

*Government Orders*

by peaceful means or by other means with Saddam Hussein getting out of Kuwait.

I do not know the answers to those questions, but those are questions that are called up by the motion put forward by the government and by the resolution that will be put forward and discussed in the United Nations tomorrow.

My party has rejected the motion put forward by the government for a very simple reason as discussed by my hon. colleague, the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce. It is because we are giving a blank cheque for subsequent resolutions of the United Nations. We have always supported the United Nations. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that my party has always been behind the actions of the United Nations, but only after discussions.

It has taken us from August 2 to September 25 to have the 10 resolutions that we now have. Presumably there was a lot of discussion. How can we now say: "Yes, and all follow-on discussions we will give you blank agreement for?" What we are about to embark on, whether it is this month, next month, six months or a year from now, deserves much more discussion and debate than that.

I am sure the public listened to resolutions 660, 661, 662, et cetera. We have now a total of 10 resolutions passed by the United Nations, all voted on and agreed to by Canada. Time does not permit that we go through them all, but I took the time to look at them and tried to relate them to what it is we are trying to do in the United Nations and in Iraq.

I believe the United Nations action that has taken place so far has been a model of the way the United Nations was supposed to operate and had not been able to operate because of the difficulty of the larger members of the Security Council not being able to agree.

In other words, it was the unique and remarkable unanimity of the Security Council that has allowed us to get these resolutions that we now have. We began first of all by identifying the aggressor. This was done on August 2 with resolution 660. It stated that there was a determi-

nation that a breach of international peace and security had taken place, and they condemned the Iraq invasion.

The second sequence in this drill is a call for compliance. This was achieved in resolution 661, which stated that Iraq had not complied with resolution 660 and affirmed the right of individual and collective self-defence under chapter 7 of the United Nations charter.

The next procedure was the declaration of non-military sanctions. That too was achieved by resolution 661, where it was stated that there would be an imposition of strict economic sanctions on Iraq until it complied with resolution 660.

Then the next step in the procedure was to call for compliance. This was done on August 9, a week after the invasion, and the resolution said that there was a decision that the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq was null and void and demanded that Iraq rescind its declaration of the annexation.

The next step was military sanctions. This was achieved by resolution 665 that called upon maritime forces to use such measures as may be necessary to halt all maritime shipping in order to prevent cargoes from reaching Iraq.

The next level is force. That is agreed. The next level has to be force, but only if these measures that we have discussed and that have been debated in the United Nations from August 2 to pretty well the end of September do not work.

My major concern with the resolution of the United Nations is that I believe it is too early. I have difficulty understanding why the deadline of January 15 has been used. I agree there has to be a deadline, but I would like to spend a few moments talking about the reason I have difficulty with that deadline.

It is agreed that military sanctions can work. I am not going to go through a great litany, but it goes back a long time. Britain maintained naval blockades of the main French ports during the Napoleonic Wars and they were successful. During the U.S. Civil War the union navy was unable to do a lot of things, but it was able to prevent the south from exporting cotton and getting cash so that it could buy weapons. That was a factor in determining the outcome of the Civil War. During World War I, the allies