

*Government Orders*

The United Nations was born out of the carnage of the Second World War. The first sentence of the preamble of the United Nations Charter states:

We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind—

Again, I say to the Minister of Defence, if it takes two years, we continue sanctions. The preamble then calls on member nations:

—to practice tolerance and live in peace with one another as good neighbours—

I say, not only is our government forgetting the important place Canada has occupied in international diplomacy, but members of the United Nations are forgetting these important words in the Charter. I stress the word “tolerance” because that is what we are debating tonight. That is what the government is ignoring. United Nations resolutions are not some kind of blank cheque to be used by those able to coerce others into their schemes. Of course, part of the intention of the United Nations Charter is to ensure that armed forces not be used, save in the common interest. We must ask ourselves, is the use of all necessary means—let us be honest here, it is the use of force—truly in the common interests of all UN members. Second, is this of such importance that the guiding principle of tolerance be ignored? Tolerance should be given the greatest opportunity. As the great historian, Edmund Burke, noted: “Our patience will achieve more than our force”.

Through the motion before us here today, the government is seeking tacit approval of its actions. Should the House approve this motion, it will be interpreted by the Prime Minister as an approval for the Parliament of Canada to use all necessary means to enact punishment on Iraq.

The motion 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—

—here is the caveat, again—

—all subsequent resolutions.

We cleared that up a little bit here this evening, not too long ago. All subsequent resolutions does not mean

the resolutions we have brought forward to the 28th of this month, but what will happen tomorrow and beyond?

By carefully couching its words with this blanket search for approval of military force, the government has not been as clever as it had hoped. The wolf in sheep's clothing has been exposed. Yes, we denounce Iraq's action. We denounce the detention of third country nationals. But we also denounce the attempt by the government to manipulate this important and sensitive issue and denounce its unwillingness to prevail over others, show leadership, and allow cooler heads to prevail.

We, in the Liberal Party, support the United Nations in its efforts to encourage understanding and peace among all member nations. In addition, solidarity between member nations is required if UN resolutions, such as the sanctions presently under discussion, are to have effect. But they must be left in effect.

This being said, it is not enough for member nations of the UN, such as Canada, to operate under the current multinational military effort. Canada, as well as other countries involved in this military effort, must only take direction under the auspices of a co-operative United Nations force. Now is the time. We have the opportunity as members of the Security Council to further enhance the role of the United Nations.

The Prime Minister has taken the easy way out. He jumped on the bandwagon. I say Canada has never accepted a free ride because Canada has the global reputation of solving international problems through conciliation, patience, and thoughtful negotiations. Ours is a positive agenda, not a reactionary one. The Liberal Party believes that, apart from the Security Council resolutions, primacy must be given to the United Nations to negotiate an end to the crisis.

The Prime Minister attempts to justify his arbitrary actions by pointing to history. Canada has never been faint of heart, he says. Well, no one denies Canada's capacity to defend freedom. Canadian soldiers have paid the supreme sacrifice, but always in the knowledge that their government tried everything in its power to resolve the situation peacefully before sending them away from their homes, their families, and their country.