

### *Government Orders*

An important part of the allied camp, and of congressional and public opinion in the United States, thinks that sanctions should be given more time to work, that the alternatives to war have not been exhausted. This latter clearly is true.

Of course, that criterion that he refers to for a justified war is that it must be the last resort after all peaceful measures have been exhausted.

William Pfaff asks in his article: "How did the United States get itself into this situation?" He points out that the American ultimatum and the deployment of so many troops, military equipment and forces to the area have placed them in a position now where they feel they cannot withdraw without losing face.

One knows that one of the very basic tenets of negotiation is that the top man does not make ultimatums at the very beginning of the resolution of the conflict. The President of the United States or the President of Iraq never says at the very beginning that this is the ultimatum for solving the crisis, so that neither side can back out, so that there is no door to escape by.

William Pfaff says that the American ultimatums and the deployment of so large an American and international force have created conditions with gross built-in penalties should Washington change course. That is the problem. They have themselves so far committed to war down the road that now they feel they would more or less embarrass themselves to back down. Again, Pfaff analyses that particular policy of the United States. He states:

That puts the United States in the position of justifying immediate war to redeem its own unconsidered commitments.

But he says: "The critical moral commitment lies here. The Bush administration should never have put the United States into this position. However, it does little good to say that now we are where we are. . . Intellectual failure, is also a moral issue. Leaders are elected on their claim to know what they are doing. In this case they didn't know what they were doing."

The President of the United States and the administration of the United States, in making those ultimatums and in committing so many troops at an early stage of the situation, put themselves into a position now where they make war almost inevitable and they are trying to justify

it after the fact. Unfortunately this government is backing them all the way on that particular effort.

It is true that the Security Council approved resolution 678. It is interesting, when we look at that particular vote, to see that such a wide diversity of countries actually came together in approving that resolution, countries such as the Soviet Union, France, China—

**An hon. member:** Not China.

**Mr. Allmand:** My colleague says: "Not China". It abstained. It certainly did not vote against it. It almost passed unanimously. It was not vetoed. There were only two dissenting votes by countries that did not have a veto.

In any case, it is true that they got that approval, but once again the fact that this group of nations approved of that resolution does not mean it is fully in accordance with the United Nations charter.

• (2350 )

As my leader pointed out this morning, when we look at the key words in the resolution, it states that the Security Council authorizes member states co-operating with the Government of Kuwait to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area. It is authorizing member states to do all those things. It is authorizing the United States, Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt as individual states to take what action they believe "all necessary" means, including war, to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and to restore international peace and security in the area.

As we asked in the previous debate, what is meant by the area? Does this mean invading Israel, Lebanon, or Egypt? What does it mean to restore peace and security in the area?

It was a very wide open resolution. We voted against that resolution in this House at that time which would have supported this U.N. resolution because we said that it was too early, that sanctions had not been given enough time, and that diplomatic initiatives had not been given enough time.