

Government Orders

time to roust Saddam Hussein from Kuwait will bring about peace, maintain or improve international order?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to say with regard to sanctions that many believed a peaceful solution was impossible, whatever their desire. Yet, again I say, we do not have enough evidence from this government upon which we can base such a statement. He also said whether or not the UN resolution will mean using force was entirely up to Saddam Hussein.

• (1740)

In describing the draft UN resolution which is to come before the Security Council tomorrow, he made a very curious statement. He talked about what he called the built-in constructive proposal which we see, in other words, as a deadline. I found it personally amusing to hear the Secretary of State for External Affairs comment that the Prime Minister interprets deadline as a pause of goodwill and that a pause of goodwill cannot be misconstrued as a deadline. It is important for the Prime Minister to make this fine distinction because our Secretary of State for External Affairs is on record for believing that a deadline, in his view, is artificial and should not be used. Now, instead of talking about a deadline, we talk about a pause of goodwill. To my mind, in reading the UN resolution, by any other word that means deadline.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs went on to talk about the post war situation *vis-à-vis* Iraq and about what accommodations could be made. It sounded so unrealistic, as if a war in the Middle East would be a very clean, neat operation. I reiterate that it is important for people to understand that a war in the Middle East will have enormous costs in terms of human life, if nothing else.

Saddam Hussein is somebody who has been known from past experience to use the weapons at hand that he has. There is no reason to believe that he would not use those weapons again. The weapons in hand would have a tremendously devastating effect, not just on Iraq and Kuwait but on the whole region. However, the loss of life will be beyond reckoning anything that we could condone or support, certainly at this time.

There were a few encouraging notes from the Secretary of State for External Affairs—and I hope it is so—in his comments wherein he said that this crisis had given

us a new sense of urgency to deal with other Middle East problems. If this is so, we welcome it. I personally feel that the addressing of other Middle East problems is long past due.

Also he said that there must be elements of a peaceful resolution of this conflict. I think all of us would like to see a peaceful resolution of this conflict. I believe that at this time it is possible to do so in a peaceful way and not to have to use force through supporting the draft UN resolution which will come before the Security Council of the United Nations tomorrow.

I know that my time is nearly up. As a final point I just wish to say that the Liberal Party on this side of the House for which I speak cannot approve of the blank cheque the government has presented to us today with regard to the situation in the Middle East. We can support an amended resolution and hope that the government would agree with it.

Mr. Benno Friesen (Parliamentary Secretary to Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I listened with care to the speech of the hon. member. She began by saying that the Liberal Party condemns Saddam Hussein for what he has done. I am not sure he will toss and turn in his bed at night worrying about our condemnation, if that is all we do.

Mr. Allmand: Sanctions too.

Mr. Friesen: Sanctions too, yes. She went on to say that the UN was created to stop war. Nobody would deny that, but I wonder why she stopped there. Let me read the first article of the UN charter:

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

2. To develop friendly relations—

And so on. I think she may have read this herself at some time. It continues:

3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and