

*Government Orders*

• (2340)

**An hon. member:** And Cyprus.

**Mr. Allmand:** My hon. friend mentions Cyprus and I could mention even cases of the United States in Grenada, Panama, and so on.

When the Prime Minister stands up in his place, as he did this morning, and when the Secretary of State for External Affairs stands up and talks of principle, it rings a bit hollow. It is no wonder the world looks at this with a certain amount of doubt and suspicion. There is a great credibility gap in what is happening at the United Nations with the initiative of the United States.

Nobody believes that guff which is being delivered by the Prime Minister and by the Conservative party that just because we do not support this resolution, we do not support the United Nations. The Liberal Party has supported the United Nations from its very beginning and our former leader, Mr. Pearson, won the Nobel Prize for his innovative work at the United Nations. We support the charter of the United Nations but we do not support every resolution, nor does the Conservative Party. Nor does any government in the world support every resolution passed by the United Nations.

The reason we do not support this resolution 678 is because not enough time has been given to other methods to resolve the conflict. If one reads the charter of the United Nations closely, one will see in chapter 6 and 7, and it makes it very clear in those two chapters of the charter, that military action by the United Nations should only be used after other methods to resolve a conflict have been tried and failed.

The United Nations in the month of August approved of resolution 660 and other resolutions which provided for economic sanctions and military action to support the sanctions. These are now being tried, but they have not been proved to have failed. As a matter of fact there is a lot of evidence to the effect that they are beginning to bite and to bite hard.

I was at the United Nations for five days last week. I spoke to a medical team which had just returned from Iraq and I was told that the medical system in that country is in very bad shape as a result of sanctions. Others have returned from Iraq and will confirm that the Iraqi government is having a difficult time obtaining spare parts for its military equipment and military

vehicles, for its aircraft, and for its tanks. The major source of income for Iraq is oil revenues and they are not selling their oil.

I have an article written in *The New York Times* of yesterday, January 14, 1991. The headline of the article is: "Sanctions will bite and soon." In this article the writers refer to a study being carried out at Harvard University in which they have used an economic model to determine the effectiveness of the sanctions. They say that the sanctions are working and will work in a very strong manner. The article states: "Far from inconclusive the evidence suggests that sanctions will begin to bite sometime in the spring or early summer with a high probability of forcing Iraq from Kuwait as early as the fall." It states: "War may resolve the situation more quickly but with unpredictable side effects, including the loss of thousands of American lives."

I pointed to the resolutions of the United Nations in August. These resolutions authorize the sanctions and military action to support the sanctions. I said that if you read chapters 6 and 7 of the charter, it is absolutely clear that you only resort to military action after all other methods to resolve the conflict have failed. If one looks even beyond chapters 6 and 7 of the charter and look, at the preamble and the first chapter, which deals with the purposes of the United Nations, it is very clear that the purpose of the United Nations is to pursue peaceful means in resolving conflict. That is its principal goal. It must make every effort to seek peace through diplomatic and other measures and avoid war.

There certainly is nothing in the charter which would authorize "kicking ass", as the President of the United States suggested. At midnight on January 15, he would have the authority to go over and "kick ass" in Iraq and Kuwait. That did not impress the world and did not impress those who are seeking peaceful solutions to this very difficult situation.

I want to refer to an article by William Pfaff, a syndicated columnist for the *Los Angeles Times*, also on January 14, yesterday morning, in which he examines again whether or not this potential war is justified. In making his analysis, he refers to the moral rules that have been referred to over the centuries for judging whether or not a war is morally justified. He says that trouble begins with the third criterion for a justified war. He says that that is what the great debate in the United States Congress and among the public is about.