

*Government Orders*

participating member, a first world nation, to support the United Nations in the efforts it has undertaken and in resolutions it undertakes.

Our history is one we should be proud of. The men and women of our Armed Forces are people who are first-class in the work they have determined they want to undertake. I have every confidence in their ability to deal with their activities from a professional standpoint. I am sure that they understand their duty to this country and their duty to the world. They are prepared to undertake those responsibilities in a very serious manner, anticipating that they will be returning to this country leaving the world in better condition than they found it because of their interest.

**Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands):** Mr. Speaker, as I rise tonight let me indicate that I have just received news that hostilities have in fact broken out in the Persian Gulf. That brings to mind a question as to the very nature of us as human beings. What perverse creatures we are if the first collective act after the end of the cold war is to make war. Our party has had a long history of support for the United Nations, the body that is there to prevent war.

The charter of the United Nations says that the purpose of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security. As I said, we have a long history of support for the United Nations, and how perverse that the United Nations is now being used as an instrument to make war. How can we accomplish the goal of the United Nations to maintain international peace and security by making war? We must see the contradiction in that.

It can be argued that UN resolution 678 is a contradiction of the UN charter, because it is a licence to make war, but it could also be argued that in the very language of resolution 678 it says to use all necessary means. All necessary means have not yet been exhausted.

I hope those news reports that are just now coming in are wrong. I hope that it is just a test, another way of bringing the nerves of the Iraqi forces to the verge. If it is in fact true that the bombs are dropping, I remind this House there are human beings under those bombs.

The United States claims to be supporting international law and opposing aggression. That rings hollow when we look at the history of the United States concern for East Timor, Cyprus, Lebanon, the occupied territories, Grenada, Panama, and Nicaragua.

Canada must respect international law as embodied by UN Security Council resolution 660, but that respect cannot be selective. There has been a curious selectivity of outrage. I think that this House in this debate should be peeling away those levels of hypocrisy. To date this government has squandered Canada's historic opportunity as a member of the Security Council to play an independent peacekeeping role and peacemaking role in the gulf.

I want to turn my comments now to focus on reputations. Reputations either personal, business, organizational or national are the currency by which we are judged, are the currency by which we are held in esteem, are the currency by way we make progress.

Canada's international reputation—and I speak from experience because I have travelled internationally both as a member of Parliament and prior to becoming a member of Parliament—is enormous. Canada's international reputation is as a peacemaker, as a peacekeeper. Canada's Armed Forces have always been used to this effect.

Now this government has taken that role and perverted that historic role of the Canadian Armed Forces by engaging in this war. This resolution that we are debating here tonight, make no mistake about the kind of wishy-washy language of the resolution, is the government's way of asking for our permission to make war. That is not what we want to do.

I have just been handed a note, Mr. Speaker, and the White House has now confirmed the war has started.

**Some hon. members:** Shame.

**Ms. Hunter:** Canada's international reputation has just changed dramatically. I urge those government members, who feel as I do that this is a perversion of Canada's history, to vote against it.

• (1910)

I am going to focus my remarks now on the environmental consequences. The Secretary of State for External Affairs talked earlier today during Question Period