

slightly differently; perhaps in brief recapitulation, it is possible to achieve a slightly different synthesis.

To begin with, let us be clear and precise in the use of language. Let us not engage in verbal defoliation.

Yesterday, the Soviet Union characterized the events of the last seven years as an "armed intervention" against the sovereign state of Afghanistan. The mere use of that phrase sets the mind reeling. Whose armed intervention? The Afghan people, the Afghan rebels have engaged in no intervention. You cannot take history and stand it on its head; it is an insult to every country in this chamber. When we speak of "armed intervention" we're talking about December, 1979, when the Soviet military juggernaut rolled into Kabul to instal a puppet fiefdom and subdue an entire people.

Yesterday, as well, we were told that mere discussions of Afghanistan constituted a violation of the UN Charter and the rules and principles of international law. I suppose, Mr. President, that that is meant to mean interference in the internal affairs of a member state. It's exactly the kind of argument which South Africa makes. But we don't give it any credence in that case; why should we give it any credence in this case?

We're talking about a premeditated act of military subjugation. How does that harmonize with international law, or with the words in the Charter which instruct member states to - quote - "refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or independence of any state..." The Charter, when last read by Canada, had no chapter on territorial amalgamation by force of arms.

And yesterday again, to take this question of strangled language but one step further, it was argued that this debate is designed to destroy the fruits which the Revolution has brought to the Afghan people. That, Mr. President, was the very phrase: "The fruits".

Well Canada doesn't know what the Soviet Union has in mind; but for us, as for so many other nations, the fruits of the Revolution mean one million Afghans dead. And we must ask, with anguished desperation, for what crime? By what right? What is the end that justifies such means? What revolutionary fruitfulness transforms an entire country into a killing-field?

I guess, Mr. President, that's what makes such an overwhelming majority of nation-states so frantic about the horror of Afghanistan. The liquidation of the country and its