

Canada has participated in many officially sanctioned United Nations peacekeeping forces. Perhaps the most memorable to Canadians was the participation of Canada in the United Nations Temporary Commission for Korea. In June, 1950, Parliament was still sitting and the Liberal government of the day took great pains to keep the House informed of developments, including the use of Canadian military forces. In fact, when the Canadian military was requested to participate in a UN force, that is, one with UN helmets, clothing, et cetera, the announcement was made here in Parliament. It was done with the full opportunity to discuss the issue. Parliament was subsequently recalled later that summer in August for an emergency session to deal specifically with events in Korea. The traditions in respect of Parliament were upheld and the view was that Canada would not fight for Korea, but for the United Nations and the principle of collective security.

I see by the clock, Mr. Speaker, I only have a minute left, so I would like to summarize.

Let us not forget that Canada could go to war. Our troops are already shoulder to shoulder with the Americans, as deep as you can get in the Persian Gulf. We are on the front-line. As what? Peacekeepers? Or order takers? God forbid the worst scenario comes true, we will have no alternative but to take our orders from George Bush.

Canada was not even a member of the Security Council when Canadian forces were sent to Korea under the UN flag. Now that Canada is a member of the Security Council, it has a special and valued opportunity to defend a multinational force. By jumping on the bandwagon called the multinational military force, Canada has lost that golden opportunity to be respected, to be counted on as the initiator of independent, thoughtful diplomacy. Failure to do so is nothing short of shameful.

• (2200)

Hon. Alan Redway (Minister of State (Housing)): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words this evening with respect to the motion before the House, which reads:

That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure

compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, outside the Parliament Buildings, there was a sign held by a number of Canadians which read, "Canada is for Peace not War". I think that that very well sums up my own personal feelings, the feelings of all of my colleagues on the government benches and I know, from the parts of the debate that I have heard in the House this evening, that it certainly sums up the feelings of the opposition members. I truly believe it sums up the feelings of all Canadians. Canada is indeed for peace and is certainly not for war.

This feeling has not burst forth in the last day or two, it is something that has been around for many, many years. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, as I do, the days of the early and middle 1980s in particular, when one of the principal concerns if not, perhaps, the principal concern of Canadians was the whole question of peace of disarmament. The desire for peace and disarmament heightened a fear that we would be engaged in a nuclear holocaust, a fear that there would be an escalation of the cold war, and concerns about nuclear missiles in Europe.

Those concerns led to the establishment of many groups and committees dedicated to peace and the cause of peace in Canada and around the world. I am sure that in every constituency in this country there are a number of these peace committees. Certainly in my own constituency, the East York Peace Committee has been established for many years and makes its points exceedingly well on this principle that Canada is for peace and Canada is not for war.

You will recall as well, Mr. Speaker, that during the 1980s there was a tremendous amount of focus in the schools, a lot of classes where the teachers focused on many, many occasions on this issue of peace and disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. It parallels one of the phenomena that we have right at the moment where, in many of our schools, we have teachers focusing on the environment and environmental issues, as the hon. member for Davenport is well aware.

The issue of peace and not war is certainly not a new one but it really boils down, not really to the question of whether people are for peace or war because I think we would agree, unanimously, that we are all for peace but, as there was at that time, there is a legitimate difference of opinion on how peace can best be achieved. Of course in the 1980s, there were those who argued that peace could best be achieved by not only disarmament but unilateral disarmament. Perhaps by disarming ourselves