

*Government Orders*

closer social policy and environmental connection. That is why we are seeing the increased budget items for the defence department. It is not just because of the Persian Gulf war; it is because of the increased militarization of our country.

**Mr. Stan J. Hovdebo (Saskatoon—Humboldt):** Mr. Speaker, I would feel much better about this debate tonight if it were a little more honest and if we were debating in this House whether we should be sending our troops to war. That would be a much more honest debate than the one we are having here today.

The position being put forward by the government in its motion does not even suggest that it is planning to use force. The government's motion, which asks us to support Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions before the Security Council, does not even suggest that the resolution that will be before the Security Council tomorrow is part of this debate. But the resolution that is to be debated tomorrow is very specific because it:

2. Authorizes Member States cooperating with the Government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before January 1 (15), 1991 fully implements, as set forth in Paragraph one above, the foregoing resolutions, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council Resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security to the area;

3. Requests all States to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph two of this resolution; and—

It goes on. This provides a blank cheque to any country, Canada, the United States, or any other country to begin war in Kuwait. All other countries would be expected to support it. That is what we are debating today.

It goes on to make three other requests. If we pass this resolution, we are supporting the movement of troops, planes and ships into a war zone and into a war. To whom are we giving this support? To whatever country decides to go to war. The only country that has been talking about war in the last month is the United States. The decision to go to war will not be made by the Canadian government, but by some other government and from our understanding of Mr. Bush's comments, the United States government.

I think that the President of the United States has misread his people because there is a growing concern in the States that this is not the way to solve the problem. The sanctions seem to have been working but they have not been given a chance. As my colleague suggested, sanctions in South Africa took 20 to 30 years to work. I am not suggesting that there is a parallel here, but it does indicate that sanctions take time to work.

A declaration of war or an acceptance of this resolution gives someone authority to attack another nation, to attack another people. The products of war are death. The member from Surrey—White Rock—South Langley talked about the atrocities of the Iraqi. Violence begets violence. Should we kill thousands of Iraqi children by declaring this war? Do we punish Saddam Hussein by killing children and the civilians of Iraq?

There has to be a better way and the United Nations, until now, has been advocating that better way. It has advocated sanctions, isolation, and strong world opinion. We have come a long way on that track. We have acted together in the United Nations to keep the peace. Are we going to take a backward step now? Are we going to take a backward step because the President of the United States sees this as an opportunity to shore up his image in his own country? Again I think he has misread what his people believe because the U.S. people are not going to be supportive of this war.

What about the cost? The cost of keeping these troops in the Gulf in that area has been very high but it is small compared to the cost of going to war. As the critic for official development aid, I know that we can do a lot more for the people of this world by taking some of that money and spending it for aid in underdeveloped countries than spending it in war.

I am not alone in my concern.

• (2250)

In a letter from the Canadian Council of Churches to the Prime Minister, signed by my old friend, Dr. Stuart Brown, several points were made which I want to read into the record. A communique from the council states:

A gulf war could have no beneficial results.

Quoting the letter, it continues: