

Government Orders

driven Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, as opposed to the current military action.

I wonder if my hon. colleague would respond to the following. The former Chief of the Defence Staff has said: "Nothing is getting in or out of Iraq by sea. . . There can be no doubt that the swift and united action of much of the world. . . is deterring Iraq from further aggression and increasing the chances of a solution to the affair without further aggression." That was before the war was started.

Addresses by U.S. Senators Mitchell and Kennedy identify testimony from President Bush, Secretary of State Baker, and CIA Director Webster indicating that sanctions are working.

Canada's Secretary of State for External Affairs stated in a letter to John Bosley, on December 28, 1990, that "these are the most effective and comprehensive sanctions ever applied by the international community".

General Schwarzkopf, Commander of the U.S. Forces in the Persian Gulf, and U.S. Senator Sam Nunn have also issued statements in support of continued economic sanctions.

Finally, in a study of over 100 cases examining how well sanctions had performed, Gary Hufbauer and Kimberly Elliott wrote in an article in *The New York Times* just a couple of days ago that "Sanctions Will Bite—and Soon". "Far from inconclusive, the evidence suggests that sanctions will begin to bite some time in the spring or early summer, with a high probability of forcing Iraq from Kuwait as early as the fall."

With all of that evidence that sanctions and the embargo were having a very detrimental effect on Iraq, how does he respond to this evidence that I just shared with the House?

Mr. Belsher: Madam Speaker, I must point out to the hon. member that he is dealing with some of the motions that were before us yesterday which we voted on in the House. The motion that we are debating today is whether or not the House will continue to support the actions of the UN. That is the motion before us. We are dealing with the motions that were in the UN, number 660 right through to 678.

The debate today is not whether or not sanctions had been given long enough to take further action, but whether or not the House is supportive of the actions and the motions made in the UN last fall and last summer. That is what I was debating and that is what I

was talking about. I am in full support of us endorsing those motions.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East): Madam Speaker, I, too, would like to question the member for Fraser Valley East, if I may.

He has indicated in his speech that we have looked at slapping these people on the wrists when they ignore United Nations resolutions. I take exception to that remark because in fact there was a lot more than that done.

Again, I would like to refer to the information from the intelligence service: "This assumption ignores the striking evidence given by the Central Intelligence Agency, Director William Webster, before the U.S. Congress," as reported in *The Manchester Guardian Weekly* of December 23. The CIA director said "that Iraq exports had been slashed by 97 per cent, even greater than the cut in imports which had been reduced to a mere 10 per cent of the trade before Saddam Hussein annexed Kuwait. The Baghdad regime is inexplorably running out of commodity on which its future depends, money. Oil revenues are the drip-feed of Baghdad's life support system. With them, the dictatorship will inevitably perish." That is the comments of the CIA.

Here we are debating a United Nations resolution which we have supported with regard to the sanctions and giving them an opportunity to work. We have now reversed that decision as a country and gone to war.

I say to the hon. member when I question him, is that merely a slap on the wrist, or should we have not continued on with those sanctions to bring this dictator to his knees?

Mr. Belsher: Madam Speaker, the hon. member raises a very worthwhile question. What the hon. member must remember is that sanctions can only work for so long and that we also have a coalition of countries that were supportive of the resolutions that were passed in the United Nations. We have no way of knowing as to whether or not these sanctions would have taken the desired effect within the foreseeable future or within years as to what was going on.

We do know that Kuwait was still completely under the domination of the Iraqis. A country had been invaded. We know that the surveillance was indicating that they were strengthening and fortifying themselves in Kuwait. They were setting themselves up for a very, very long stay in the country of Kuwait. Action had to be taken in