

Government Orders

when I referred to the declarations of the State Department in the 1940s and of President Eisenhower.

For years and years, the Americans have considered that the energy resources of the Middle East and of the Arabian Peninsula are of great strategic value to them. Here they act in a different way than they have done with respect to other places. It is not just the United States. It is China in Tibet. It is the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. It is Turkey in Cyprus, and so on.

We have turned a blind eye to those things. I am not saying that is right, but if we are going to do this this time, let us be consistent. Let us act on principle and have it apply to everyone in the same way as we are doing now. That will be a new world order and I will support it.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, in congratulating the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce, I would like to ask him if in his view, the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his speech this afternoon discharged the onus of demonstrating to the House that there is an urgency and inevitability and that it is absolutely necessary to subscribe in advance to a resolution which is a potential declaration of war through the United Nations?

Mr. Allmand: No, Mr. Speaker, he made his case. What the government, through the Secretary of State for External Affairs, was attempting to do was to gain the support of the House for an exceptional measure, a measure which would give the member states of the United Nations all necessary means, including war, to implement the resolutions of the United Nations. That is an exceptional request of the House and the burden of proving it and gaining support for it was with the minister. He did not give us enough evidence to support it. As a matter of fact, he did not deal with the questions that were raised. Most experts think that sanctions, given time, will have an impact on Iraq and will work. If diplomatic initiatives were used with greater imagination, they would work as well. He did not make his case. The burden of proof is with him. This party will not support him in that resolution.

• (1900)

Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Security Council of the United Nations again takes up the issue of the events in the gulf. Tonight, we

again debate this very difficult question in the Canadian House of Commons.

We find ourselves these days in a desperate conundrum: committed to peace but constrained to show a willingness to use force to resolve the gulf crisis. I am as uncomfortable with this state of affairs as I think anyone else in our country is. I want peaceful resolutions to international conflicts and would certainly prefer the deliberate process of discussing the reasons for disputes before they turn into something more serious. Yet we are now beyond that point.

Iraq has already attacked its neighbour, Kuwait, and has begun to efface from the earth all evidence of the existence of that small country. The world cannot allow that sort of aggression to go unchecked, or it will invite further aggression and intimidation. All that stands between the collapse of respect for international order and the obliteration of a member state of the United Nations is the will of other member states that this must not happen.

Last week, I met with the new ambassador from Ethiopia to Canada. I asked him what he thought about the situation in the gulf. He pointed out that his country, Ethiopia, was one of the founding members of the League of Nations. He also pointed out that when Mussolini, the head of Italy, bombed, invaded, and occupied Ethiopia, the other members of the league stood by. While they lamented the development, they, in effect, did nothing about it. It is the ambassador's view that Adolf Hitler, watching that unwillingness of the League of Nations to respond to the wholesale occupation of one of the other league members, a charter member become emboldened in the subsequent course of events that unleashed an unspeakable terror in Europe and throughout the rest of the world in the late 1930s as Hitler occupied the Sudetenland, then Austria, Poland and Czechoslovakia and the low countries and everything that came in the wake of that.

In this crisis, the United Nations is facing its first real test since the end of the cold war and international law, and order must be upheld. If there was a peace dividend at the end of the east-west conflict, which ran virtually unchecked since 1945, it was the prospect of a more rational approach to the regional conflicts and of a smoother road to their resolution. We now see how fragile and, perhaps even naive, that hope was. Iraq has not only violated the sovereignty of another state, it has breached the human rights of the Kuwaiti people, as a