

Government Orders

blockaded German ports, stopping supplies of war material and food from reaching the Kaiser's realm. By the end of the war in 1918, I think it was agreed by everybody that the Germans were hungry and they were short of munitions.

There were other examples where sanctions did not work. I refer now to the invasion of Ethiopia by Italy in 1935, where the League of Nations did impose sanctions for two years and they did not work.

A set of rules has been worked out by the experts addressing the question as to whether or not these sanctions will be able to work. The determinants are not difficult. There are four questions that you use in the litmus test, if you like.

The first one is that the country under embargo must have a weak economy. Iraq is a semi-developed country. It relies on its foreign exchange for the export of oil. It imports three-quarters of its food and most of its manufactured goods. As we stand in the House today, the Iraqis have spent billions of dollars. They have difficulty. They cannot export their oil, and their foreign exchange is being spent at a rate that they cannot replace. Therefore we answer yes to the first litmus test.

• (2040)

Second, there should be a relatively small number of geographical or financial points which international action can control. Iraq is surrounded by countries that are basically friendly to us, with one exception. It has 29 miles of coastline and is looking for more. Because of the confluence and the nature of the Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman, and the fairly narrow Strait of Hormuz, it is an ideal country in which to operate economic sanctions.

Another test is that its domestic political conditions must a little shaky. I do not think I need to go on about that. Any country that has to use chemical warfare on its own citizens to keep them in their place would come under the guise of being a fairly shaky country.

Finally, and I think this is very important, the leaders of the international community should be as clear as possible about their own objectives, which must be widely supported. I think we have that. Certainly in my knowledge of warfare and history, this is one of the first times we have had such world order being put together by 26 countries to try to deter the aggression of another country. Force may well be necessary. I agree with those

who say that we may have to use force. That is why you have armed forces, so that you can if you have to use force.

Inherent in that statement and inherent in the possibility of new world order, where we may have a United Nations policeman made up of 26 countries and all these forces to which I made reference, it is incumbent on those who do the ordering of force to try every means in the book to make sure that they have tried every possible measure, means, and avenue to ensure that force has to be used.

The embargo started in the middle of August. Whenever I turn and whatever I hear, it is indicated to me that it is going to take six months as a minimum for the embargo to bite, that is to hurt Iraq. It could take a year as a maximum before we know where we are in this situation. We will not be at six months until the middle of February. A year from August is going to be August 1991. This is why I have difficulty with the ultimatum date of January 15. If it were March 15, I may not be making the same kind of presentation this evening.

Let's have a look at some of the costs. I see the Minister of National Defence is here. This not meant as rhetoric and it is not meant to get at the government. I understand how difficult it is to cost an operation exactly. The peacetime cost to Canada is anywhere from \$1 million, to \$3 million, to \$5 million or thereabouts per day. The real cost is in the tension, although the morale is good, created in the country by having forces there. That is the real cost.

How long can we sustain this? We can sustain the peacetime operation as long as we want. We have to suffer, as indeed we have seen last Friday. The cost of force, whether or not it works, is a tremendous estimate. It is anywhere from 250,000 casualties on both sides, 65,000 deaths, and between \$65 billion and \$100 billion. God knows what will happen to the oil fields and the economies and where it will stop.

World War I started with a small scrimmage on June 28, 1914 when a nationalist killed Archduke Ferdinand of Austria. I do not have to tell the House how big that became. World War II started from a fairly small thing. It started small and ended with 50 million people being killed. I am not conjuring up that kind of an image for this kind of an operation, but the implications of force are fantastic.