

*Government Orders*

going. It is their President, he being Republican and they being Democrat, whom they had do what the commander and chief of that country is entitled and is supposed to do. That is, to move quickly when Congress is not in session and/or stabilize bad situations. That is what George Bush did. That is why the Prime Minister of our country responded to the call and it is why other countries of the group of 26 of the coalition responded to the call to do what everyone wanted to be done, that is, to stabilize the position in the Middle East that everyone who is a student of history, let alone a student of the Middle East, knows is a most unstable area at the best of times.

You have friends one year that you feed fuel to and give them armaments. They are your best friends and then you do not believe what they say. They shoot a British journalist about a week or so before and everyone complains. They are still saying that an American delegation should go and meet Saddam Hussein.

I am going to quote the most interesting article that I wish everyone on the government side and everyone in the United Nations would have read. It appeared in a Sunday edition of *The New York Times* in September. It is the most appalling indictment of foreign policy when the ambassador of the United States, in talking to the President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, eight days before the attack, asks her about what is your position on Kuwait. I have the quotes here and I know the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs is perhaps aware of it.

I am amazed that it has not been raised more in this country in the media. It was of so much import before the Americans adjourned for their mid-term congressional elections, that a subcommittee on middle eastern affairs was having hearings on how their Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Kelly, had given instructions to the poor American ambassador. She was just carrying out instructions from Washington. She said: "Oh, your problem with Kuwait is a dispute between Arab and Arab. You don't have to worry about the United States on that". That was eight days before Saddam Hussein made the attack across the border and took over Kuwait. He may not be going to do it anyway, but it is that type of fundamental flip-flop on something that is so important that disturbs many people.

I want to congratulate the member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception, an ex-military maritime commander, who made a tremendous contribution.

I will digress to the American side. You can raise legitimate questions, but do not let anyone raise a question that people, on raising the questions, no matter where they sit, are for Saddam Hussein and against peace. This is the worst type of demagoguery that you could ever see. To bring this into proper perspective, we have a debate on a vague resolution that disturbs me.

I wish the government, before tomorrow's vote, would amend its own resolution. The Liberal Party has moved an amendment to the motion that I can certainly support because it clarifies some of the legitimate vagueness in the present resolution. I will not go over the interpretation we give to all the resolutions confronting the United Nations which will be debated tomorrow. They can be amended tomorrow, as the member for South West Nova mentioned in a question to the minister or one of the government members. Who is to say that even the draft will be debated? Yet this blanket resolution will get us involved, potentially, with whatever they pass in New York tomorrow.

• (2300)

Just to reduce the argument to the absurd by using an extreme analogy, there are resolutions at the United Nations about Israel. Let us just save it tonight over coffee cups in New York as they try to hammer out things. There seems to be a crack in the coalition. Someone says, and it might be Gorbachev, having just had the Foreign Minister of Iraq in Moscow, and allegedly, Gorbachev was supposed to have given him a tongue lashing and said: "Get out, you have only a little time". Well, let us say the coalition is starting to get frayed at the edges, because it is a very tenuous coalition at the best of times.

Just to reduce this argument to the extreme, when you start to absorb the blanket resolutions of the United Nations, they could start to make a deal down there that comes on the United Nations Plaza tomorrow which will affect Israel. Some of those resolutions very definitely affect the whole Middle East. Of course, that is one of the troubling things with this whole debate, we are talking about oil—and we know it is oil—but we also know, and everyone knows, and I am glad the Secretary of State for External Affairs alluded to it in his remarks, that until we can resolve the question of Israel and the