

I say peace begotten of peace would be lasting and that future generations of children in the Middle East would benefit from a peaceful approach as profoundly and wonderfully as would this generation of children from the Middle East.

As Senate majority leader, George Mitchell, said: "War is such a grave undertaking, with such serious consequences, we must make certain that war is employed only as a last resort."

In closing, I would like to quote an excerpt from a November *The Ottawa Citizen* editorial, as well as yesterday's: "The resolution that Canada is considering voting for would be a double tragedy.

Not only would it start a war that is totally unnecessary, it would also administer a major defeat to the United Nations. The sanctions program is strictly a UN operation, controlled and directed by the Security Council. The military action under the proposed resolution would not be a UN operation. It would be an independent operation authorized by the Security Council but not supervised by it. Any war fought essentially by the U.S. and its allies would not be a UN war. There would be no blue helmets and no direction from the UN.

A peaceful resolution of this crisis will produce complications, granted, but not so many complications as would a war. We should not be fighting a war not of our own making, a war that might have been prevented and a war that may well create as many problems as it solves.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we are finally debating this issue in Parliament. We have been calling upon the Government of Canada to recall Parliament since last fall, since last summer in fact. I am glad that we are finally having this debate. Since the beginning when the Canadian forces were committed to the gulf initially to enforce sanctions, the government has treated Parliament as a rubber stamp, treated it with something close to contempt. I am glad that we are finally having this debate so that parliamentarians can express their views.

Government Orders

The resolution that we are debating today is really not the issue. The issue before Canadians now is should Canada be going to war or not. I think that it is worth reading into the record, as I have 10 minutes only, and as this makes many of the points that we had been making on this side of the House, the position of the United Nations Association in Canada, because what Mr. Geoffrey Grenville-Wood is saying, as the national President of the United Nations Association in Canada, is exactly what this party has been saying all along. I am going to read it into the record:

The world awaits, with increasing trepidation, the expiry of the deadline imposed by the United Nations Security Council for the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

I believe that the Security Council Resolution, number 678 of November 29, giving the authority to use force was a bad resolution, bad for the United Nations and bad for world peace. In my view, it was not necessary. Sanctions should have been given a chance to have an effect.

He says further:

Also, the resolution was arguably wrong in law in that it did not comply with the requirement in the United Nations Charter that sanctions had "proven to be inadequate", before force could be used.

As recently as last month, the Director of the CIA told the U.S. Congress that given a reasonable time sanctions would have a crippling effect on the Iraqi economy.

This resolution is bad also because it permits the United States and the others in the coalition to consider that the UN has now authorized them, in George Bush's words, to "kick arse". Well, the UN is not about (that). The organization was created at the end of the Second World War to save the peoples of the world from, in the words of the UN Charter, "the scourge of war". The Charter sets out a very clear step by step process that is to be followed to suppress aggression. The emphasis throughout this document is on the non-violent resolution of disputes.

His statement goes on:

It is important to remember that any offensive action that might be undertaken will not be taken on behalf of the United Nations. This will not be a United Nations war.

Yes, the Charter does permit the use of force, but only in very restricted circumstances and only as a last resort. I do not believe—

He says, as head of the United Nations Association in Canada:

—we were at that stage when this resolution was passed, in November. And, in fact we are still not there.