

Government Orders

has stated openly that he would not deprive the armed forces and the government of what is required.

Equally important, one must also ask the questions: What would have been the difference some six, twelve or eighteen months from now? Would Saddam, by having more time, have developed new capabilities? Would he have fortified his defences? As a result, would the casualties have increased as we waited? Who would he attempt to annex next?

In the end, my decision to support the motion before us has been primarily shaped by eight principle considerations.

First, the international order is Canada's objective through our United Nations participation. The prohibition against aggression which is a fundamental principle of the UN charter can never be really effective unless its members are willing to deliver on their own solemn commitments to collective security.

Second, when asked whether it should give support or walk away, it would be extraordinary if Canada was not participating in a UN action under the charter.

Third, there has been no change in Canada's approach to foreign policy. There is no contradiction between its present role and the peacekeeping role which it has undertaken in the past. Both support international efforts to maintain order and peace through the United Nations system.

Fourth, I am confident that I have been provided straight, accurate and in-depth information that substantiates that international order is being challenged.

In this respect, through external affairs, intelligence is telling us that the sanctions were not working; that the poor are being hurt; that the defences were being built up; and that it was certainly the time for us to enact a time date and carry on.

Any significant deal on the terms of Saddam Hussein—and I say any deal—could have been an extremely bad example and weakened the United Nations for years to come.

• (1740)

Seventh, human nature dictates the need for a deadline. In its absence, would we have had all this shuttle diplomacy that we had in the last two weeks? I doubt that very much.

Eighth, there are strong signals from our Armed Forces of their readiness in terms of training and their mental state-of-mind and, if need be, they are confident that they can carry out the task for which they are ready.

On the basis of these considerations and after looking at all available information, it is with a great deal of concern and consternation, and certainly deep thought, that I support the motion presented that supports the 12 United Nations resolutions.

This is a most difficult and certainly an emotional decision for many members of Parliament on all sides of the House. But failure to vote for this motion would repudiate Canada's support for the major resolutions and for international order that is so important.

So, I pray that this war will end quickly. My heart is with our Armed Forces who are defending freedom and peace in the gulf, as well for their families and relatives at home in my riding and in many places across the country. I wish the Armed Forces a speedy and safe return from the conflict that is taking place.

Mr. Raymond Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Madam Speaker, I ask the hon. member one question about his own personal approach and, I hope, the approach of every member of Parliament.

If the primary objective to destroy all Iraqi military infrastructures has largely been achieved, that the capacity to fight the size of force that has been accumulated against them has been removed, and that the cost of that was a third of a million Iraqis, if that bombardment continues from this day onward it is butchery. It is butchery of the poor, of the people of a Third World country. It is the most disgusting and despicable thing that could be imagined.

Would the hon. member join with us in the House in asking the Prime Minister to ask the President of the United States to stop the bombardment. A madman is being asked to take the responsibility for a nation and stop this battle, but that madman is probably incapable of