

*Government Orders*

I would suggest that the United States is not so much concerned with the United Nations as it is concerned with a steady and secure oil supply. I am also concerned about its military intentions in that area of the world. Certainly an Iraq that controls a Kuwait controls a significant amount of the world's oil production and could have a significant impact on the United States.

• (1900)

The desire for extended military bases in that area certainly is part of the Americans' decision to take the action that they have. I am very glad that the United States has taken the position that it has in respect of Iraq in condemning it. However, I would question some of its motives.

If the UN is now so important, why does not the United States support resolution 242 which calls for Israel to withdraw from occupied territories that it has occupied since 1967? It is interesting that since the United States has been moving into that area of the world it has now found new criticism recently for Israel because it is looking for support for the Arab nations.

President Bush said that we could not have a dictatorship running a country in this world and imposing its will on people throughout its territory. We have noticed in the past that the United States condoned Panama, for example. Panama had a dictator for years, and it was involved in the drug trade. In fact there were implications connecting General Noriega to the CIA itself. Only when General Noriega's plans did not fit with the United States did it invade Panama.

This is a similar line to that which the United States took in places like Grenada and in its attacks on Libya. Why did not the United States condemn Dictator Hussein when he invaded Iran back in 1980? There was no action when Iraq chemically gassed the Kurds, resulting in some 4,000 terrible deaths in 1988 that inflicted a lot of pain and suffering on a lot of individuals and causing thousands of injuries which people will suffer from for the rest of their lives. Also there was no condemnation of Syrian and Israeli occupation of Lebanon. What about the occupation of East Timor by Indonesia?

I am very glad that the United States has taken a turn for the best with respect to the United Nations and has condemned the actions of Iraq, but it is certainly with questionable intention that the United States has taken this action. When the United States announced that it

would be sending troops into that area of the world, it did so long before UN resolution 665 and without prior consultation. It was only when UN policy happened to coincide with U.S. policy that the U.S. began to sing the United Nations praises.

In respect of all of that we have our Government in Canada supporting a U.S. position long before the UN resolution. I would suggest that the Prime Minister acted in a fashion that has affected and harmed the reputation of this country in the world.

Why would the Prime Minister and why would this country take the actions it did in light of the background I just highlighted in respect of the United States? This decision seems to have been made on the spur of the moment. On August 3, the Right Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs had indicated that he no intention of any military action in the Middle East. On August 6, the Prime Minister met with President Bush. On August 10, after a NATO meeting, the Prime Minister announced that Canada would be sending two naval destroyers and a supply ship into the Middle East. This was a very quick turnaround. In fact the announcement by Canada was made two weeks before the UN passed Resolution 665. That resolution, of course, is the one which authorized UN member states to take necessary measures against shipping to ensure strict implementation of the UN sanctions.

With respect to the government, I think that has hurt Canada's reputation in the world. It has hurt our reputation as a peacekeeping nation. It is the first time since the Second World War, I believe, that we have sent Canadian ships under a Canadian flag into a potential war zone. I think that action by the Prime Minister was one that certainly should have led him to call Parliament back immediately. He did not. In fact, Parliament was not called back until its scheduled date of September 24. At that time this debate began, Mr. Speaker.

This action is not justifiable. The government considered it to be important, but when you consider it in light of other actions, one wonders about the respect that this government has for democracy in this country. In August 1987, when 174 refugees landed on the coast of Nova Scotia, the government considered that an emergency situation and immediately called back the House of Commons to sit. Yet, when the Prime Minister announced that for the first time since the Second World War we are going to be sending Canadian ships into a