

I will offer my own personal opinion, and I would suggest that it may be just as good as the opinion of the Secretary of State for External Affairs because I was in Iraq. He was not. I put that on the table. I was there. I do not pretend I saw everything or went everywhere, but we were there for 12 days and we had a lot of time between meetings, and that was the question we kept asking.

Even the Secretary of State for External Affairs concedes our point that there is a substantial erosion in foodstuffs, in the economy, and in the industrial capacity of the country. Inflation is hundreds upon hundreds per cent. A can of beer costs \$32. It is the best place to dry out in the world.

Unemployment is now 40 or 50 per cent. Why? All the factories are shutting down. They are cannibalizing cars and trucks to get spare parts. They cannot refine their petroleum. They no longer have additives, because everything is imported.

While the Secretary of State for External Affairs dismisses the Brookings study—he says: “Ah, it does not mean anything”—it points out very clearly the linkage between economics and military. I think I am being fair paraphrasing it. The argument is: Saddam Hussein is a ruthless dictator. He will let his poor people starve, and he is immune and isolated from any impact.

He is not immune from supplying gasoline to his army. He is not immune from aeroplanes that no longer have spare parts. He is not immune from the kind of basic wherewithal that makes an economy work.

Why, in the Second World War, did we have B-17s and Lancaster bombers leaving Great Britain every night to bomb the hell out of Dresden and Cologne, every major industrial city in Germany? Because we wanted to destroy its industrial capacity so it could no longer fight a war. That was the stated objective of the strategic bombing program for which countless Canadians, including one of my uncles, gave their lives in a worthy cause.

### *Government Orders*

All of a sudden, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the military genius that he is, says: “That no longer counts for anything. There is no connection between the economy and the military. There is no linkage any more.”

I think he is dead wrong. He is simply using that as sort of a canard, a false argument, because he realizes and recognizes that his only way of justifying military action which the government became committed to last November is that they can assert that sanctions are not working.

I am prepared to debate with the Secretary of State for External Affairs any place, any time and anywhere in this country about that. I will tell him something else. Let's not worry about it. Let us do it properly. Let's go through the United Nations, the way it is supposed to go. What is the use?

This is a government that says it wants to defend the UN. Okay. Let's work through the UN. That is what it is there for, but it has not been followed up to now.

To take it one step further, I challenge the government today—good citizens that we are internationally—to call a meeting of all the coalition partners, which are presently exercising a monitoring function in the gulf on the sanctions program. Let's bring them together and say: “Is it working or not, folks?”

Let's get their assessment. Let's get it out in public, and let's ask them: “How can we tighten it up? How can we improve it? How can we ratchet the pressure on? How can we squeeze them harder?”

Let's have a kind of international mission. The Secretary of State for External Affairs says he wants ideas. Okay. Let's take some initiative. Let's see how sanctions can really be put to work. He says: “We do not have time. We are in a rush. We are in a big hurry.” He says: “It is too costly. We have to keep those people out in the gulf. It is going to hit our budgets.”

From 1948 on, the western countries maintained close to 1 million troops in western Europe on the threat of a Soviet invasion. It cost Canada \$1 billion a year. For 45 years we kept them there. We never used them, thank God, because we knew if we used them it could bring about nuclear exchanges and all their dangers.