long-range missiles. We do not think it has access to a nuclear arsenal and we certainly hope that it does not have access to it. However, the potency of that force compared to what we would have seen in the fifties and sixties has changed dramatically.

As we resolve a large conflict on one front, we turn around and face the Middle East. The Middle East is not only going to involve the Iraq-Kuwait border, but it is also going to involve other border fronts. Of course that is why a peace plan and a Middle East committee was suggested. I think that that should be supported by all members of the House.

The fact that these 30 nations are working together and the fact that each step has been going along very carefully and in a very controlled manner is testimony to just how determined the leadership of all these countries is to make sure that this is a successful venture.

Then we go down the line and we have to come to some very critical decisions. How are we going to come to the conclusion that the blockade is not working? Who makes that decision? Once that decision is made and if the answer is that it has not worked, who makes the next decision? Once that decision is made, who implements it?

Those are very important questions. I think the member is right in asking me to address those matters and to give them some thought.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I listened with care to the hon. member's statement. I know he has given a great deal of thought to this issue, having worked with him on the Standing Committee on Human Rights in the past and in particular on the subcommittee on international human rights.

I would just like to seek clarification from the hon. member with respect to his position on the resolution which is before the House. There is a resolution before the House now. There is an amendment and a sub-amendment. Is it his intention to support that resolution or not if the amendment fails?

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the question. I too enjoyed the collegiality we shared on the human rights committee in addressing many issues.

This is one of the most important debates that we can have because we are looking at questions that not only deal with the immediacy of the Iraq-Kuwait-United Nations conflict but also deal with some very basic questions about the UN.

When I was listening to his question, I was thinking of the point that it is not only dealing with what the Middle East looks like today but what we are going to do when this conflict is over. For example, if we are successful in the blockade and Kuwait is restored, are we going to leave Kuwait as a battleground for Iraq to come into again? Are we going to leave it as one of the most undemocratic regimes in the area? Or, are we going to try to show some leadership and say: now that we have