

4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

I wonder why the hon. member stopped only at the fact that it was created to stop war.

In responding to the Secretary of State for External Affairs' address, she went on to say that there has been a flow of arms to Iraq, and I hope I quote her accurately, and that Canada was wrong in assisting in the steady flow of conventional arms to Saddam Hussein.

In light of the fact that Canada has very strong legislation proscribing the flow of arms to countries such as Iraq, I wonder if she could give us evidence to support her claim that we assisted in the flow of arms to Saddam Hussein?

**Mrs. Stewart:** Mr. Speaker, I would begin by answering the hon. member's first comments about the UN Charter. There is nothing in the Charter that the member read here in the House with which I would disagree. I support that totally. It is how we institute and bring about those principles that is important.

In the United Nations itself we have all been so pleased with the universal adoption of UN resolutions imposing sanctions against Iraq and the participation of so many countries from all areas around the world in trying to make sure that those sanctions bite.

At the time that those resolutions were put in place, the thought was that through this peaceful means we would be able to get and convince Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait. There is evidence internationally today that those sanctions are beginning to bite. They are beginning to work. The problem is that we have not had provided to us, as requested, any information from this government which would lead us to believe that those sanctions are not being effective.

We listened to experts world-wide who are saying that it requires more time for those sanctions to be effective. If we can provide for those sanctions to be effective, we will have achieved our goal of driving Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait in a peaceful manner. That surely is our objective. We should be doing everything we can, in keeping with the principles of the United Nations, to work in a peaceful way for peace and security in our world.

### *Government Orders*

With regard to the flow of arms into Iraq and the implication of Canada being involved with that, it is well known that the disclosure procedures and records of the government are inadequate. There have been constant and repeated requests for improved recording of Canada's trading in arms world-wide.

Canada is very involved in the production of parts of armaments that do not necessarily go directly to the end user of those parts. We need better records and a better method of disclosing publicly how arms flow around the world. There certainly have been strong allegations to the effect that indeed Canadian production has been implicated and that arms with Canadian parts at least have found their final residence in Iraq. We want to see measures taken by the government to prevent that occurrence in the future.

• (1750)

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** First, I want to thank my colleague for her address. I found it most useful and helpful. I appreciate that she has put forward our party's position. I am going to make a comment, but with a series of questions that have been raised by my constituents. My colleague may choose to answer any one of them, or perhaps none at all, depending upon the time.

The constituents have called about a series of three concepts. The first is why the government did not consult Parliament before committing troops to the Gulf. There is a real concern that, whenever there is a possibility of major conflict, that should be discussed openly in the House of Commons.

The second question relates to the debate today. Why will the government not accept to wait for UN authorization before considering armed conflict, unless attacked of course? There is a real concern there that we ought to be going forward only with the UN resolution.

There is a concern, I believe, in further discussions, that this motion is really quite vague. I do not say that in a partisan or unkind way. Perhaps it is a blank cheque. The government is looking for a lot of flexibility and manoeuvrability and where will this lead?

Concerns are also related to casualties. For example, there is the whole question of what are the expected casualties if we were to go to war. That is a very important question that has not been addressed. When I