

this as an instance where the cold war is on the demise—it is not over yet—we see here a basic point in the crossroads in the evolution of international order. I would not have believed this could have happened, that we would have had 30 nations so solid in their support of the Security Council in the United Nations with no vetoes. I think this is a wonderful occasion.

We should take some measure from this, because since World War II analysts have been carefully endeavouring to evaluate the sufficiency of our force in a single, simple defence criterion, and that has been the extent to which our commitments correspond with our capabilities. Indeed the title of the last written white paper is *Capability versus Commitment*. I submit that perhaps a more appropriate assessment today should include the consideration of the degree to which the quality, size and utility of our forces parallel a more realistic evaluation of future threats.

Accordingly, I want to take this opportunity in the three or four or so minutes that I have to indicate some of the concerns that perhaps we need to look at when we plan our defence budget.

We no longer have the same bipolar world we had before. I do not suggest that traditions of the east-west conflict do not still maintain, but we do not have a world where we have one monolithic communism. We do not have two bipolar powers that always disagree in principle. In the past conventional thought focused on fighting a major conflict in eastern Europe. In fact the main battlefield is now one country, so the eastern front is not what it used to be.

We have new threats. We have the proliferation of missiles and high-tech weapons in the Middle East as we see today in Asia. We have the expanding drug war in Latin America, and we have the unending spectre of international terrorism that we see almost on a regular basis.

In addition to these changes we also recognize that military might, might not wield the same power of influence it did in earlier times. Instead we are looking at a relative power of countries in an increasing complex interplay of economic and military factors, as we see by the oil determinants, which together are impacted by the fragile disposition of modern domestic political systems. We have the emergent democracies in eastern Europe. In fact instead of one nuclear power in the Soviet Union, we may have 15 independent ones, which quite frankly

Government Orders

from an arms control viewpoint scares the living day-lights out of me.

There are three key developments that we should be concerned about. Very quickly, they are the international threat environment that I just mentioned. The second development refers to efforts to forge a new approach toward devising strategy, and this is the inclusion of economic factors, as well as military and political factors. Third, we have items that concern us taking place in the United Nations like we have recently seen. The degree of co-operation that countries may now be able to have because the cold war does not constrain people to one side or the other, I believe is a harbinger of international order and perhaps an international peace force that we may see in the future. We may not be looking at peacekeeping, as was suggested yesterday; we may be looking at peacemaking.

In conclusion, if I could suggest that we are looking at a more macro, different view of the world today and if events of the past are to be recognized in a positive sense, we have to look at this major occurrence and apply it to our defence planning in the following manner.

For example, what are our objectives? The objective here is to contribute to world peace, to get Iraq out of Kuwait and to make it difficult for it to go back. What this has in a follow-on commitment is open to our imagination. What are our goals? What assets do we have? How willing are we to defend or preserve the peace and at what level?

In speaking to the motion, yes, I can agree that the House condemns the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. It is unprecedented. It is against world order. I can agree that we want the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and the full restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. I affirm unequivocally our support for the action of our men and women, the United Nations Security Council, those who have participated since August 2, and the dispatch that has taken place in the past.

I would be very concerned if we were to give a blank cheque for what happens in the future, because in this kind of situation the fear of a sudden escalation is something that I am sure concerns all members of the House. I sincerely hope that before we move into that kind of thing we would have a full, open and candid debate about the future of our Canadian Forces in the Middle East.