

We know what the principles were in the first and second wars. We know why the Americans were in Vietnam. We know why they lost. We know why 57,000 Americans lives were lost. A lot of people regret the fact that the Americans went into Vietnam. But what exactly is the principle? What are we trying to defend here by allowing the Americans and others to go to war? Why are we asking Canadian men and women in the Armed Forces to put their lives at risk, to remove an aggressor from Kuwait? What kind of precedent do we have?

That is my question to the member. What kind of precedent will be set here if that is the reason why we would allow member states of the United Nations to declare war or to go to war? Would it mean that in the future, it would be acceptable if the Americans were to invade Panama or another similar country? Would the precedent be set today to allow the Soviet Union or another country to declare war on the Americans?

If we were to have another regime similar to the South African regime that supported and endorsed the system of apartheid, would that be enough? Would that be sufficient reason to allow the declaration of war? I think not. War is brutal. It is ugly. It is hideous. It is the mark of madness to support war. Frankly, I am concerned about the direction this House and the world is going with respect to this particular set of circumstances in the Middle East.

I would like to ask the member: What type of precedent will be set if this particular resolution is passed in the House and at the United Nations?

**Mr. Reimer:** Mr. Speaker, there is one point on which I can totally agree with the hon member and that is when he said: "War is brutal. It is ugly. It is hideous". There I totally agree with him. There is no question about that, and no one wants it. We are both saying the same thing.

He went on to ask what precedent was being set. He wanted to know what we were engaging in by putting this motion tonight, and then the Security Council approving the motion before the United Nations tomorrow. Was it a declaration of war.

No, it is not a declaration of war. I have read the resolution. It says that that it will authorize member states co-operating with the Government of Kuwait, that unless Iraq on or before January 1 or the 15, to be resolved tomorrow, fully implements resolution 660 and all the other 10 resolutions. Then it authorizes them to

### *Government Orders*

"use all necessary means to uphold and to implement the Security Council resolution 660".

The member said the only definition or interpretation he places on that is a declaration of war. That is the only one he places on that.

What it also does is send a clear signal to the Government of Iraq: "Look, we are giving you a pause of goodwill. Seize it. You can solve this problem. After all, you started it". The United Nations is saying to Saddam Hussein: "You decided in a classic case of aggression to aggress upon your unsuspecting neighbour. You did that. Now we are saying to you, for six months we will have had economic sanctions and you have not withdrawn".

Then we are saying we are now authorizing all of the member states of which there are many, not just the United States—and we are just one of over 26 others—to use all the necessary means to uphold and to implement the Security Council resolution 660. That is what it says. So, what is the principle? What is the fundamental issue at stake? Well, as I said in my comments, in my opinion the fundamental issue in the Persian Gulf is morality and international behaviour. Iraq broke it. The UN has now put in economic sanctions. The UN is now saying: "Here is another period of time. Think seriously about it because the consequences are severe". That is what we are saying.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, the deliberate vagueness of this motion and the motion before the United Nations can only lead a person to conclude that this will authorize this Prime Minister to engage the Canadian Armed Forces against Iraq. I am convinced of that. I am convinced most Canadians believe that will happen. We are tonight dealing with a declaration of war.

I challenge the member for Surrey—White Rock—South Langley to debate this issue in any place in British Columbia that he chooses. They will stone him off the platform, if he has the guts to take up that challenge.

I am also convinced of how serious this is and how deceptive the Prime Minister is, that people in Canada will have to go into the streets in order to stop Canadian Armed Forces from engaging in a military action in Iraq. That is how concerned I am. That is how concerned people in the opposition are that there will be a betrayal