

*Government Orders*

activity and the numbers of sorties, to constantly keep from 17 to 18 aircraft in operation in a difficult climate and provide cover for ships within that Persian Gulf region.

When we look at the buildup of the Iraqi army, we have to ask, why is it there? As King Fahd said, why was the army built up on the border of Saudi Arabia? Why was the Iraqi army there? Saudi Arabia was not going to attack Iraq so, obviously, one must ask the question, why? I think the answer is quite obvious. There was a determined pattern in Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and it has continued to work toward a military dominance of the region, which is resisted by other countries in that region.

We look at the difference between the conflict, as Canada sees it. We have been opposed to conflict in other areas; we have brought forward resolutions, stating that opposition; we have been involved in peacemaking. I have trouble with some members who would say that peacemaking is not part of peacekeeping tradition. It flows, naturally, in a democracy that is proud of its peacekeeping heritage, as we should be, that peacemaking also is an important part of Canada's heritage and our tradition and is consistent with bringing about a more stable and peaceful world.

When I take a look at the resolution that I see here, and in the United Nations, the resolution commits us to no change in our current status. I hear the members on the other side talking about blank cheques, but I tell you that it commits us to no change in our operations. What it does is send a signal to Saddam Hussein that those countries which have joined together in the United Nations to condemn his aggression, starting with UN resolution 660 and the other nine resolutions that have followed to this point, will not allow him and the Iraqi army to occupy a small country which had legitimate borders, just as Canada's borders are legitimate, which were invaded, occupied and annexed.

I have a lot of trouble with the argument that we should wait before applying more pressure, because what this resolution that will be voted on tomorrow at the United Nations does is give a signal to Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi people and the army of Iraq, that their future is in their own hands, that the world has condemned their

action, that the world will respect the legitimate borders of Kuwait, and that that effort and that conviction by the world powers can only lead to one thing: either Saddam Hussein believes that he has to remove himself or he believes that the world will take whatever steps are necessary to restore the legitimate borders of Kuwait.

• (2120)

I believe that the UN resolution is appropriate to the traditions of the UN, particularly to the UN Charter. Obviously, it is not just my belief or Canada's belief, it is a belief of the assembled nations in the United Nations. It is not U.S. led, as our friends in the New Democratic Party would say. That is an affront to all the other nations which are presently in the gulf, all the other nations which have voted to condemn Iraq, all the other nations which are going to vote in support of the UN resolution tomorrow.

**Mr. Keyes:** Wrong.

**Mr. McKnight:** I see the member from Toronto is talking from his seat. His party has consistently said to the government: "Why don't you co-operate with the United Nations?" Tomorrow we are going to co-operate with the United Nations. The Liberal Party is condemning the government for doing just what it suggested we should do.

I suggest this is a difficult time. I really have concern about some of the members in the Official Opposition. I know they find the resolution that has been put forward by their leader difficult to support. They have to understand that any change in the mandate of the Canadian forces deployment in the Persian Gulf will only be consistent with the capabilities of the Canadian forces. I can assure hon. members that if there is a change in the mandate, it will be raised in the House of Commons if and when that time comes.

What the hon. members are saying now to the government is to assume—

**Mr. Caccia:** You didn't do it last summer.

**Mr. McKnight:** They say we did not do it the last time. We had a debate. The hon. member from Newfoundland referred to the debate. I know the hon. member from Toronto was not able to take part in it. It would be interesting reading, I am sure, if he had.