

*Government Orders*

President Mubarak of Egypt, and with his foreign minister, Dr. Abdul Mequid.

Several weeks ago, I met with other foreign ministers from the gulf area, from Saudi Arabia and Qatar. I set out for all these interlocutors the view of this government regarding the unacceptability of Iraq's invasion.

It is important for the House to know that every head of state, every head of government, and every minister with whom we have met shared that view, that the occupation of Kuwait is unacceptable.

The view in Canada, in the region, and throughout the world is the same. Iraq is isolated. Iraq has behaved abominably. It has invaded a small neighbour, and it has done its utmost to ensure that its restoration would be impossible. It has taken thousands of hostages, including Canadians.

This destruction of a small country is, in the words of President Mubarak, "unbelievable". That was the word President Mubarak conveyed to me when he told me of specific and categorical assurances that had been given to him personally by Iraq's president only days before Iraq unleashed its military arsenal against Kuwait.

From the beginning of this crisis, we have all hoped that peaceful means would produce the necessary Iraqi compliance with Security Council resolutions. Indeed, Canada has been working strenuously since the beginning of August to seek just such a peaceful solution. We have done so in the United Nations, we have done so in the region, and we have done so in close consultation with all the members of the Security Council.

Officials of my department have been travelling around the world regularly, particularly to Security Council members—including the people who rarely vote with Canada—to try to encourage a unanimity and a consensus that will allow the United Nations to be effective in these circumstances.

I am sure that I speak for all Canadians in hoping that a peaceful solution may still be possible. Time, however, is running out.

Tomorrow at the United Nations in New York, Canada will, as a member of the Security Council, participate in the formal consideration of a new resolution that has been under discussion for some days now. This new resolution will almost certainly authorize the use of

whatever means are necessary to remove Iraq from Kuwait and to restore to Kuwait its own destiny.

For Canada and for others, what is at stake is the integrity of our international order and the credibility of international law and of our multilateral institutions.

We must recognize, however, as I have seen over the last few days, that the neighbours of Iraq have another interest in ensuring that Iraq's deed is undone. Mr. Speaker, we in Canada, far from the scene of the battle, far from the immediate site of those terrible tensions, must realize that there will be no safety and there will be no stability if Saddam Hussein gets away with his annexation of Kuwait.

All countries would prefer a peaceful solution, not a deal which rewards the aggressor, but full and swift compliance with the resolutions of the Security Council. Regrettably, many believe that a peaceful solution is not attainable, whatever their preference.

The leader of Iraq does not seem to grasp the dimensions of the problem he has created. Consequently, he does not seem to understand the strength of the resolve to see justice done. He thinks the world is bluffing. The purpose of the United Nations resolution, which Canada and other members of the Security Council will consider tomorrow, is to ensure that Iraq understands that this is not a bluff.

Tomorrow's resolution will demand full compliance with previous council resolutions. If Iraq does not fully implement those resolutions, the text will authorize member states co-operating with the government of Kuwait to use all necessary means to see they are implemented and to restore international peace and security in the area. Does this mean that force will be used? That is up to Iraq.

That resolution will probably be approved tomorrow, November 29. In normal cases, that would mean the capacity to act, with whatever means, would exist tomorrow, November 29. Now there is a serious and constructive proposal that the resolution build in a pause between the day in November when the authority is vested, and some specific later date on which it might be used. That proposal reflects the call for a pause which