

### *Government Orders*

There is one overriding truth in this nuclear age—no nation can achieve true security by itself—Both we and the Soviet Union are, and will remain, vulnerable to nuclear attack—To guarantee our own security in this nuclear age, we must therefore face these realities and work together with other nations to achieve common security. For security in the nuclear age means common security.

The question is, how can we put into practice the principle of common security put forward by the former Secretary of State of the United States? That is the principle, that if our enemy is afraid of us, we are not safe. Or if we are afraid of our enemy, he is not safe, not with nuclear weapons around. The principle is that we must co-operate in order to live and in order bequeath a world in which our children or our grandchildren can live.

We have the basic means to do that in the United Nations. We have the United Nations General Assembly when for the first time in the history of the world almost all countries, including the Arab countries, are present. We have the Security Council empowered to act. We have the World Court, even though the United States ignores it. We have almost four decades of experience of UN peacekeeping.

I see, Mr. Speaker, you are indicating that my time is close to finished and I simply want to make two more points. We must make up our minds to use the least violent methods we can find to end international violence. Some of these are sanctions, continued negotiations, a peace conference on the Middle East to include Israel and the Palestine Liberal Organization and we must stop the deadly trade of money for weapons.

Finally, we should learn to get off dependency on oil. We can do that and it would help everybody including ourselves if we would.

These are alternatives to appeasement. They are alternatives to international war. It is in lines like this we must work to try to restore peace in the Middle East.

**Mr. Jack Whittaker (Okanagan—Similkameen—Meritt):** Mr. Speaker, I found the comments, particularly the final comments of my friend from Trinity—Spadina most interesting given the article that I was just reading *Defense & Diplomacy*, October 1990 issue, an article by Dr. Christine M. Helms. In this article Dr. Helms discusses some of the background of the present dispute in the Persian Gulf, as set out by my friend, and makes a

comment that the seeds of discontent between Iraq and the United States had been sown at least five years earlier when American officials became increasingly concerned over Iraq's military capabilities, particularly an acquisition of advanced technology. She goes on in the article to talk about one of the matters the member for Trinity—Spadina has talked about, common security. I think it would be relevant to quote a couple of paragraphs from the article where she says:

Rhetoric is platitude, and morality will remain elusive. The ultimate losers are the region's common folk, people whose mundane daily problems will continue to multiply. The region's population, for example, will double in the next two decades in the face of dwindling resources, especially water.

But crises can be turned for the better. If Arab leaders can address more effectively the causes of the region's economic and social discontent and the Western world can learn about the deep-rooted causes of conflict in the region and assist in a wise positive response, some good may yet come of all this.

• (1630)

Given the hon. member's comments on our common security and a move toward common security, does he feel that any of the recipe for that commonality is present? Can there be some way that some good can come out of this total conflict?

**Mr. Heap:** Mr. Speaker, I thank the member for his question. I think it can. I do not think it will or will not. I am not trying to predict. We have the possibility. We are in the very business now, along with people in other countries, of making that choice.

We can choose to revert to old patterns, World War I and World War II patterns, and fire all our ammunition or, we can choose to hold off, to pull back, and to use diplomatic pressure, economic pressure, offers of aid, not only to the Iraqi population who are by far definitely not the most affluent in the world, offers of aid to others in that region, that is non-military aid instead of sending more guns, either in the hands of our troops or to put into their hands. That money is needed so that children, women, and even men can live. I believe if we move in that direction, then there is the chance to do something much better than what we have had up until now in the Middle East.

**Mr. Steven W. Langdon (Essex—Windsor):** Mr. Speaker, I would first like to congratulate my desk-mate on an excellent speech.