

*Government Orders*

The issue is how to deal with Saddam Hussein. How do you deal with Iraq? That is the issue, and the member agrees. The question then is how to deal with him in a way that is as consistent as possible with the United Nations charter. While it fundamentally calls for peace, it understands, however, the need to escalate the various efforts that the world community can make to enforce world law and the rule of law internationally.

This brings us very quickly to the issue of sanctions. Again we all agreed initially in this House that sanctions were valuable and important, so sanctions were imposed. In terms of the compliance with those sanctions, they have proven to be the most effective sanctions ever imposed in the history of the world.

There are 115 cases of sanctions since the end of the First World War. A very learned study published in *The New York Times* and again in *The Globe and Mail* demonstrates in detail—if the member would do me the courtesy; I gave him the courtesy—that these are the most effective sanctions since the First World War and in fact since sanctions were recorded.

These sanctions operated on a country that is particularly vulnerable to sanctions. It has one major export, which is oil. The member shakes his head. It is really interesting that there has been simply no evidence placed on the table of this House of Commons or before a committee that would contradict the fundamental conclusions of this study.

Let me just deal with how it deals with dictators, which is the final point I wish to make. It has been suggested over and over again that dictators would not respond to this and that somehow Saddam Hussein would not respond to sanctions. Benito Mussolini is said to have confided to Hitler that, had the League of Nations included oil in its sanctions against Italy in 1935-36, he would have been forced to withdraw from Ethiopia in a week. This study concludes that if sanctions had had time to work, this war would not have been necessary. That is why we say this is an unnecessary war. That is why we say this is an unjustified war.

• (1610)

**Mr. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt):** Madam Speaker, I listened to the hon. member for Victoria with great interest. As we have seen, Iraq, under the leadership of Saddam Hussein, invaded its southern neighbour, Kuwait, a smaller country. While this is a

major concern to the world and to all Canadians, we are looking at this with interest. It attracted great world attention and resulted in an aggression by other countries against Saddam Hussein.

However, there are similar cases in which such things have been done. A prime example is Cyprus. In 1974, Turkish troops invaded the island of Cyprus and succeeded in taking over one-half of the island, resulting in many deaths and more than 2,000 disappearances. The United Nations has passed numerous resolutions condemning the Turkish action but did not even go so far as to impose sanctions or other punitive measures on Turkey. I have repeatedly questioned the government on the double standard.

I would like to know from the member for Victoria what his party's position is regarding the issue of Cyprus, because I have not heard it. Maybe they have commented on it, but I would like to hear with my own ears what his party's position is regarding Cyprus and what they are proposing to bring to this House in order to resolve the situation, which has been ongoing for 16 years.

**Mr. Brewin:** Madam Speaker, I simply am not going to respond, much as I would love to do so and get into a discussion on Cyprus. Generally, our party has always supported any effort to bring peace to that troubled area as well as Canada's work in peacekeeping. We have sent delegations and so forth. But this is not the day to debate the question of Cyprus and to come to full grips with the issue. We believe there are many troubled areas in the world, but today the area of the world that needs our attention is the gulf. I would hope this House would keep its attention to that subject.

**Mr. Karygiannis:** You have no position on Cyprus.

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Madam Speaker, just referring to the gulf, would the member for Victoria tell us: Does the NDP's position of non-involvement extend to the situation in which Saddam Hussein carries out his threat and attacks Israel? Does it mean the NDP would not allow Canadian forces to attack Iraq in order to end that type of travesty?

**Mr. Brewin:** Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate the question because it permits me to clear up what may be a misconception, one I hope is not fostered by the hon. member. I am sure he is looking for information. Let me clarify it.