

*Government Orders*

decision with none of the five permanent members vetoing action.

I want to plead with members to go easy on the luxury of talking about fighting Iraq, deposing Saddam. Calling him a madman suggests that he might be less than human, and therefore we can treat him as less than human. I believe that is not the kind of thinking we should be following. That is no solution.

We have been told that we had to act quickly to protect Saudi Arabia. We really have been presented, so far as I have heard, with no evidence that Saudi Arabia was in danger. United States reported that it had information through its satellites that Iraqi tanks were amassing on the Saudi border.

United States reports have before at times turned out not to be true. There was the infamous Gulf of Tonkin incident which was concocted in order to escalate the war in Vietnam. Perhaps it was a mistake. Perhaps it was not deliberately concocted, but it certainly should not have been used as the jumping off point for that miserable war.

The invasion of Kuwait arises from a 60-year old dispute, in part that was generated by Britain's handling of its sphere of influence in the Middle East after World War I. There is no such dispute to my knowledge between Iraq and Saudi Arabia. There is no such dispute over any shared oil fields and this dispute between Iraq and Kuwait is partly a legacy of World War I colonialism when Britain and France as the principal victors in World War I, partitioned the old Ottoman Empire and took some as colonies and took some as, in effect, semi-independent states but under their tutelage.

In that area where Britain and France have been active ever since, though less than before, we had the United Nations' action of creating the State of Israel, a decision which unfortunately blew up in a dispute between the Israelis and those who had lived there before.

This arose from Britain's policy of having promised during the war, to get allies, promised the same land both to the Palestinians who had always lived there and to the Jews who yearned to return there.

When the United Nations tried to stabilize that situation with Resolution 242 demanding that Israel withdraw from territories it had occupied in war later on, that was scorned by Israel, ignored by the United States, not enforced by the Security Council, just as there was no Security Council action to stop or even condemn the United States for its naked, aggressive invasion of Panama and the killing of 3,000 people, mostly civilians. In other words we have a double standard here, Mr. Speaker, and let us not go to war just to make a debating point in a double standard.

The fact is also that the five permanent members of the Security Council have been among those who armed Saddam during the past 10 years. Why? Apparently they wanted Saddam to attack Iran, which Saddam did. Now Saddam has made peace with Iran and has attacked Kuwait, but his conduct as a military aggressor was blessed for years by the United States, by Britain, by France, implicitly, and suddenly they have turned their blessing into a curse.

Mr. Speaker, we have something on our own consciences as allies in NATO of the United States and Britain. In fact it was the NATO alliance to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs appealed as an authority when he said that he had sent the ships to the Middle East after consulting with NATO officials in Brussels. The Middle East is not in the legal sphere of responsibility of NATO by the NATO charter. It is thousands, or hundreds of miles outside it. NATO had no business authorizing ships or encouraging Canada to send ships to the Gulf of Oman. It was not NATO's responsibility, although I understand some NATO generals, now that they do not think they have to use their weapons against the Soviet Union, would like to try them somewhere else, such as in Arabia to defend United States oil.

United States oil has been a very serious problem in the Middle East for a good many decades, for example in the overthrow of the former Prime Minister of Iran. I am reading here from a document called *The Recent Iranian History* by the parliamentary Library dated September 19. In part he is talking about the dispute over oil price:

— the British owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC) was still in place, and its royalties to Iran totalled less than the British Government's tax revenues from the Company. Many Iranians grew increasingly discontent with this arrangement, regarding it as blatant exploitation—