

partners, but others who might have some influence. The Prime Minister, in particular, is in regular contact with President Mubarak; with King Hussein; with President Bush; with Prime Minister Major; with President Mitterrand; with President Gorbachev. In his conversations two days ago with President Mitterrand, there was discussion of the proposals we had put forward to the Secretary-General, proposals that were not then public, and Mitterrand indicated at that time that there was a great deal of similarity in the thinking and the analysis of the French and the Canadian governments.

Those activities, of course, continue, as was indicated during Question Period, as we try to find if there are ways in the hours that remain in this pause for peace that was established to try to encourage Saddam Hussein to respond to someone.

Those things have been done. They have been done by Canada. And they have been done by other countries. There has been an extraordinary attempt to solve this diplomatically.

But today, January 15, we are at an impasse and approaching a turning point. Peace still has a chance. But where once peace might have been an expectation, it is now only a hope, and that hope grows dim with every door Saddam Hussein slams shut, with every hour that passes.

So Canada, and the world, must face the fact that Iraq may force a conflict. There are no good wars. War is mankind's least noble invention. Everyone wants to avoid it. At this sombre moment, we owe it to Canadians to determine as best we can if the course we are embarked upon is correct, and if there are responsible realistic alternatives -- not waiting, not running away, but real alternatives. There have been wars in the past where patriotism has overshadowed logic, where pride has prevented peace, where emotion has overcome reason. We must be as confident as we can be that if this comes to war, it is not one of those wars.

Forty-six years ago the nations of the world formed an organization -- the United Nations -- whose primary purpose was to be the maintenance of international peace and security. The men and women who designed that organization were not idealists. They were realists, worn by war, steeped in suffering. They had seen the futility of rules without a capacity to enforce them. They knew that as in societies everywhere, rules will only be obeyed if they are enforced and that if they are not enforced, rules become meaningless and societies themselves cease to be peaceful for anyone. And so, with the sorry history of the League of Nations behind them, with the awful consequences of appeasement to guide them, they crafted a Charter which would