

"The modern high-technology warfare for which the Gulf region has been prepared would result in mass destruction," with the loss of tens of thousands of lives and increased long-term instability in the Middle East.

It is more than just that. The communique goes to state:

While Iraq's aggression against Kuwait is unacceptable, the most effective instrument against this aggression is economic sanctions. Sanctions must be accompanied by two fundamental assurances: that "the innocent people of Iraq and Kuwait will not simply be starved into submission" and that "there will be an openness to negotiate the terms of an Iraqi retreat." Canadian churches and churches in the region are committed to monitoring the effects of sanctions to ensure that the basic dietary and health needs of the people are met.

The letter commends the government for agreeing to debate this issue in Parliament. "This is not the time for ultimata; rather it is the time to search for non-military solutions, even if that means compromise and a less than ideal resolution. War will most certainly not produce an ideal solution".

The Council letter, signed by Dr. Stuart E. Brown, general secretary, was prepared by a joint working group of the CCC bodies: the Committee on International Affairs, the Middle East Working Group and Project Ploughshares. It was formally endorsed by the Anglican, United, Roman Catholic, Lutheran and Presbyterian churches.

Each member of the House, and each Canadian, who supports this resolution or the idea that we should go, should ask themselves if they would sacrifice their son or daughter for this war. Would they sacrifice their son or daughter if there was another way to save them? That is what they are asking other people to do.

**Mr. Patrick Boyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs):** Mr. Speaker, I would just like to ask the member who spoke, given what he has said, if he and his party have ruled out any military option, or if they still envisage that that is a possibility at some stage?

**Mr. Hovdebo:** Mr. Speaker, the idea of war under any circumstances is abhorrent to me.

We understand that security sometimes is backed up by military force. The need to use it is usually because there is an intent to gain something by it. I do not believe

### *Government Orders*

there is anything to be gained by it here, and I do not think it is necessary.

My suggestion would be that only under extreme circumstances and possibly on attack would we suggest that it go, but it is something that we have not ruled out entirely.

**Mr. Pat Nowlan (Annapolis Valley—Hants):** Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have been involved in quite a few debates in the House.

I am not taking tremendous exception to the remarks of the last speaker but, quite frankly, I feel that this debate from its start has been one of the more sombre and serious debates, and has actually had a flow of information back and forth that sometimes is not the common denominator in debates. In particular, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs made a tremendous contribution. He did clarify perhaps one of the big things that we are debating.

To start with, there is no one who is supporting Saddam Hussein by standing and asking questions about a resolution that is very vague.

There is an honest interpretation as to the meaning of the resolution when it is tied in with what is going to be debated in New York tomorrow. As it stands now, Motion No. 24, which the hon. member for Etobicoke Lakeshore tried to clarify, is vague and can be open to the interpretation that opposition members and others have put on it. I tremendously resent it, as sombre as I can be tonight, because other remarks have been said outside the House which have been more inflammatory than any remarks that have been made in the House. When talking about potential conflict, we do not need inflammatory remarks to put the old gas on the fire. Fortunately, tonight, things have been sombre. I intend to try to maintain that dictum along with all members' contributions here today in large measure.

People outside the House say that if you dispute this or do not support that, then you are in some camp that we never want to be in, that is Saddam Hussein's. But they forget that there is a fellow called Sam Nunn. He is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States. There is a fellow called Les Aspin, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the United States. They have questioned where America is