

sions. Carbon dioxide emissions come from fossil fuels, come from oil. This is an opportunity to reduce our dependency on oil.

The government would have the public support to say no, we have to reduce our dependency on oil. But, no, the government has decided to take another tack. It has given away its independence on foreign policy. It is lock-step with the United States. It is leading us down a path, not only for our destruction, but for possible world destruction. I am not talking inflated rhetoric. We are playing a very dangerous game here.

In conclusion, there is no way that I will support this resolution, this government motion. I think the high-minded talk about supporting the UN is political expediency. They only do it when they figure that it is in lock-step with the United States. Let us be clear, my party and I are opposed to war in the gulf. We will be working diligently to make certain that the peace activists right across Canada contact their members of Parliament in every party of this House to make certain that they vote the correct way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Ferland (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on her performance this evening. I note that she is a known pacifist and that she truly believes in what she says. But what I did not like about her speech was that she hinted that Canada, with regard to the Iraqi situation, has climbed onto the American band wagon. That is not true. If she has followed the debates during the last few weeks, if she has kept up with the reactions of all the presidents and heads of state including Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. Mitterrand and others, then she knows that UN members for the first time are unanimous in saying that it is wrong, that it is unacceptable for any country to invade another by the force of arms, to rape the women, to kill the children, to destroy. I believe this is taking place at this very moment and that we must act; we must show all the other nations that we can unanimously tell Mr. Hussein:

"If you do not leave Kuwait, if you do not respect the freedom of the Kuwaiti, if you do not stop killing them and torturing them, we shall unfortunately have no choice but to take action". And this is what all countries

are saying, not just the United States. Mr. Gorbachev clearly said so not long ago.

The Chinese made the same statement recently when they said: "No, Mr. Hussein, we shall not use our right of veto to support you in this action. It is unacceptable; we are heading towards a new world order". This is what we hear from all national leaders except Mr. Hussein who says: "I have my own vision of things. Using brute force, I shall attack any country I choose. I shall make them say that their land is now my land and I shall do as I please in those countries".

• (2240)

I consider that unacceptable and everyone in this country, all the men and women of Canada, disagree with what Mr. Hussein is doing at this time.

[*English*]

Ms. Hunter: Mr. Speaker, I think that we all share mutual abhorrence of Saddam Hussein's actions. I do not think that there should be any doubt of that, and I would take extreme umbrage if that was what the member intended to say. Where we differ, though, is on how we are going to move him to change. Are we going to kill millions of women and children in a holocaust in the Persian Gulf, or are we going to allow economic sanctions time to work?

Mr. John Brewin (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, it has almost been driven out of my mind, the searing question that I had on the eloquent speech the member for Saanich—Gulf Islands has given.

I would like first of all to make this comment that in dealing with the issue that is before the House we have one item in background. We heard the other day that the government was making various cutbacks to public and social services, allegedly to pay for the war. It even has \$17 million in preparation for actions beyond March 1991.

What does the hon. member think of the idea of cutbacks in public and social services to pay for war in the gulf?

Ms. Hunter: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for Victoria for his question. This is what I was speaking of in my initial comments.

The increased militarization of our country is what we are seeing here, and that was implicit with the trade deal. If you are going to have a closer economic relationship with a country, it is a given that you are going to have a