

Government Orders

Are we, in fact, looking at a declaration of war and will we not get another attempt to debate this? Is the government in fact looking at this as their authority to deploy Canadian troops in a war in Iraq?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before this House today asks us not only to support Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent resolutions up to this date, but it is asking us to support all subsequent resolutions, including those that may come after this date, including one that will be presented tomorrow to the Security Council.

The government is asking us to support the resolution which will go to the Security Council tomorrow and the draft that I have before me would authorize member states to use all means necessary to implement Security Council Resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

Quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, if we were to vote for this government resolution as it stands, we would also be approving the draft resolution to be presented to the Security Council tomorrow which would allow the United States, or any other individual member state of the United Nations, to use all means necessary—I guess it could include nuclear weapons, it is horrible to think about that, but that is what the resolution says; there is no limit on it—to implement the Security Council resolution and all future resolutions, including the restoration of peace and security in the area.

This is virtually giving a *carte blanche* to the government and to the superpowers at the United Nations. It is not acceptable. It could in fact be a declaration of war.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for York South—Weston, then the hon. member for Athabasca, and the hon. member for Davenport.

Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston): Mr. Speaker, at times I have to pinch myself to determine if what we are doing here in the House of Commons is real, and if this discussion is fully comprehended by the people of Canada.

What we are doing here in the House is debating a resolution that would authorize war, that would authorize the United States and other member states to use

whatever means possible to force Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait.

• (1850)

I do not think Canadians have been sufficiently involved in this debate for the House to take this position tomorrow, when the vote is called. I certainly was not elected to support war, or to support the sending of our troops to fight in battle, anywhere in the world. I certainly was not elected to support American foreign policy that could result in the loss of hundreds of thousands of lives. We have to ask ourselves why the United States and other states are asking for this authority to declare war and, in effect, to attack Iraq or Kuwait.

Let us not lose track of what the situation is. We went to war in the First World War and the Second World War for principles and those principles were democracy and freedom. Those values were important to fight for to ensure that people around the world were free.

What is the principle that the government wants us to fight for today? It wants to risk hundreds of thousands of lives, but for what? It is not freedom and democracy. It is aggression. As the hon. member has pointed out in his speech, there are all kinds of inconsistencies, hypocrisy and double-standards when we talk about this very principle of aggression.

Does the hon. member believe that the circumstances that exist in the Middle East justify war, whether it be today, tomorrow, or at any point in time? In other words, does aggression by a state—whether it be Iraq, the United States or the Soviet Union—justify declaring war? That is the question I would like to put to my friend and colleague.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that this party and I, personally, do not support the aggression of Saddam Hussein. We are totally opposed to that. I tried to make it clear that we condemn that. But we also approve of a means of dealing with it: economic sanctions, supported by military forces, and diplomatic initiatives.

Every expert will tell us that the diplomatic initiatives and the sanctions have not been given enough time. So, in answer to my hon. colleague, this is not the time for war. We must exhaust every possible means to settle this politically, through diplomacy and through economic