

*Government Orders*

were. For example, he could aim the Scud B at Israel and probably miss within 100 kilometres. It is difficult.

There may be a loss of life and that would be tragic. There is no question about it. As I say, I do not think there is any guarantee, now that he has built himself up to this level of armament, now that he is in Kuwait, and now that he is in total control of his situation, even though the economy will begin to suffer, that we can in any way anticipate what he will do. As long as we are there, as long as the blockade is in effect, as long as hopefully by then a United Nations command has a tremendously effective military at its disposal if necessary, and as long as Saddam Hussein knows that he is at the end of the road, that he cannot go any further and that he has got to build down, I think that is all we can hope for.

Hopefully, as my friend has pointed out, when the sanctions really begin to bite, some sense may come into his position and he may indeed then attempt to bargain for some kind of, I will not say compromise, but certainly some end to the stalemate.

**Mr. Len Hopkins (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke):** Mr. Speaker, through the years in history we have seen all kinds of dictatorships and we have seen all kinds of efforts to overcome them.

The League of Nations was a great attempt to try to overcome the problems between the two world wars. That organization failed because the stronger nations of the world failed to support it. We saw the consequences of that through six years of horrible war in World War II.

• (1340)

It brings to light another point about Saddam Hussein and Iraq. When he moved to take over Kuwait on August 2, it was an act of international aggression probably more serious than we have seen in 15 years. The question is, are we going to allow this to happen or are we going to take action?

The hon. member for Brant talked about what might have happened in Europe, when Hitler moved into Czechoslovakia and the other countries, if nations at that time should have opposed him. What would the result have been? We all know that at that time the western free countries were not prepared to hold a great war because they did not have the equipment. When World War II broke out, Britain almost collapsed. It had very

few weapons and Canada was the first country to send a major contingent to help.

What I want to point out is this. We will have more Saddam Hussein in world history. It will not stop here. It is the old adage that people who think that we do not need a good solid military force in the free world are just dreaming. We have to be prepared to defend freedom at any time. There is no way in a free and democratic country that force will be used for dictatorial purposes. In Canada, for example, we have had Canadian Forces playing a part in peacekeeping between Iran and Iraq. We are already very educated about the situation there. We have had peacekeeping in Korea and in parts of Africa. Canadians are professional peacekeepers.

In the Persian Gulf we have Saddam Hussein who came forward with a strong army, a fairly strong air force, and chemical weapons which we have not seen used in major warfare since World War I. All these inhumanities are coming to the fore once again. He is not just a dictator. He is worse than that. We see blatant dictatorship, blatant nationalism and greed on the part of the Iraqi leader and greed is what prompts dictators to move.

On August 2, when Saddam Hussein moved into the oil-rich emirate of Kuwait, the world was suddenly faced with a dilemma. If there is one thing that has been brought to the fore, it is whether or not we should look seriously at reforming the speed at which the United Nations may act under such circumstances. It has always been Canada's position to be peacekeepers under the command of the UN, to unite with other nations to maintain peace, and to maintain international boundaries where there is aggression, but to do it under the flag of the United Nations.

In this case, Canada can back up the resolutions already passed by the United Nations, but we want to see this become a UN force. It is very important, not just for Canada's national policy, what our national policy should be, and that it should be practised, but it is also very important for the years to come. When another fracas break out, nations will say that they will go to war and set up blockades. That is fine, but they will be doing it on their own.

Every time we do that in international affairs in today's world context, we are not doing it under the guise of a United Nations effort and the United Nations mandate. We are weakening the United Nations when we make