

The New Democratic Party and I fully agree with the first part of the resolution, condemning Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and supporting the United Nations Security Council's decisions. It is likely that if there are further decisions by the Security Council in this matter we will support them as well.

However, we do not support the decision of the United States and certain other countries to take large military action in and around the Arabian Peninsula. We believe they should have waited for the United Nations to carry out the mandate that it has in this matter to give leadership to the nations of the world.

Therefore, of course, with my party, I support the amendment by the Liberal Party, that instead of the words "to take part in the multinational military effort in and around the Arabian Peninsula", we put in the words "to enforce these United Nations resolutions and that this House censure the government for not recalling Parliament at the earliest opportunity to fulfil its legitimate function of consultation and debate as to what role Canada should play in the resolution of the present crisis". We support that.

I do not intend to discuss that point particularly today since I think it has been well treated so far.

However, I do want to focus on the subamendment moved by the member for Yukon, the Leader of the NDP, to add the following words:

And further, that Canada work at the Security Council to seek assurances that no country will take undertake offensive military operations against Iraq unless they are under UN command and explicitly authorized by the Security Council.

There are provisions in the United Nations Charter in articles 42 and 43 for dealing with this sort of situation. They have been very little used during a great deal of the history of the United Nations for reasons that have often been commented upon, having to do with the cold war.

• (1610)

I believe this is the occasion when those articles should be used. I think the United Nations is the only instrument created by the nations of the world by which we can choose a course of peace at this time, not instant peace but direction toward peace and avoid a course toward war.

We could be at a turning point. This is not just one little incident. This is an incident with many others behind it, beside it, and possibly following it. We could be

Government Orders

making a major choice—not just Canada but some countries of the world—either to have more generations of war, and perhaps the ultimately disastrous war that all of us have learned to fear, or a choice toward building peace, slowly, with difficulty, with disappointment but nevertheless moving more and more by agreement toward peace.

I fear the danger is that we could tumble into a resumption of the conflict between what some people have called the northern hemisphere and the southern hemisphere, give or take a few miles here and there.

Beginning 1,000 years ago, there was a conflict between Europe and Islam as it spread across the Arabian Peninsula, northern Africa, and even into south western and south eastern Europe. Then there were five centuries of European expansion. There was conquest in the other continents, massacres of the population as in many parts of the western hemisphere, enslavement of non-European peoples mainly, and pillaging of their resources as though their people had no right of ownership to them.

Those memories have not disappeared among those people who are the majority of the world as it happens now. I believe there is no authority in the world except the United Nations that can guide us to find the way to peace. It is not some outside authority. The United Nations is us, but we have to work together to do it.

We must now stick with the United Nations in order to avoid a possible network of wars, not just one war alone around Kuwait and Iraq but the possible repercussions of it as happened, as everybody knows, in 1914 when one assassination in what was thought of as an unimportant part of Europe plunged Europe and other parts of the world into four years of war.

There are the possibilities of serious wars related to this not only in the Middle East but in other parts of Africa, in other parts of Asia and in Central or South America. As I said, I agree that Iraq by modern standards is an aggressor. It is a military aggressor. What it did is wrong. We must condemn it and oppose it by the best means we can choose.

However, as it was put once by Jesus: "Let him that is without sin cast the first stone." This is not the first act of military aggression in recent history. It is not the first act of military aggression in 1990. It is the first time the United Nations Security Council has taken it up, or the first time it has been able to arrive at an unanimous