

on the other side so that I can complete my answer. The hon. member's question was a long one. I know she would love me to give a long answer as well. That is truly what I intend to do in keeping with her wishes.

Paragraph 2 of that UN resolution for tomorrow states: "authorizes member states to co-operate with the Government of Kuwait unless Iraq, on or before January 15, 1991, fully implements as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions: To use all necessary means to uphold and implement the Security Council resolution 660".

That does not refer to war either, Mr. Speaker.

In addition, the Minister of National Defence in his comments indicated quite clearly that this government has given a mandate to our forces in the gulf that if there is to be a change in that mandate in any way, there will be a debate in this House specifically on any change in that mandate.

There is nothing in any of that that refers to war in any way. The hon. member also asked what we and our children had to gain from all this. I think it is quite clear that we and our children have an enormous amount to gain from standing firm with the United Nations to standing against aggression.

A few years ago the Second World War got off the track when people refused to stand up against aggression. Now, at long last, the world seems to be united, not just the United States, not just Canada, not just the Soviet Union, but countries around the world are united in standing against aggression.

If we can finally get the world to stand up against aggression, albeit once, then there will be a second time, a third time, and pretty soon we will have a rule of law applying right across the world where we will have a peace which is meaningful and permanent. We are going to have disarmament, all the sorts of things that the hon. member would wish for our country, and certainly I do. I know that the government shares those wishes as well.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** I congratulate the previous speaker for a balanced and inciteful description of what exists here.

### *Government Orders*

On this side of the House there is a group of people who believe that two open-ended resolutions exist for the purposes of allowing the government the opportunity to make war.

We have no assurances over here. If the Prime Minister were to stand up and say we absolutely commit ourselves to not using the Canadian Armed Forces but are going to work to make sure that the economic sanctions, the blockade, the diplomatic initiatives and any other measures and pressures that can be conjured up, will be put on Iraq. If that is what we are dealing with, we could take some comfort in that. The Prime Minister's track record is honestly bad. The members have to admit that. This government's track record is so bad that the majority of Canadians are absolutely opposed to it.

I do not even know why we are here debating this. If the members who have spoken believe that the government is not going to use this as an opportunity to use the Canadian Armed Forces without the consent of Parliament, the motion would say that. That is what we would be dealing with. The government has left it open-ended because the opposition forced it to do so. There is very strong circumstantial evidence to assume that the government is going to follow Mr. Bush to war.

We should not be here debating an open-ended motion like this. I thank the member for his presentation. He certainly has defined it very clearly. We believe on the track record of that Prime Minister that we will go to war.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Questions and comments are now completed. Debate.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I wish I could say that I was pleased to be rising tonight, but I am not.

Just over two years ago I was elected in what was called the free trade election. During that election campaign I made it clear that that election was a lot more than about a trade deal. That election was about a closer cultural-military link with the United States. We are seeing now that that is happening. What I was saying during that election campaign has turned out to be prophetic. We are seeing our independence in developing our foreign policy withering away, and now it seems that our foreign policy is practically indistinguishable from that of the United States.