

*Government Orders*

Over the years, Canadian soldiers have justifiably won a tremendous reputation as peacekeepers. But there is more than this to being a supporter of the principles of the UN. There are occasions when to be a good peacekeeper, one must be a peacemaker. This is what I hope and pray is taking place right now.

It is clear what Canadian forces are doing in the Persian Gulf. As of yesterday evening, we are helping "to maintain international peace and security", as outlined in Article I of the UN charter, by preventing further aggression by Saddam Hussein. As of yesterday evening, because of the intransigence of Saddam Hussein, we are in a position to fulfil the other facets of the first principle, which is "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace".

Critics have argued that taking action against Saddam Hussein is a cynical double standard and that the world in general and the west in particular have not seen fit to respond to acts of aggression and breaches of the peace and international law in the past. Are they saying we should do nothing now? Should we not seize opportunities to uphold international peace, security and law when possible? If not, when? If not Canada, our allies and others who believe in international order, then who will be left to maintain the peace on these occasions?

I have never doubted that in the end, if Saddam did not back down, Canadians would be there to play their part. I for one know that the Canadian men and women in the forces in the gulf will do their jobs well and with courage when they are called upon to fight. Diplomatic moves were attempted in an effort to resolve this crisis. Unfortunately, they were rebuffed by Saddam Hussein. Saddam Hussein must not profit from aggression and he must not be seen to profit from aggression.

We are unfortunately forced to use all necessary means, as resolution 678 states, to implement the will of the international community. We know that Saddam Hussein did not back down. I think it would be unconscionable now to allow such a dictator, who is armed with more than 5,000 main battle tanks, modern fighter aircraft, artillery, ballistic missiles, chemical weapons and a one-million-man army and who has a track record of aggression, brutality and terrorism both at home and abroad, off the hook now.

The multinational UN force simply had no choice. Saddam Hussein has shown a willingness to use force to grab territory, to intimidate his neighbours, to attack his own people and his enemies with mustard gas and cyanide and to blackmail every nation in the region within range of Iraqi missiles.

What we know is that Saddam Hussein must be stopped. We know there is no chance of peace in the Middle East if every well-armed dictator is given a free hand to satisfy his territorial, economic or political ambitions or to coerce and intimidate their militarily weaker neighbours. We also know that if Saddam is not wholly checked now, then Iraq will go on increasing its military capabilities and developing chemical and nuclear weapons to be used against any rival or soft target, even against his own people.

Kuwait sustained and supported ordinary Palestinians on the West Bank when poorer Jordan decided it could no longer afford to do so. This support has inevitably ended since Iraq's invasion. Iraq's petro dollars have not been going to keep Palestinians alive; they have been going into Saddam Hussein's war machine.

At the same time, Saddam Hussein has done all in his power to avoid coming up with any reasonable initiatives to settle the Middle East problem once and for all. Saddam's policy has been to milk the plight of the Palestinians for what it was worth to him; nothing more. This is the enemy the international community faces and under which the Iraqi people themselves have lived for 22 years. This is the enemy the world is confronting and whom the Canadian men and women in our forces in the gulf, along with the other members of the international community who have rallied against Saddam Hussein, must confront.

Madam Speaker, they must not fail. We in this House must be very careful also not to fail them.

**Madam Deputy Speaker:** Questions and comments.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface):** Madam Speaker, it seems to me there is a flagrant inconsistency in the hon. member's presentation.

[*English*]

The inconsistency in his position is as follows: He did address the issue of not having acted before when there was aggression toward another neighbour. But why did we not intervene when the Russians went into Afghanistan? Why did we not intervene when the Chinese went into Tibet? Is it not because clearly they are giants in the