

make. They are also voiced by people like Helen Petrowski, Norman Vale, and Vi McIntosh.

On the other hand, there are those who take exactly the opposite position. They feel very strongly that Canada should be in the gulf and that we should be doing all that we can to resist the aggression of Iraq against Kuwait. There are people such as Richard Kerfoot, Nancy Tittel and Mr. Tooke who have all been in touch with me. Their positions are quite legitimate and understandable.

There is another group. I referred to them during the debate in late September when the issue first came before the House. This group of Canadians are of the Muslim faith, particularly Canadians who come from the Middle East. They have a point of view to bring forward on this issue. Their concerns are somewhat different from the concerns of other Canadians. I believe very strongly that they should have a forum in which to voice those concerns.

They should have a forum somewhat similar to that which was put in place with the problems in China. It was one of a consultative committee of Canadians of Chinese origin who had an opportunity to exchange views with the government, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in particular. They had an opportunity to make their feelings and those of others with similar feelings known. At the same time they heard first hand from the Secretary of State for External Affairs the views of the government, and had an opportunity to have those explained to them.

In September, I put forth the suggestion that we have such a consultative committee. We have been working with the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his staff to put that together. I am hopeful and optimistic that it will soon be reality, and we will have an opportunity for Canadians of the Muslim faith, particularly those from the Middle East, to have a voice in the whole process relating to this issue.

While there are many different views and concerns, all of them have been legitimate and understandable. As we know from what this House has debated before and is debating now, the government has taken a position very strongly in favour of peace. At the same time it has held

### *Government Orders*

the belief that peace can best be achieved not by pretending that there was no aggression on the part of Iraq against Kuwait but by opposing that aggression, and by doing it under the auspices of the United Nations, by working hard to ensure that there is United Nations endorsement for any actions that are taken with respect to the Persian Gulf.

You and I know, Mr. Speaker, that of the 11 resolutions of the United Nations Security Council to date on this issue, some nine of those have been co-sponsored by Canada. Canada has played a very significant role in trying to ensure that this entire process comes under the United Nations itself.

At the same time, the government feels, and I think a great many Canadians agree, that we have to back up our specific support. That is why, we have our ships in the Gulf, our squadron of CF-18s, and Canadian military personnel there as well. Canada has been trying to work through the system, just as we did in Europe with NATO, to try to influence the system, not toward war but toward peace; to make sure that there is no unilateral action on the part of anyone, the United States or anyone else; to make sure that nothing happens there without the authority and the full sanction of the United Nations. As in the case of NATO in the 1980s, we want to apply as much pressure as possible but always for the purpose of achieving peace, not war. That is what this motion is all about tonight. It is a motion to apply pressure. It is a motion to send a signal. I believe it is a motion in keeping with the kinds of action that were taken by NATO during the 1980s with respect to the Cold War, not in an effort to start a war but really to maintain peace and achieve disarmament.

There are some differences as well between the Persian Gulf situation today in the 1990s and Europe in the 1980s. One of them quite clearly is the fact that we are dealing now with the case of unprovoked aggression on the part of Iraq. Another is the fact that the Soviet Union and virtually all of the other countries are on our side as well.

Another difference is that this time it is not just a group of western nations through NATO but the United Nations that is taking this stand against aggression. It is acting, in my view at least, as a world policeman. Perhaps