



House of Commons Debates

VOLUME 133

NUMBER 094

1st SESSION

35th PARLIAMENT

OFFICIAL REPORT
(HANSARD)

Wednesday, September 21, 1994

Speaker: The Honourable Gilbert Parent

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, September 21, 1994

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Mr. Eugène Bellemare (Carleton—Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the media Tuesday that the minister of supply and services has struck a committee of bureaucrats to find ways of moving supply and services jobs from Ottawa to Atlantic Canada.

I strongly disagree with the study and any decision to move public servants from the national capital region.

[*Translation*]

At the present time 31.7 per cent of federal public servants work in the national capital region, whereas in each province and territory the number is proportionate to population.

[*English*]

The minister has no intention of either pursuing Tory practices or, even worse, applying the Reform Party's right wing agenda vis-à-vis the public service. He informed me today that the study is just that, a study. I am confident that we will treat any suggestion of transferring public servants out of the capital as an ill advised, bad public policy.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN ECONOMY

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Mr. Speaker, the recent figures in the Work Competitiveness Report show that Canada is in a very bad position. In 1989 Canada had the fourth most competitive economy among OECD countries. Five years later, it stood fourteenth!

This drop is the predictable result of the federal government's inability to control its deficit. The government's stubborn insistence on using its spending power to intervene in provincial

areas of jurisdiction is a waste of public funds and is slowing down job creation. Labour training, a tangle of federal-provincial overlap, as the Quebec manufacturers association pointed out yesterday, is a perfect example of the ineffectiveness of federal intervention. And who is paying for all this? Taxpayers and the unemployed.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert): Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House today to call upon the government to properly compensate my constituent, Mr. Walter Jerram.

His bull was seized because its only crime was being imported from the United Kingdom and just may have been exposed to BSE, mad cow disease.

Last Thursday Agriculture Canada and the RCMP seized the bull at 6.30 a.m. They cut through his chain fence, seized his bull and were gone in 20 minutes. No warrant was produced and a curt letter was left behind informing him that because he had resorted to legal recourse he would not be paid the routine, if low, \$2,000 in compensation.

The handling of this case is despicable. They came as thieves in the night. Canadians deserve better from their government. I call upon the minister of agriculture to pay the compensation my constituent deserves and launch an inquiry into the handling of this case.

* * *

NEW DIRECTIONS

Mrs. Anna Terrana (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago in my riding I had the privilege of attending the graduation ceremony of 14 young Vietnamese men who found an alternative to their lives. Of these young men two-thirds were on drugs and three were in jail. They were all part of gangs, did not have families and were all on social assistance.

These young people participated in a project called New Directions. For a year they were coached, taught, put through school, and they are now all free from drugs. They all have become part of society and some are continuing with school. It was an uplifting experience. Fourteen lives were saved. There is an alternative to crime but we must be proactive.

S. O. 31

Congratulations to immigrant services societies and the agencies involved and to the instructors and young people who had the courage to complete the program.

* * *

RAILWAYS

Mr. Paul DeVillers (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, Canada's railway policy lacks a short line railway strategy. Several American states, our most important trading partners and stiffest competition, have dynamic, comprehensive plans to strengthen and expand their short lines.

[Translation]

In Canada, and particularly in the province of Ontario, CN and CP are abandoning their branch lines at an astonishing rate.

[English]

This includes Midland-Uthoff subdivision which will be abandoned as of October 8, 1994 unless the petition to governor in council I presented on August 30 is successful in keeping the line open.

[Translation]

These closures are taking place at a time when Ontario's new labour legislation does not allow operators of secondary lines to buy and run abandoned lines at a profit.

[English]

Canada needs a strategy to address this grave situation before our short line network has been completely dismantled. I urge the Minister of Transport to come up with a plan quickly to save our short line network.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Bernie Collins (Souris—Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, on September 15, 1994 the Government of Canada entered into two administrative agreements with the province of Saskatchewan. These agreements provide for the more effective administration of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the pollution provisions of the Fisheries Act and the complementary Saskatchewan legislation.

The agreements are among the first of their kind in Canada. They apply to the areas of environmental protection and are jointly regulated by federal and provincial groups. The agreements will lead to more effective environmental protection programs by reducing duplication. The agreements ensure co-operation and reduce duplication in areas of reporting spills, spill response, inspections, investigation and information gathering.

The agreements reflect the federal government's goal to effectively protect the environment through federal-provincial harmonization and to ensure wise use of our limited resources.

* * *

[Translation]

MANPOWER TRAINING

Mr. Philippe Paré (Louis-Hébert): Mr. Speaker, when the people of Quebec make a little noise and threaten to walk out, you can always find some well-intentioned English-speaking Canadians to tell them that their Canada includes Quebec. The fact of the matter is that the rest of Canada usually greets Quebec's claims with: "Your demands are inadmissible and unacceptable. But we really like you and would want you to remain within Canada."

That is precisely what happened yesterday at the Canadian Chamber of Commerce convention, where the delegates from English Canada rejected a resolution from the Sainte-Foy Chamber of Commerce asking that manpower training be transferred to the provinces. "Quebec, we love you", said the Premier of Alberta yesterday.

For an increasing number of Quebecers, the English Canadian mermaid's song is losing its appeal and fast.

* * *

(1405)

[English]

ROD HAY

Mr. Cliff Breitkreuz (Yellowhead): Mr. Speaker, my very first member's statement in the House was about a young cowboy from the heart of Yellowhead country, Mayerthorpe, Alberta. I spoke about Rod Hay, a tough cowboy who has seen it all.

I am not talking about the beautiful countryside. I am talking about mud, dust and pain. In fact Rod walks around with plates, screws and wire holding his hip together because of a rodeo mishap three years ago.

He is almost in as bad shape as I am. All of the pain and hard work has paid off for this 25-year old cowboy. Today Rod is \$50,000 richer thanks to the biggest rodeo win in his life, the saddle-bronc championship at the greatest outdoor show on earth, The Calgary Stampede.

The win puts an exclamation point on Rod's illustrious career as the best bronco buster in Canada. Rod is also the reigning Canadian saddle-bronc champion and he will represent Canada at the world championships this fall.

I ask all members to join me in cheering for Rod Hay.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

S. O. 31

CANADA

Mrs. Jane Stewart (Brant): Mr. Speaker, during the first week in September I had the privilege of being part of the Canadian delegation to the United Nations conference on population and development in Cairo, Egypt.

There were many significant things to be learned. One of the most interesting was an understanding as to how the world community views Canada. Canada is a nation to be trusted. It is a nation turned to when issues are polarized and emotions are frayed.

We are truly the honest broker on the global stage. This is important for us to understand right now because initiatives here at home threaten to tear our country apart. For Canadians that means risking the loss of the rich culture and heritage that is so much a part of Quebec and her people. For the world there is a risk of loss of a great partner, the likes of which could never be replaced.

* * *

1999 PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. David Walker (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure I announce to the House that during the summer break the city of Winnipeg won the bid to host the 1999 Pan-American Games. We view the games as an opportunity to bring the world to our doorstep, to extend friendship and to exchange cultural traditions with our close cousins in the American hemisphere.

Indeed showcasing Canada to the world by hosting international games contributes immeasurably to forging international bonds. At the same time it instills in Canadians a sense of national pride and unity and a better understanding of the diversity of linguistic and cultural identities.

It will be a great celebration in 1999. Winnipeg has a long tradition of excellence in playing host to major events. I am proud to have had the opportunity to work with the excellent co-chairs Don Mackenzie and Barbara Huck, the mayor of the city of Winnipeg, the premier and the numerous volunteers to bring the games home again.

I would like to say a special thanks to the Prime Minister for supporting the bid to its success.

* * *

MICHAEL STRANGE

Mr. Gary Pillitteri (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise in the House today to congratulate a constituent of mine, Michael Strange, the gold medalist in boxing, 60 kilograms class, at the 25th Commonwealth Games in Victoria, British Columbia, where Team Canada won 128 medals.

Michael's achievement was remarkable, given the many adversities that he and his team mates encountered outside the ring. His outstanding performance is testimony to his skills, hard work and commitment to excellence. The efforts, teamwork, sportsmanship and dedication of athletes like Mr. Strange constantly make Canada's sporting scene one of the best in the world.

If we are to enjoy a repeated performance by Team Canada at world events we must, as Canadians, continue to recognize the positive influence these young athletes have on Canadian youth and support the valuable contributions they make to the Canadian identity.

* * *

[Translation]

1992 REFERENDUM

Mr. Gilles Duceppe (Laurier—Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, as we know, Quebec spent \$45 million in 1992 to organize its own referendum on federal offers. Yesterday, we learned that the federal government refused to refund the \$26 million, or one quarter of the total costs, the people of Quebec have contributed toward the referendum held in the nine other provinces.

All told, the cost of the referendum on the Charlottetown Accord to the Quebec taxpayers was \$70 million, as compared to \$80 million for the rest of Canada. Moreover, the Deputy Prime Minister was pleased to hear this yesterday. She said that separation is expensive.

(1410)

Unfortunately, Quebec is not a sovereign state yet and the Quebec taxpayers have paid three times as much as those from the other Canadian provinces for the referendum that buried any hope of federal renewal to be held. It was expensive indeed just to find out that federalism equals status quo.

* * *

[English]

THE REFORM PARTY

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that yesterday the Reform Party broke new ground in Ontario. Three Reform MPs, the member for Moose Jaw—Lake Centre, the member for Prince George—Peace River and I, participated in the international ploughing match special class competition for members of Parliament. This took place in Pembroke.

I am proud to say that we ploughed the competition under and left them in the dust. My colleague, the member for Prince George—Peace River, was straight and focused to the end. His winning performance proved that with hard work and perseverance we will be the voters' choice as well.

S. O. 31

Give us a chance and we will plough under the national debt which today stands at \$531,298,621,000.

* * *

[Translation]

REFERENDUM ON QUEBEC SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. Patrick Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine): Mr. Speaker, like millions of Quebecers, I understood that there was some confusion following a telephone conversation between Premier Parizeau and the Prime Minister of Canada. However, I clearly heard Mr. Parizeau make an election commitment to hold a referendum within 10 months. That statement is the only one that matters.

[English]

I say ignore the advice of the Leader of the Opposition to put off the referendum until the climate is more favourable. I can assure Mr. Parizeau that these are not the winds of change he hears from the Leader of the Opposition. It is simply hot air.

[Translation]

Mr. Parizeau, hold the referendum in 10 months as you had planned and promised Quebecers during the election campaign. It is time for the Leader of the Opposition to respect the democratic choice of Quebecers and the commitment made by Premier Parizeau, who stated that the referendum must be held quickly, that is, 8 to 10 months after the election.

* * *

HAITI

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, Sunday night's agreement between Haiti's illegal president and Mr. Carter, which was drafted without consulting President Jean-Bertrand Aristide or the United Nations, is a tragic betrayal of the Haitian people. The hoodlum Raoul Cédras and his associates did not sign anything, do not have to leave the country and will even enjoy a general amnesty.

Last week, President Clinton strongly denounced Cédras and his army of thugs and condemned his reign of terror. Today, according to him, he is an honourable man. President Aristide has called for the implementation of Resolution 940 and of the Governors Island Accord, and I hope that the Government of Canada will support him while denouncing this repugnant agreement.

TERRY FOX RUN

Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues in this House to the 14th Terry Fox Run which was held on Sunday, September 18.

[English]

At 3,400 different sites across Canada on Sunday, hundreds of thousands of people took part in the event which raised a total of \$8.5 million in 40 countries worldwide last year and is expected to raise more this year.

These donations pay 20 per cent of all the cancer research in Canada.

[Translation]

Over half a million Canadians walked, ran, pedalled or skated in memory of Terry Fox, who died of cancer in June 1981. I would like to pay tribute to the Canadians who once again volunteered their time to promote this cause they care about. Volunteers are needed now more than ever.

* * *

(1415)

RADIO-RESTIGOUCHE COMMUNITY RADIO STATION

Mr. Guy H. Arseneault (Restigouche—Chaleur): Mr. Speaker, a dream came true in my constituency of Restigouche—Chaleur. Last Monday, Radio-Restigouche, a community radio station also known as CIMS-FM, went on the air.

For the last few years, a great number of volunteers and employees have been working relentlessly to reach this goal. This community radio station aims at promoting the Acadian and French culture and at providing high quality regional news. CIMS-FM will also give its many volunteers the opportunity to train in the communications sector.

I want to congratulate all the members of the Radio-Restigouche team for their hard work. Such commitment by volunteers is worth mentioning. Long live Radio-Restigouche.

* * *

[English]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: I like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in the gallery today of Major-General Roméo Dallaire, des forces armées canadiennes.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Oral Questions

The Speaker: It seems that his reputation has preceded him and rightly so for all members of the House. I welcome you home, Major-General Roméo Dallaire. This is your place and we are glad to have you here.

not, he should talk to President Aristide, who will confirm for him that he fully supports what the Canadian government is doing.

(1420)

President Aristide has always shown himself to be very interested in and very close to the positions taken by Canada. He knows that the Canadian government is a dependable friend and ally.

So I do not accept the Leader of the Opposition trying for partisan reasons to create dissension between the Government of Canada and President Aristide when there is none at all.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, let us limit the debate to whether or not Canada is meeting its commitments to democracy and the support promised for President Aristide.

In this regard, if the government really played an important role, how could it let this agreement be reached with an impostor president, with no mention of President Aristide, who is supposed to be Canada's protégé?

In particular, I ask the minister whether he agrees with the clauses in the latest agreement that provide for amnesty, despite what was in the Governors Island Accord; according to our information, these clauses are the main obstacle to President Aristide's return.

[English]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly interesting that the Leader of the Opposition is now second guessing the actions of President Carter and the emissaries who at the very last minute obtained capitulations from the military junta.

What took place there at the last minute was that decisions were made by the Haitian junta to accept that multinational forces would arrive in Haiti without any confrontation in order to ensure that there would not be any loss of lives. That is what took place. Nothing else.

All the elements of resolution 940 will be carried out and will be exercised by the military forces that are there. That will ensure the speedy and safe return of President Aristide.

* * *

[Translation]

COLLECTION OF UNPAID TAXES

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance. The Auditor General of Canada, Mr. Denis Desautels, is understandably concerned by the problems experienced by the government in collecting unpaid taxes. In the last five years, the amount of taxes owed by Canadian taxpayers has nearly doubled, going from 3.7 to more than \$6.2 billion.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[Translation]

HAITI

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the brutal repression which the Haitian police and army carry on is getting worse in Port-au-Prince, as the American soldiers watch impassively. For his part, exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide has publicly repudiated the agreement reached between Washington and the military junta, referring back to the Governors Island Accord. The UN special envoy who was in charge of negotiating these accords has just resigned. His name is Dante Caputo.

I ask the minister who seems to be increasingly embarrassed by the growing confusion to tell us if negotiations are now going on in Washington to ensure the speedy and effective return of President Aristide.

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my answer is yes. As much as the Leader of the Opposition, I deplore this carnage that has followed the arrival of multinational troops in Haiti. These are certainly unacceptable actions which should have been expected from the military who are losing control of the country. I think that we must see what is happening there in that context and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition not to make a partisan issue of it but to accept that the Government of Canada is playing a very important and very useful role with President Aristide, who will return to his country very soon.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I always thought that Canada's policy was to support President Aristide. I wonder if President Aristide cannot rightly ask whether Canada did not support him by signing an agreement with an impostor president who has taken his place, without any reference to President Aristide's own legitimacy.

[English]

Did the minister intervene on behalf of Canada with Washington in order to ensure that the return of President Aristide takes place under conditions which respect the Governors Island agreement rather than according to the terms of agreement negotiated last Sunday with the U.S.?

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition should know; if he does

Oral Questions

Will the Minister of Finance recognize that, before targeting the poorest ones through a social reform, he should first set up a more efficient system to collect the more than six billion dollars owed in taxes?

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I read the account by Norman Delisle in this morning's *La Presse* of the speech by the Auditor General, and I must say I was very encouraged and pleased by what I read. He has identified the close to doubling of the taxes owed during the last five years of the Tory administration of which my hon. friend has made mention.

He has made it perfectly clear that this is indeed an area which the Government of Canada must pursue vigorously to make sure that all Canadians pay their fair share of taxes and that the business community is faced with a level playing field so it does not have to compete for contracts against those who do not pay their share. It is clear that he has identified a problem which we have recognized.

I remind the hon. member that within three weeks of becoming minister I announced a major campaign in consultation with my friend the hon. Minister of Finance to make sure that we would be able to address these very problems that the Auditor General mentioned in Quebec City yesterday.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Brien (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the results are yet to come. The minister and his government were elected a year ago. Will the minister tell us why his government did not make as much effort to collect taxes owed to the Treasury as it does to cut social benefits through its upcoming reform of those social programs designed to protect the poorest ones in our society? Why did the government not make as much effort to collect those unpaid taxes?

(1425)

[English]

Hon. David Anderson (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that within three weeks of becoming minister we launched a major campaign against the underground economy and against those who are not paying their fair share.

I pointed out that this was an important initiative of the government. The member seems to have overlooked the fact that revenues are up dramatically for this period over last year and that a considerable part of this, approximately \$700 million, is due to improved efficiency of collection. He has overlooked the fact that we are doing much better.

He has also overlooked the fact that the Auditor General in this article to which I referred earlier said the following:

[Translation]

The Auditor was very pleased by the decision of the federal Revenue minister to intensify measures to collect amounts owed to the Treasury.

[English]

Had the hon. member bothered to read the story and the speech of the Auditor General, he would have noticed that the Auditor General is congratulating us for the actions we are taking.

* * *

THE ECONOMY

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal premier of New Brunswick has expressed the view that Canada will sink into a lower economic order if the federal government does not come to grips with the debt problem.

He says that the efforts of the provinces to control their spending are being held back by the federal government which has yet to show a clear demonstrable commitment to fiscal management that would inspire international investors.

The Prime Minister will not heed advice from members on this side with respect to this subject. He does not heed advice from the taxpayers and the investment community. Perhaps he will heed the words of his Liberal colleagues and provide a clear demonstrable commitment to sound fiscal management.

Will the Prime Minister publicly direct the finance minister to reduce the deficit, not by raising taxes but by further spending reductions?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the Minister of Finance is doing.

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister apparently has no idea of the uncertainty that these non-answers and political answers create with respect to investors and taxpayers.

Many resource companies, particularly in western Canada, are starting to make money for the first time in a number of years. They are in a position of trying to decide whether to invest those profits in Canada or take them elsewhere out of the reach of the government.

Since the Prime Minister, given his track record on this issue and the uncertainty, creates only more uncertainty by responding, will the finance minister clear the air by stating categorically that he is not planning any tax increases on the resource industry?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to know that the leader of the Reform Party is conceding that when we had a Conservative government even less right wing than his, business was not making money and with the Liberal government in power it is starting to make

Oral Questions

money. It does not know where to invest it. It is better to have that problem than the problem it had with the Tories in government.

Talking about uncertainty I would like the leader of the Reform Party to be a bit objective. It is on TV every night and every morning that the Canadian dollar is going up. The interest rate is going down. The international community has more confidence in Canada than ever before. He should rejoice. That is simple.

(1430)

Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest): I read the papers, Mr. Speaker, but I am more conscious of the fact that the government is spending \$110 million more per day than it takes in, and a lot of other people recognize that as well.

If the Prime Minister cannot answer this question with clarity and resolve uncertainty in the resource industry perhaps he can say something that would calm the uncertainty among RRSP investors.

Yesterday the Prime Minister would not give a straight answer on whether the government is contemplating a raid on RRSP contributions. These investors are already organizing themselves to oppose an expected tax grab while we wait for an answer from the government on how many more dollars will seek a safer haven elsewhere.

My question is for the finance minister if the Prime Minister cannot answer. Will he clear the air on this issue by stating categorically that he is not planning a tax raid on RRSP contributions?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, we have made it very clear that we are about to embark on the most comprehensive, deep consultative process in the budget preparation that has ever been done. There will be extensive opportunity for debate. We welcome that opportunity.

The challenge I lay before the leader of the Reform Party is to rise to that opportunity. Or, is the Reform Party going to do what it did in the pre-budget debate, what it has done throughout the summer, and that is refuse to be constructive, refuse to tell us what it would do and refuse to face the fundamental challenges facing the country?

* * *

*[Translation]***DUPLICATION AND OVERLAP**

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot): Mr. Speaker, we now know that in five years, Canada has dropped from fourth

to fourteenth place among the 24 OECD countries as far its competitive position is concerned, mainly because of the unprecedented extent of the federal debt, inefficient government policies that undermine job creation and, above all, the wasteful overlap in manpower training.

My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Considering this disastrous state of affairs, what more will it take for the Minister of Finance to decide to make a move, act responsibly, eliminate the inefficiencies in federal spending and at last do something about duplication and overlap?

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, we have every intention of dealing with overlap. In fact, the Minister responsible for Public Service Renewal has been given that role.

I may add that the problems are more fundamental and that we will have to deal with the loss of our technological edge, the manpower issue, and, of course, the issue of the debt. That is why the Minister of Human Resources Development is going to start on his program to restructure our social programs, why the Minister of Industry is going to start on his program to restructure industry, and why we intend to reach our objective of bringing the federal deficit down to 3 per cent of GNP.

Mr. Yvan Loubier (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot): Mr. Speaker, earlier I heard the Prime Minister refer to the Conservatives. I now hear the Minister of Finance saying exactly the same thing he said about a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will put the question to the minister: What has he done for the past year, aside from conducting some pretty useless consultations, to cut operating expenditures? What has he done to eliminate overlap and duplication? What has he done to help the government make a sensible decision, which would be to decentralize all authority over manpower training to Quebec?

Eight hundred thousand unemployed individuals are waiting for this to happen. They are waiting for the glimmer of hope that the Minister of Finance and the government are certainly not giving them. So what has he done? That is my question.

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, what we did? Real growth was 6.4 per cent during the past quarter, the best performance of all our G-7 partners. Consumer spending was up 3.5 per cent during the first half of 1994. Exports were up 0.6 per cent in July, and I can go on.

(1435)

The hon. member asked me what I did. Well, I am not entirely responsible for all this. The government is.

*Oral Questions**[English]***NATIONAL UNITY**

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, you will know there has been some debate outside the House this week concerning the date of a referendum in Quebec. You will also know that many Canadians, after 25 years, are sick and tired of this separatist merry-go-round.

I would like the Prime Minister to clarify for the House whether he has clearly communicated the position of his government, of the vast majority of members of the House and the vast majority of the population of Canada that the premier of Quebec should fulfil his commitment to have this referendum as soon as possible. What assurances has he received in that regard?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, and the commitment was not only in a private conversation. It was made public on the Wednesday afternoon during a press conference when Mr. Parizeau answered a question by a CBC radio reporter stating he was to fulfil his commitment. I took his word in the press as well as what he said privately.

I see that the Reform Party is trying to make money on that subject by having a 1-900 telephone number. It is pretty awkward for a political party to want people to express a view and pay money to the Reform Party on a divisive issue like this one.

It is unbelievable and not very ethical to take a controversial problem, one that is very divisive and ask the people to pay to make money for the Reform Party. I can understand why the Reform Party has problems with its funding at this time, if we judge it by its performance in the House of Commons.

Mr. Stephen Harper (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

It is in the interests of this party and should be in the interests of the government to get the views of all Canadians on the unity of the country. I am surprised that the Prime Minister does not want that.

[Translation]

Here is my supplementary question: Does the Prime Minister intend to contact officially the new Quebec Government to urge it to respect its commitment and hold its referendum as quickly as possible, on the simple question of Quebec separation?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I already called them, as I mentioned before in this House, and I made a speech in Quebec City, before the Canadian Chamber of Commerce last Sunday, so my message is well known. We want

this question to be resolved in a civilized manner and quickly, so we can turn our attention to the other problems facing this country.

I would like to tell the hon. member that his party should have subscribed to a 1-800 number, instead of trying to make money with a 1-900 number. This is quite inappropriate.

* * *

FRANCOPHONES IN KINGSTON

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Once again, this year, Kingston High School students went back to school in shacks without running water or bathrooms because Kingston city council still refuses to let the school board build a school on its land.

On May 31, the Prime Minister pledged to help francophones get their high school without delay. In his opinion, is it normal for the school board to have to resort to the courts to have this fundamental right upheld? Given that the school will not be built soon, does the Prime Minister acknowledge that his May 31 pledge was nothing but hogwash?

(1440)

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have asked ministers who have Crown lands in Kingston to make a site available to the Kingston French-Language School Board to build a school, if it cannot come to an agreement with the city council. The Solicitor General and the Minister of National Defence have been trying to resolve this issue and we will find a suitable site if no agreement is forthcoming.

Mrs. Suzanne Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata): Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister recognize that the systematic obstruction and the obvious bad faith of Kingston city council confirm what the Commissioner of Official Languages said, namely that it will be extremely difficult to turn Kingston into a bilingual place respectful of the fundamental rights of francophones in this country?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we intend to take the necessary steps to ensure that Kingston college provides services in both official languages to all its students.

I am surprised to see how emotional these people who want to split Quebec from Canada and have their own army and so on can be. We will do what is good for Canada. We will make sure that anyone attending the only military college this country needs since we reduced our troops to 60,000—will be able to attend a bilingual institution, as required by Canadian legislation.

*Oral Questions**[English]***CANADIAN SECURITY INTELLIGENCE SERVICE**

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley): Mr. Speaker, the Security Intelligence Review Committee has publicly stated that the Solicitor General will have sole discretion in determining the openness of the SIRC report on the CSIS—Bristow affair.

Will the minister assure the House that he will make the entire report public, excluding the identification of confidential CSIS sources, other than Grant Bristow?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, it is my objective to make as much as possible of the report public. Once I receive the report I will review it. I will seek such legal advice as I need to make up my mind on how much I can make public.

It is my objective, as I said, to make as much as possible of the report public. If I can make the whole thing public I will certainly do so.

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley): Mr. Speaker, earlier this year SIRC tried to convince the justice committee that the fact that Canada was a world leader in the petroleum industry was a national secret.

Will the minister assure the House that he will provide a broader interpretation of what national security is?

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I think the CSIS act adopted by the House provides a definition. It is a very broad definition.

I appreciate the hon. member's question. I look forward to receiving the SIRC report so that after receiving advice on my legal position I can proceed as quickly as possible to make as much of that report public as possible to help reassure the public about this important subject.

* * *

*[Translation]***TAINED BLOOD**

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health.

The minister said at a press conference on September 12 that the inspection carried out by the Food and Drug Administration resulted from a change in the American regulations.

How can the minister reconcile her statement with that made by Red Cross spokespersons who were saying exactly the opposite, namely that there had been no change in the American regulations.

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I must tell the hon. member that there has in fact been a change in the FDA policy. They have decided to require Canadian blood collection centres to have a licence. There was already a request for this licence in their system. The FDA had not required Canadian centres to have this licence for several years.

(1445)

So, they suddenly changed their mind and now require us to licence these centres in order to meet the US regulations.

Mrs. Pauline Picard (Drummond): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whom we should believe. In response to a question I asked at a press conference, she told us that the American regulations have been changed. Then the Red Cross looks into it and says that there has been no change. I am trying to sort this out. I never get a straight answer.

I ask her the same question again: Was there, yes or no, any change in the American regulations? And I expect a clear answer.

Hon. Diane Marleau (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, there was a change in the policies of the FDA. Red Cross centres are now required to have a licence. That is all.

* * *

*[English]***GUN CONTROL**

Mr. Rex Crawford (Kent): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice. On behalf of thousands of honest law-abiding gun owners in Canada and being one myself as a former president of the Dover Rod and Gun Club and with many legitimate target shooting clubs wondering about their future, will the minister clearly state the government's position on the banning of handguns?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, the regulation of handguns is just one aspect of a comprehensive package this government is preparing in response to the Prime Minister's request last May.

I can tell the hon. member we are going to have to deal with handguns. A poll taken less than a year ago showed that 71 per cent of Canadians and a clear majority of firearms owners were in favour of an absolute ban on handguns. I am not suggesting the answer is that simple and no final decision has been made.

I spent the last three months speaking with dozens of pistol clubs, shooting clubs and handgun associations, among others. I am very sensitive to the interests they claim.

A study released yesterday by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force gave further reason to believe this subject needs attention. We already knew that 3,800 firearms are lost or stolen each year, about half of which are handguns. The study released yesterday demonstrated that about 30 per cent of the firearms

Oral Questions

used in the commission of crimes in Toronto were originally legally registered handguns.

We will be turning our attention to this subject. We will do our best to find a solution that respects the legitimate interests of Canadians and at the same time enhances public safety.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.

In 1981 Mr. Dudley Vincent Forbes was ordered deported to Jamaica for overstaying his visa. Four years later he was actually deported and the following year he returned. He was deported again and again he returned. Last Saturday Mr. Forbes allegedly walked into a Toronto establishment and opened fire on a crowd killing two and wounding several more.

After having been deported twice Forbes was recently granted permanent resident status. My question is why?

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this case is before the police. This individual came to Canada in 1981. He was asked to leave after overstaying and returned in 1986.

(1450)

If the hon. member is questioning whether people who are deported should not be permitted to return and go through due process then why is it that his party is refusing to adopt Bill C-44? Those amendments would allow the individual to be turned around at the border without legal process. Why is his party saying no to that?

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast): Mr. Speaker, this minister's record is not before the police; it is open for the public to look at. Bill C-44 would not have stopped Forbes from entering this country. We will not support the half measures the government proposes.

Will this minister agree today to put the protection of Canadian health and safety ahead of all other concerns in immigration, ahead of procedure, ahead of his friends in the immigration industry, ahead of his own personal ambitions?

The Speaker: My colleagues, we should not in any way impugn motives. That part of the question is out of order. I will allow the first part of the question to stand, if the minister would like to answer it.

Hon. Sergio Marchi (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Reform Party does not like to deal with the facts, but it should get around to doing that.

The facts are that this individual came to Canada and left some 15 years ago. The police are looking for this individual. Charges are pending. The person is at large. There are deportations on the books of individuals who are convicted of crimes that we believe are due to deportation. Fifteen years after this individual has entered Canada, is charged by the police—not convicted, charged—and is at large, what does that member expect me as minister of immigration to do?

On July 7 this government made a very clear reorientation of how we remove individuals. We set up a joint task force made up of police, RCMP, provincial and federal immigration authorities.

The hon. member does not need to lecture this government about taking the appropriate action. However the member does need a lecture about how our judicial system works and that we cannot deport someone who is charged and at large.

* * *

[Translation]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. The latest figures from the finance department show a significant reduction in UI benefits from April to July. However, these numbers also show a significant increase in social assistance costs—and that applies only to the federal government's share and does not include the increased costs in the provinces.

Given these figures, how can the Prime Minister take pleasure, as he did last Sunday at the Canadian Chamber of Commerce in Quebec City, in saying that a growing number of Canadian households no longer need to rely on unemployment insurance or social assistance?

Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that there has been a significant decrease in the number of people who need UI benefits at this time and that the creation of 275,000 jobs allowed these people to return to the workforce. That is why I said that fewer people need to rely on unemployment insurance and social assistance, since many jobs have been created in the last 10 months.

Mrs. Francine Lalonde (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, if the figures are higher, it is certainly not because there are fewer beneficiaries.

(1455)

Does the Prime Minister not recognize that the reduction in UI benefits is due in very large part to the reforms, the exemptions voted not only by the former government but also by the current government, that this is a tragedy for individuals and that it simply means a heavier burden for the provinces?

Oral Questions

Hon. Paul Martin (Minister of Finance and Minister responsible for the Federal Office of Regional Development—Quebec): Mr. Speaker, as far as the reduction is concerned, it is very clear. The figures are there. In Quebec alone, for example, the help wanted index is 10 per cent higher than in 1993. Since we were elected, Quebec's unemployment rate has fallen by more than 1 per cent. Again, in Quebec, 79,000 jobs were created, while 261,000 jobs were created in Canada. That is why the rates are down.

* * *

[English]

DANGEROUS OFFENDERS

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice knows that Keith Legere is a reported pedophile just released from prison for the killing of a six-year old boy. His psychiatric assessment shows he is a pedophile with psychopathic tendencies. The protection of society has to be our number one priority yet there is no mechanism in our system to protect society against people like Keith Legere.

Will the minister take immediate steps to bring in legislation that will indefinitely incarcerate dangerous offenders?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, part XXIV of the Criminal Code calls for the indefinite incarceration of dangerous offenders. Part XXIV has been in place for decades. In the appropriate cases it permits the prosecuting attorney to bring to the attention of the court circumstances which would establish that the accused person is of sufficient danger to society that they should be locked up indefinitely. That happens weekly in the courts of the country.

The government has identified a gap in the system. It is that category of case in which no such application under part XXIV of the Criminal Code is brought. Such persons may be incarcerated for fixed periods but may arguably still be dangerous upon the expiration of those terms.

I am not speaking to the case of Legere but speaking generally when I say that for the past several months the Solicitor General, the Minister of Health and I have been working with our provincial counterparts toward the creation of a nationwide policy with changes to the provincial health acts, if necessary. This is to provide for the continued detention under the health regimes of persons who, upon the expiration of their criminal terms, may be dangerous to the public.

I will be happy to provide the hon. member with details of the state of those discussions. They continue and I remain optimistic as do my colleagues that we can make a significant improvement in the system in that way.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): Mr. Speaker, that is good talk and I would like to see something really happen. However from what I have seen from the proposals and the talk I have heard their policies are going to be as useless as the immigration policies.

I will give another example. A convicted sexual predator, a pedophile named Galiene, will be released in October. Experts say he is not rehabilitated and will prey on young children again.

Washington State has successfully enacted legislation that locks up perverts indefinitely. Will the justice minister implement an immediate moratorium on the release of all dangerous offenders until such time as new effective legislation is in place?

Hon. Allan Rock (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I share the hon. member's concern for the safety of the public, but I suggest that a different approach would be more effective and in the long run necessary as constitutional.

The hon. member may have noticed two weeks ago that an Ontario court upheld a ruling. It would keep in detention a person who had completed a prison term but who was taken into the Ontario health regime and held involuntarily for the protection of the public.

(1500)

The person challenged that ruling and the ruling was upheld. I took that as very encouraging for the approach that the Solicitor General of Canada, the Minister of Health and I want to pursue, which is working with the health systems to fill that gap.

There cannot be a moratorium because that would not be lawful. It would not be constitutional.

An hon. member: Would it be safe?

Mr. Rock: What is safe and expedient is not always what is lawful. The rule of law must govern. I can assure the hon. member that we will pursue the approach I have described. We are confident it will result in an enhancement of public safety.

* * *

PORT OF QUEBEC CITY

Mrs. Dianne Brushett (Cumberland—Colchester): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Canadian Heritage. In 1985, UNESCO of the United Nations recognized the unsurpassed heritage value of the historic old port in Quebec City, placing it on the world list of heritage sites.

Will the government also recognize the heritage value of the old port of Quebec and monitor the encroachment of developers whose sole interests for prime real estate are for profit?

Hon. Michel Dupuy (Minister of Canadian Heritage): Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague for her interest in the historic district of Quebec. Of course Canada played an important role in the development of the world heritage convention.

Points of Order

As minister responsible for heritage sites in Canada, I am always encouraging the very careful management of the lands in the old, historic district of Quebec and in adjacent areas.

[Translation]

To reassure her further, I am pleased to report that I was informed that the City of Quebec announced on June 23 that it was pulling out of a project to build parking spaces and, a few days later, the promoters of a Imax cinema project also abandoned their plans for that area.

This means that the district is indeed protected and I have no doubt that we will remain vigilant in the future.

* * *

CANADA LABOUR CODE

Mr. Bernard St-Laurent (Manicouagan): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Human Resources. The 128 workers of Ogilvie Mills, in Montreal, have been on strike for three and a half months now. And there is no hope of settlement in sight, as the company can hire scabs to remain in operation.

Considering that about 70 per cent of the Canadian workforce is already protected by provincial anti-strikebreaking legislation, does the minister intend to table in this House proposals to amend the Canada Labour Code by adding anti-strikebreaking provisions at the federal level?

Mr. Clifford Lincoln (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to the hon. member that the minister met on Monday with several CNTU officers representing Ogilvie Mills workers. He assured them that he was taking a close look at this whole issue of Canadian anti-strikebreaking legislation, an issue which will be considered as part of the in-depth reform of the Canada Labour Code, and that he will give this problem the urgent and serious attention it deserves.

* * *

[English]

HEALTH

Mr. Grant Hill (MacLeod): Mr. Speaker, on February 18 in the House my colleague from Surrey North warned the Minister of Health about the differences between the Canadian blood supply and the U.S. blood supply. The minister's answer was do not worry. We are inspecting the blood supply and by March this will all be taken care of.

If those inspections had been done, we would not be in the pickle we are in today. Were those inspections done, or was this simply to cover the minister's gluteus maximus?

The Speaker: The question is out of order.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

BILL C-41—COMMENTS DURING DEBATE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege, of which I had given notice, related to certain comments made during the course of debate yesterday by the member for Central Nova.

(1505)

However, following consultation with the Clerk, I understand that this matter may be more appropriately addressed as a point of order. I will certainly pursue the matter at the earliest possible opportunity, after having given notice to the member for Central Nova.

* * *

POINTS OF ORDER

ALLEGED UNPARLIAMENTARY LANGUAGE

Miss Deborah Grey (Beaver River): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to rise on a point of order regarding question period yesterday afternoon. I asked the Prime Minister a question about an appointment of a lawyer.

I would like to draw your attention to Beauchesne's 6th edition, citation 489 which states that the phrase "has not got the guts" is unparliamentary. That comes from *Debates* of May 27, 1959, page 4078.

I would like to draw your attention to *Hansard* of yesterday, page 5898 where the Prime Minister responded to me with the exact words "if the member had any guts she would try to prove that the person is not competent".

I think it is fairly clear that statement is out of order and I would like to ask that the Prime Minister either withdraw those comments or apologize.

Hon. Herb Gray (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons and Solicitor General of Canada): Mr. Speaker, I am speaking in my capacity as government House leader.

With respect to the point of order just raised, I respectfully submit there are two problems with it. First, I am not aware whether the hon. member gave notice to the Prime Minister that she intended to raise it so that he could be present. More important, I understand that such matters are to be raised at the

Routine Proceedings

first opportunity which should have been yesterday immediately after the end of the question period.

The time has passed for raising this point. However in saying that I am not in any way accepting the premise of the hon. member's point of order.

The Speaker: Many times in the course of debate when we take words out of context they do not always have the same connotation that they ordinarily would have.

Notwithstanding the fact that the hon. member has rightly pointed out that the statement which she quotes as being used is out of order I would refer the hon. member to page 149 of Beauchesne's 6th edition, "unparliamentary language", where it says:

The Speaker has consistently ruled that language used in the House should be temperate and worthy of the place in which it is spoken. No language is, by virtue of any list, acceptable or unacceptable. A word which is parliamentary in one context may cause disorder in another context, and therefore be unparliamentary.

I would say the point has been made. I would rule that it should have been brought up probably at the instant when it occurred rather than a day later. I am hopeful the hon. member will accept it is on the record that these words are indeed unparliamentary. My ruling for now would simply be that I hope the use of these words would not occur again in the near future.

Is this on the same point of order?

Miss Grey: Yes.

The Speaker: Unless it adds something new I would prefer just to lay this aside. Thank you very much.

COMMENTS DURING QUESTION PERIOD

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod): Mr. Speaker, my question was ruled out of order and I would like to request a ruling on that please.

The Speaker: The ruling is simply that it is out of order in the context in which it was made. I think that this kind of language in certain circumstances could be very inflammatory and I would ask the hon. member that in future when he is putting questions that they not in any way stoop to even a hint of vulgarity.

That is not by way of explanation so much as it is by way of asking the hon. member to please refrain from language which could be judged to be inflammatory.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

(1510)

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to table, in both official languages, and pursuant to Standing Order 36(8), the government's response to five petitions.

INTERPARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Mr. Francis G. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 34(1), I have the honour to present to the House, in both official languages, the report of the Canada–Europe Parliamentary Association to the Third Annual Parliamentary Assembly of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe held in Vienna, Austria, from July 4 to July 8, 1994.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House the third report of the Canadian NATO Parliamentary Association concerning the North Atlantic Assembly's spring session which was held in Oslo, Norway, May 26 to May 30, 1994.

* * *

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-267, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act (election expenses).

He said: Madam Speaker, with the permission of the House, may I make a short statement on each bill.

The purpose of the bill covering election expenses is to eliminate any reimbursement by taxpayers of election expenses incurred by candidates and political parties.

(1515)

The Canada Elections Act presently obliges taxpayers to reimburse 50 per cent of election expenses of candidates and political parties if they achieve set percentages of the vote.

Such reimbursement is actually a taxpayer funded grant to a special interest group which should be raising the money from the people it purports to represent. Passage of the bill would ensure that they would have to do exactly that.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

PLAIN LANGUAGE ACT

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-268, an act to promote the use of plain language in federal statutes and regulations.

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill regarding plain language is to ensure that plain language is used in federal legislation so that legislation may be clearly and readily understood by non-lawyers. Some of the bills the House has passed and no doubt will pass in the future are so legally complex that it takes a gaggle of lawyers to interpret and explain the legislation. Even then it is not unusual for the original intent of the bill to end up being lost in legal challenges.

Routine Proceedings

This bill if passed would ensure that the final language of a bill is straightforward enough and in simple enough language that its intent could not be misunderstood or misinterpreted.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

CANADA PENSION PLAN

Mr. Paul Szabo (Mississauga South) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-269, an act to amend the Canada Pension Plan (income transferred to spouse).

He said: Madam Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to amend the Canada pension plan to permit income transferred to a spouse to qualify as pensionable and thereby extend CPP benefits to stay at home parents.

The bill is a follow-up to my, Bill C-256, introduced on June 7, 1994 which proposed to amend the Income Tax Act to allow one spouse to pay or split income up to \$25,000 to the other spouse who is managing the family home and caring for at least one dependent child who has not commenced full time attendance at school.

This new bill would give further recognition to the principle that caring for children is an important job to be fairly compensated including the extension of pension benefits to a parent working in the home.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT RETIRING ALLOWANCES ACT

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-270, an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act (money purchase pension).

He said: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce a private member's bill entitled an act to amend the Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act (money purchase pension).

The bill if passed will significantly change the MPs pension plan. It is designed to reduce the burden significantly taken on by taxpayers under the current member of Parliament pension plan.

Currently members of Parliament contribute \$1 for \$7 of taxpayers' money to the existing plan. This new plan is \$1 for \$1, taxpayer by member. It will reduce the cost to taxpayers of the pension plan for members of Parliament by approximately \$11.7 million per year.

This is a plan that is endorsed by the Saskatchewan Taxpayers Association, the Canadian Taxpayers Association and the Canadian Federation of Independent Business. It is a plan that is modelled after the Saskatchewan MLAs plan which has been in place for over 15 years and works very well for both taxpayers and members.

It will end unfunded future liabilities of MPs pensions. It will also reduce overall pension payout and set a higher age limit for qualifying for a pension.

I hope to gain support from all sides of the House on this very important bill.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

(1520)

YUKON FIRST NATIONS LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

Mr. Jay Hill (Prince George—Peace River) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-271, an act to amend the Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act (Interpretation).

He said: Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise in the House today to introduce an act to amend the Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act.

One of the more serious flaws in Bill C-33 allows the agreements of the Yukon First Nations to take precedence over Canadian laws. The bill would amend Bill C-33, the Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act, so that federal or territorial law will prevail where there is an inconsistency or conflict with any final agreement or transboundary agreement.

We are all Canadians and the laws of the land should apply equally to all.

(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed.)

* * *

MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, I think you will find unanimous consent of the House for the following motion. I move:

That the order of the House of Wednesday, February 23, 1994 respecting the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy be amended by adding thereto the following:

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House substitution in the membership of the Committee shall be in accordance with Standing Order 114(2), and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours thereof.

Routine Proceedings

[Translation]

ASSISTED SUICIDE

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons) moved:

That the Order of the House of March 16, 1994, respecting the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Foreign Policy be amended by adding thereto the following:

That, notwithstanding the usual practices of this House, substitution in the membership of the Committee shall be in accordance with Standing Order 114(2), and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours thereof.

(Motion agreed to.)

* * *

[English]

PETITIONS

VIOLENCE

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, these petitioners are concerned as are all Canadians that abuse and violence are real concerns throughout the whole nation.

The petitioners want all forms of abuse and violence controlled and preferably to cease; that is, those forms of abuse and violence that we hear on radio and see on television. They request that the government ask the CRTC to regulate forms of abuse and violence that are contrary to what they are trying to do to raise their families.

(1525)

These parents point out that their efforts to raise and educate their children are often counteracted by what happens on radio and television.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I rise today to present three petitions signed by my constituents in Capilano—Howe Sound.

The first petition calls on Parliament not to amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include the prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

ABORTION

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound): Madam Speaker, the second petition calls on Parliament to act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child.

Mr. Herb Grubel (Capilano—Howe Sound): Madam Speaker, the third petition calls on Parliament to prohibit assisted suicide and that Parliament make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Hon. Audrey McLaughlin (Yukon): Madam Speaker, I am presenting petitions today on behalf of members of the Kaska Dena Council of Yukon and B.C. These members are from diverse points, Watson Lake, Fort Nelson, including Good Hope.

The Kaska Dena Council requests that Parliament ensure that its fiduciary rights as related to the federal government are respected, particularly in relation to land claims issues in Yukon and B.C. in which its territory spans both that province and territory.

The Kaska Dena Council seeks the support of the minister of Indian affairs to ensure that he carries out this responsibility and former agreements with the Kaska Dena Council.

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure today to present a petition to the House signed by a number of my constituents as well as Canadians throughout southwestern Ontario.

These petitioners call on Parliament to vigorously enforce the Criminal Code of Canada to prohibit assisted suicide and they further call on Parliament to make no changes in the law which would sanction or allow the aiding or abetting of suicide or active or passive euthanasia.

I present this and most heartily concur with these petitioners.

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre): Madam Speaker, I am privileged to table in the House today duly certified petitions on behalf of the constituents of Moose Jaw—Lake Centre.

The first two petitions ask Parliament to enforce the present provisions of the Criminal Code respecting assisted suicides and that no changes in the law be contemplated by Parliament.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Allan Kerpan (Moose Jaw—Lake Centre): Madam Speaker, I table the wishes of persons in Moose Jaw—Lake Centre who humbly pray that Parliament not amend the human rights code concerning the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

I concur wholeheartedly with each of these petitions of my constituents.

Routine Proceedings

ASSISTED SUICIDE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to table a petition which is signed by residents across Canada, including from the cities of Calgary, Moose Jaw and Mill Bay.

These petitioners draw to the attention of the House the fact that the current Criminal Code denies people who are suffering from terminal or irreversible and debilitating illness the right to choose freely and voluntarily to end their lives with the assistance of a physician.

Therefore the petitions call upon Parliament to amend the Criminal Code to ensure the right of all Canadians to die with dignity by allowing people with terminal or irreversible and debilitating illnesses the right to the assistance of a physician in ending their lives at a time of their choice subject to strict safeguards to prevent abuse and to ensure that the decision is free, informed, competent and voluntary.

BILL C-91

Mr. John Solomon (Regina—Lumsden): Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure on behalf of constituents and other Canadians in Saskatchewan to present a petition pursuant to Standing Order 36. The petition is signed by people from Moose Jaw, Saskatoon, Pangman, Ogema, Minton, Oungre, Kenora and Nipawin, all in Saskatchewan.

(1530)

The petitioners are extremely worried about the impact of Bill C-91 which was passed in the last Parliament extending the patent on some prescription drugs for up to 20 years and guaranteeing drug manufacturers monopoly prices and substantial profits at Canadians' expense.

Prescription drug prices in Canada are the most expensive in the world as a result of the bill. The petitioners are calling for the repeal of Bill C-91. The Liberals in opposition supported the repealing of Bill C-91. The petitioners are asking the government to repeal the bill as quickly as possible to reduce the pressure on drug plans and health care plans across the country.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to provide a petition to the House today from constituents in Fraser Valley West and Langley, Aldergrove and Matsqui.

The petitioners request that Parliament not amend the human right code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code to include in the

prohibited grounds of discrimination the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

CHILD ABUSE

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, I have a petition from more than 60 people in the riding of Peterborough. These are people concerned about child abuse. They point out that babies and young children lack the ability to defend themselves and they fall victim to sexual abuse and serious physical and psychological abuse each year.

They urge that Parliament amend the Criminal Code to ensure stiffer sentences and mandatory treatment for all child abusers.

FIRST NATIONS

Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough): I have a second petition, Madam Speaker, prompted by the recent death of Debra Redhead and it is presented by people from the Native Friendship Centre in Peterborough. They point out that the existing judicial system continues to fail and in some cases participates in the deaths of incarcerated First Nations peoples. The group Cries to the Spirits is urging the federal government to recognize and act on this.

They petition Parliament to accept and respect First Nations people's right to reintroduce their traditional judicial system which promotes healing as opposed to punishment.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod): Madam Speaker, I have four petitions to present today, two that relate to opposition to same sex couples, homosexuality and sexual orientation.

EUTHANASIA

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod): The second petition asks Parliament not to change any legislation relating to euthanasia.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. Grant Hill (Macleod): The final petition asks for protection of the unborn child.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I would like to present petitions on behalf of my constituents to request Parliament not to amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to include the undefined phrase sexual orientation.

DIVORCE ACT

Mrs. Daphne Jennings (Mission—Coquitlam): The second petition is presented on behalf of Canadian grandparents asking Parliament to amend the Divorce Act to assure grandparents of continuous access to grandchildren and to inquire as to the health, education and welfare of their grandchildren.

Routine Proceedings

It is the hope of this member that all members of the House will support our grandparents and realize the needs of our grandchildren have got to be addressed. By addressing their needs we also address the needs of grandparents.

RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford): Madam Speaker, it is my duty to present two petitions today pursuant to Standing Order 36, the first signed by 238 constituents of Oxford County who pray that Parliament act immediately to extend protection to the unborn child by amending the Criminal Code to extend the same protection enjoyed by human beings to unborn human beings.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. John Finlay (Oxford): The second petition requests that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Canadian Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality.

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 it is my duty and honour to rise in the House to present a petition duly certified by the clerk of petitions on behalf of constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands, Victoria and Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca.

The petitioners humbly pray and call upon Parliament to enact legislation providing for a referendum of the people, binding upon Parliament, to accept or reject two official languages, English and French, for the government and the people of Canada.

(1535)

EUTHANASIA

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36 I have three petitions I would like to present today on behalf of my constituents in Simcoe Centre.

The first deals with euthanasia. The petitioners request that the current laws regarding active euthanasia be enforced.

ABORTION

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, the second petition deals with abortion. The petitioners request that Parliament reconsider amendments to the Criminal Code.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. Ed Harper (Simcoe Centre): Madam Speaker, the third petition deals with sexual orientation.

I wish to present a petition requesting that the Government of Canada not amend the Human Rights Act to include the phrase sexual orientation. The petitioners fear that such an inclusion would lead to homosexuals receiving the same benefits and societal privileges as married people.

Mr. Dale Johnston (Wetaskiwin): Madam Speaker, under Standing Order 36 it is my pleasure to present a petition duly signed by constituents of Wetaskiwin who humbly pray that Parliament not amend the human rights code, the Human Rights Act or the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in any way which would tend to indicate societal approval of same sex relationships or of homosexuality, including amending the human rights code on the grounds that this could include discrimination.

I present the petition on behalf of the constituents of Wetaskiwin.

* * *

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS

Mr. Ted White (North Vancouver): Madam Speaker, unfortunately during introduction of my private members' bills the seconders of the two bills were rotated. I would like to correct that for the records of the House.

The seconder for the bill entitled an act to amend the Canada Elections Act was Grant Hill. The seconder for the act to promote the use of plain language in federal statutes and regulations was Bob Ringma.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): That is fine. I will make sure the corrections are made.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Madam Speaker, Question No. 42 will be answered today.

[Text]

Question No. 42—**Mrs. Guay:**

With respect to the cellular telephones in use in all government departments and agencies, (a) how many are in active use, (b) how many are not in active use, (c) are they leased or owned outright and in what proportions, (d) what are the costs involved in their lease or purchase, and (e) what are the total costs of use and communications?

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): The information provided was obtained by soliciting 68 departments and agencies of which 61 had cellular telephones. The legislature (Parliament), the judiciary and crown corporations are not included.

Due to the large geographical area involved, the wide variety of leasing and usage costs, the means and time frames of billing procedures and availability of records, the figures provided are only good for the day they were collated by each government institution.

(a) Active use:	10,143
(b) Non-active use:	367
	(Non-active use includes "Seasonal Use")
(c) Owned:	9,261
Leased:	1,249

Government Orders

- (d) Purchase cost: Average price in today's market - \$400 to \$500 per unit.

(As some of these telephones were purchased many years ago, some more than 10 years and records not being available, the total actual cost cannot be provided). Please note that the cost of these devices is continually decreasing in value.

Lease cost: Average monthly - \$92,936.38

- (e) Cost of use and communications:

Average monthly - \$577,075.16

[English]

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): The question enumerated by the parliamentary secretary has been answered.

Mr. Milliken: I ask, Madam Speaker, that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

* * *

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Peter Milliken (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): I ask, Madam Speaker, that all notices of motions stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Shall all notices of motions stand?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

PEACEKEEPING

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Foreign Affairs) moved:

That this House take note of Canada's current and future international peacekeeping commitments in this world, with particular reference to the former Yugoslavia, Haiti and Rwanda.

He said: Madam Speaker, I want to address the House this afternoon about one of the strongest and most enduring traditions of Canadian foreign policy, our commitment to peacekeeping. Almost forty years ago, Lester B. Pearson first developed the modern concept of peacekeeping: a UN Force.

That idea defused an explosive international crisis and led to a peaceful disengagement of warring parties under the United Nations flag.

(1540)

Today, I may recall that since the creation of the first United Nations Emergency Force in 1956, under the leadership of a Canadian, Lt. Gen. E.L.M. Burns, there have been 26 other UN peacekeeping missions. In every case, Canada has participated in some way. Canadians have served with distinction in all 16 peacekeeping operations currently under way in the UN.

More than 3,700 Canadians are currently deployed in eight international operations, while helping the UN secretary general with the planning of two other missions in which some 700 Canadians might eventually be called to serve. This is a unique record of achievement of which all Canadians should be proud.

A decade ago, the UN had only three active peacekeeping missions, but today, a number of important factors, including the end of the Cold War, the unfortunate outbreak of ethnic and nationalist conflict, and the new co-operation among the members of the Security Council, where veto rights are no longer used to paralyse the UN—have changed the peacekeeping equation.

The United Nations has been empowered to act where once there was a stalemate. As a result, the UN is now becoming the instrument of international co-operation which was the world community's hope in 1945. The fact that the Security Council is now using peacekeeping as a central instrument to bring about peaceful change is a development we should applaud and one we wholeheartedly support. There is no doubt that Canada is one of the UN's strongest supporters.

Next week at the United Nations, I will be putting forward suggestions for making the organization more responsive to a new era in which peacekeeping and related tasks will become even more central to its mandate.

But we have also recognized in recent months, pending the implementation of these vital reforms, that the UN has more peacekeeping mandates than it can realistically handle, involving a variety of tasks which the international community is ill-equipped to manage. It therefore seems a useful time to take stock of the situation and to ask ourselves a series of questions about peacekeeping. What are Canada's national interests in the new era of peacekeeping? How should we play a role in the more diverse and demanding era which is now confronting us? How should we deploy our very valuable resources abroad at a time of

Government Orders

fiscal constraint at home? How should we support the UN in a time of transition to new and more demanding tasks?

In the coming weeks, two parliamentary committees, one responsible for reviewing Canada's foreign policy and one responsible for reviewing our defence policy, will be asked to prepare a report by the end of October, and I am sure that both committees will have some very interesting recommendations to make, as they try to answer these questions.

I am also convinced that today's debate in the House will give many of us an opportunity to intervene and offer the government suggestions on the best way to answer the very fundamental questions I just formulated.

(1545)

Allow me at this point in time to make a few personal comments.

[*English*]

My view is that peacekeeping is fundamental to Canadian foreign policy. It is not simply a question of continuing a tradition for which Canadians have a deserved international reputation. It is a question of making a concrete and key contribution to international security at a time of instability in many parts of the world. It is also a question of making the United Nations work in directions that are in Canada's interests and in the interests of virtually the entire global community.

In emphasizing the importance of peacekeeping, we have to recognize Canada's strong desire to help the UN whenever we can, but at the same time we have to acknowledge that Canada cannot be everywhere and do everything.

[*Translation*]

In my view, a number of factors should guide our future action. First of all, we should devote time, attention and resources to the planning and administrative functions at the UN which will enable the UN to function effectively in the future. This means developing ideas to make the UN secretariat more responsive to international developments, offering personnel to the UN for explicit planning functions, helping the UN plan and coordinate the initial phases of operations and, in certain cases, offering our leadership in operations, as we did in Rwanda. We had the pleasure earlier today to salute Major-General Dallaire, who was in the visitor gallery, and who so brilliantly served the UN in Rwanda.

This emphasis on the "front end", based on wide-ranging Canadian experience, will help to ensure that UN operations can function with a maximum of effectiveness. Second, Canada should focus on roles in UN missions involving what we do best. In Rwanda this has meant communications and logistics, the supply of fresh water, and the provision of medical field hospitals.

This is also what we have done with our civilian police contributions, through the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, in Namibia and the former Yugoslavia. This is what we intend to do shortly in Haiti.

Third, we should try, in thinking about our roles, to offer contributions which are not only useful in the peacekeeping phase, but which also make a contribution to the broader reconstruction of society—the "peacebuilding phase" which follows a peaceful settlement. In Kigali, for example, Canadian troops have opened the airports, and helped restore vital communications functions. In Haiti, the UN will use an international force of specially trained police officers, under the leadership of Superintendent Pouliot of the RCMP, to transform the Haitian police into a professional unit appropriate to a democratic society.

Lastly, I believe we should be open and responsive when needs arise quickly and when the international community requires an urgent response. But, to fulfil this fourth objective we will need the necessary resources. The Canadian Government and the Department of National Defence will have to plan, a bit ahead of time, to make available the human resources required to intervene, when the situation requires it, in an area of the world where our traditions or our interests might call us.

(1550)

I am thinking in particular about the day when peace in the Middle East will finally have been achieved. As you know, Canada was part of the very first UN peace mission in the Middle East. Here is a part of the world where Canada can play a significant and useful role, and I am sure it will certainly be willing to help implement the peace process which seems to be taking shape and in which we are actively involved.

[*English*]

There are no hard and fast rules about Canadian participation. There should be no arbitrary limits to Canada's contributions. What we do in each situation must be judged in light of our interests, in light of the requirements, and in light of our ability to participate.

Resource constraints have become an obvious consideration. A decade ago our share of the total UN cost of peacekeeping was only \$8 million. In this fiscal year the Canadian share will be in excess of \$150 million.

Other issues need to be looked at. For example, there is the continued deployment of our peacekeepers and the capacity of other countries to participate in these types of operations. There is always value in reviewing our ongoing peacekeeping commitments.

In light of the conditions I have just outlined, the House knows that our future peacekeeping presence in the former Yugoslavia is up for renewal at the end of this month. As members will recall, last February the government held a debate on the same question. Today we are continuing this tradition. We

Government Orders

are looking for advice, suggestions and comments from members on both sides of the House before a final decision is reached by cabinet.

[*Translation*]

Canada has played a key role in the Balkans over the past three years. We joined the European Community monitoring mission in 1991, and committed forces to the UN protection force in the former Yugoslavia in 1992.

We are continuing the humanitarian airlift into Sarajevo in cooperation with the UN High Commissioner for refugees.

We have contributed funding to the investigation of violations of international humanitarian law and to the international tribunal for war crimes. We have some 45 RCMP officers in Bosnia to help in policing operations. Canadian Naval Forces are part of NATO's Adriatic Command. We have participated in CSCE investigative and monitoring missions, and we are about to support the monitoring of the border between the federal republic of Yugoslavia and Bosnia.

[*English*]

I believe we have a moral obligation to continue to help. In the field of humanitarian assistance, the Sarajevo air bridge has proven indispensable and its work will continue.

Today I am pleased to announce in addition to what we have pledged already, an additional contribution of \$1 million to the International Red Cross and \$7 million to be divided among four United Nations agencies: the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; the World Food Program; UNICEF; and the World Health Organization.

I also want to announce the extension of projects with Care Canada for the installation of water purification units in Sarajevo, and with Queen's University for developing a network of rehabilitation centres for the wounded and the handicapped. All of this is in Sarajevo. Canada will also contribute \$500,000 to the special United Nations fund for the restoration of essential services in Sarajevo.

(1555)

Having said that, I want the House to understand it is increasingly difficult to sustain all of these efforts. This is especially so at a time when the conflict still rages, when the parties are far from a peaceful settlement and when the prospect of lifting the arms embargo may compromise the UN's mandate and endanger all peacekeeping forces in the region.

I am happy to report that the contact group is making a significant contribution to the negotiating process, although the prospect for a settlement remains far from certain.

Canada fully expects to play a role in the diplomatic process commensurate with the size and importance of our peacekeeping contribution. We will obviously be very happy to know the views of all members of this House in regard to our involvement in the former Yugoslavia.

[*Translation*]

I believe it is possible to sustain our role in the UN protection force, at least in the short run. We need to give negotiations a chance to work. We need to ensure the provision of humanitarian assistance while political pressure takes effect.

What may prove to be necessary are adjustments in the size or disposition of Canada's contribution at a time when there are other real demands on our peacekeeping forces. Whatever changes we may need to make in the months ahead, the first priority of Canadian policy must be the conclusion of a peace agreement among the parties.

Canada is also playing a key role in the efforts of the UN and the OAS to help in the restoration of democratic government in Haiti.

I think the House will share my relief at the last minute agreement reached between the American negotiators led by former president Carter and members of the de facto military regime. We look forward to an early return of Jean-Bertrand Aristide to his rightful place as democratically-elected president of Haiti.

[*English*]

I understand that meetings are taking place today in Washington between Secretary Perry and President Aristide. There is a full briefing on the activities of the multinational force in Haiti, how it has been deployed, what the mandate is of this force and how it intends to facilitate the speedy and safe return of President Aristide in his country.

I have a quote by President Aristide after his briefing. He compliments President Clinton for what has taken place, saying it was as a result of his leadership. There is no doubt that the operation to unsettle the military junta was and still is a difficult task. Many people have spoken out on it but it took decisive action by the United States of America to fulfil what was considered to be the first phase of an important process in bringing back democracy in Haiti.

Some countries were ready to intervene in the first phase; some were not ready to intervene in any phase. Canada has indicated clearly from the very beginning that we would not participate in the first phase in order to be able to play a greater and more substantive role in the long run. We will participate in the second phase and work side by side with President Aristide to rebuild his country and help its population.

Government Orders

(1600)

[Translation]

Canada will, of course, play a prominent role in re-building democracy in that troubled country, when the time is right. We feel confident that, in a few weeks, we will be able to deploy the contingents we promised. One of their tasks will be to train Haiti's civilian police. Canadian troops would also be part of a UN peacekeeping mission to restore stability so that President Aristide can govern his country without interference from a military junta who did not, does not and will never believe in democracy.

There is much work to be done over a period of time and we are very confident that we can do it in a reasonable amount of time in accordance with the wishes and goals of President Aristide himself.

I must say that we have no doubt that the Americans heading the multinational force in Haiti share our opinion that President Aristide must be reinstated. Never, in all the discussions I have had with American officials, have I doubted a single moment that they were as committed as we are to ensuring that democracy be restored in Haiti and that President Aristide be allowed to complete his mandate as president of his country with the full powers vested in him.

I wanted to clarify this point because my friend the Leader of the Opposition led me to believe, by certain comments and questions, that he assumed the Americans would not stand by President Aristide and would let him down. I can tell him that, as far as I am concerned, his doubts concerning the Americans are unfounded. The Clinton administration must not be imputed motives that it does not have in my view. Each within our own area of responsibility, we must believe in and support this process leading to the return of President Aristide in his country, with him being able to exercise full powers.

Allow me in closing to briefly recall the actions Canada has taken concerning Rwanda. I mentioned earlier the key role played by General Dallaire. I would like to say that, through his contribution and in many other ways, Canada has played a prominent role in restoring some peace to that country. Last May Canada called for a special session of the UN Commission on Human Rights.

(1605)

Canada was also the first country to make funds available to send observers to assess the human rights situation. When the crisis escalated, Canada stood out among UN action supporters by providing substantial financial assistance to the UN mission in Rwanda, in support of General Dallaire as it were.

For a long time, we were the only country to provide air transport to the capital, Kigali, taking in food and medicine and bringing out the wounded or those in danger of dying. I say without hesitation that the Canadian effort to reinforce this UN mission helped to save thousands of lives, including that of the current Prime Minister.

We were also among the first to lend tangible support to the second element of our strategy, encouraging refugees to return to Rwanda, which we think is very important at this time. We sent a 200-person medical unit to Rwanda and we were the first to send experts to see what could be done to restore the infrastructure of the country, its water supply, electricity and telephone services.

But we must realize that this awful crisis is primarily and ultimately political. It is clear that any final agreement must have the support of all parties. That is why Canada will continue to increase its efforts in the UN mission in Rwanda and at other levels, to help stabilize the situation and prepare the ground for a peaceful settlement.

The Canadian Armed Forces may eventually be deployed in as many as ten UN operations, but even with this type of global involvement, Canada will also have the flexibility to respond rapidly in the event of humanitarian tragedies or if the conclusion of peace treaties results in a need for monitoring activities. I say these things because, again, we must consider the choices to be made. We want to make these choices after consulting Parliament, as we promised at the beginning of our mandate, after consulting the elected representatives in this Parliament who can help us forge a foreign policy that fully meets the objectives of the Canadian people and that is fully in keeping with Canada's tradition and interests.

Hon. Lucien Bouchard (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, first I want to thank the government and the minister for providing us with an opportunity to discuss these very important issues today. I certainly agree with the minister that Canadians are very proud of their peacekeeping missions. In fact, if there is one initiative which gets the full support of the public in Canada, it is this collective commitment to peacekeeping missions.

It should also be pointed out that these peacekeeping missions were not an afterthought in the evolution of the Canadian society. They were, from the very beginning, an integral part of our diplomatic efforts as a sovereign state. They were an extension of co-operation efforts which soon led to interventions. Following the very appropriate comments made by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, I can only endorse the compliments made to the late Lester B. Pearson, who is among those responsible for building Canadian diplomacy, and for the prestige that this country now enjoys.

Government Orders

However, it must be said that while these missions proved very beneficial, albeit not easy, and were perceived as being effective in the first few years, they are now faced with new problems.

(1610)

These problems are both enormous and very acute, and they could undermine the credibility of Canadian commitments to peacekeeping missions. This justified the setting up, by the House of Commons, of committees which are developing new policies in that sector and are trying to redefine commitments in a way that is more relevant to the current reality.

These problems are not necessarily all new ones but they have intensified and they are enormous. Take the cost issue. Canada is not as rich as it was in the fifties. In those days, the costs involved were probably not a major factor in determining whether or not to participate in a mission. I believe that Mr. Pearson was a happy political leader who did not have to worry too much about this aspect. Indeed, at the time, costs were not very high and, moreover, the Canadian government's debt was almost non-existent and its financial stability was such that the public rarely opposed the allocation of monies to that purpose.

However, those costs have increased. Obviously, we need increasingly sophisticated equipment. Some belligerents use very modern equipment; consequently, we sometimes have to face them with inadequate material. And increasingly, we must deploy substantial contingents, so that cost becomes a very pressing issue. Even more so, now that every debate in this House and most of the concerns of the ministers and the Prime Minister focus on the crisis in our public finances, so that taxpayers, who are already taxed to the hilt as a result of our national debt, are starting to ask questions. They are starting to wonder how extensive this kind of international commitment should become.

There is another factor, and I am referring to the complex problems that create situations where intervention is necessary. Mostly, we are looking at conflicts arising from religious or ethnic differences or even worse, they may be connected with the imperialistic designs of those who want to expand their territory and engage in ethnic cleansing, and, of course, conflicts whose causes are rooted in the history of these peoples.

It is very difficult for us to go into these countries, as North Americans who may not have a European's sensitivity to this type of problem. It is very difficult to go in and quickly find a solution, a way to cut through the inextricable tangle of problems that are rooted so deeply in a country's history. I may recall what is happening now in Bosnia. The presence of different ethnic groups within the same territory, in a crazy patchwork of

different communities is all due to the impact of historic events and a very complex sequence of developments that is practically impossible to reverse today.

There are also some new questions and principles being formulated, in a debate that would have been unthinkable before. People are now asking: Is it legitimate to violate the sovereignty of foreign peoples? There used to be fundamental principles that were never challenged, at least not until now. A country's sovereignty was inviolable, period. No one would dream of challenging this principle, and those who did were condemned by the entire community.

Anyone who dared to break treaties, invade territory and undue challenge the sovereignty of foreign countries was ostracized by the rest of the world, while today, in democratic societies like ours, at international venues as distinguished as the UN and UNESCO, and elsewhere, we hear sensible people who respect the rights of others asking whether we should not intervene in such and such a country, irrespective of that country's sovereign rights, to impose peace and to neutralize situations that are a threat to human rights.

So we have these new fundamental questions and a new debate. There is a new culture, and there is a new kind of action that countries are being requested to take. And I am afraid that people are starting to wonder more and more about the effectiveness of these interventions. This is of course due to the fact that interventions are taking place in increasingly difficult situations, with fewer chances of being successful, but there is also the issue of modern technology.

(1615)

Let us take Rwanda for example. I entirely agree with what the minister just said about the outstanding Canadian contribution in that part of the world, starting with Major-General Roméo Dallaire, whom we had the pleasure of welcoming today.

We know that there were outstanding acts of personal bravery, that all the troops we have dispatched did their utmost and that Canada made as much resources available as it could under extremely difficult circumstances. Yet, we realize this is but a drop in the ocean in the context of this conflict and that our efforts, however laudable, had little effect on the magnitude of the horrible massacres that have taken place over there.

Our limited capacity for intervention in any conflict or situation of this sort is reflected most clearly by television, as we can witness these horrible scenes broadcasted live night after night. We will never be able to make everything right. There will always be massacres. There will always be parts of operations that will prove impossible to carry out. Mistakes will be made and be caught on camera. Television crews in the field will faithfully report them for us to see in our living rooms.

Government Orders

People can see for themselves, in their daily life, from their own homes, how difficult any action is and how little we were able to accomplish. That is why they have questions, and some pretty relevant ones at that.

I imagine we will soon take stock of the operations in Bosnia and determine how useful our action was over there. We know about what went wrong in Somalia. As for Rwanda, I think we all saw what happened in terms of the consequences and the acts of cruelty.

There are also aspects of a more political nature that we need to look at. Take the events in Iraq for example. We went over there to free Kuwait which had been the victim of an intolerable act of aggression. I remember the rationale for intervention, a legitimate one at that, was to restore democracy. At the time, the government of Kuwait had promised to put in place a more democratic regime. We know full well that these promises were not kept and the bottom line is that the billions of dollars invested by many countries to free Kuwait and put Iraq in its place had very little impact in terms of promoting democracy either in Iraq or in Kuwait.

Some may wonder if the intervention was not motivated by more pragmatic considerations. The cause for such a rapid, concerted and efficient action was the petroleum found under the desert sand, was it not? Canadians are asking themselves a lot of questions. I think we must be careful because if we do not answer these questions adequately, we will hurt the credibility of peacekeeping missions. On the day when Canadians no longer support the government's efforts in this area, we will lose that ability.

Again, I am happy to have the possibility in this House to address this issue. It is very important to ask ourselves questions and try to see where we are going. What path should we take? There are no easy answers. We could perhaps take one case—Haiti's case—and see if there are lessons to be learned regarding the approaches and criteria we could adopt in the future. So what is happening in Haiti?

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the minister that I never questioned the Americans' motives, but I did question his. Of course, everyone knows that the Americans are really eager to restore peace and democracy in Haiti and that they are the only ones making a real sacrifice. Despite the minister's heavy rhetoric, despite his lyrical statements, he did nothing. He simply watched the Americans, as we all did. I certainly am not blaming the Americans for anything in this matter, on the contrary. It is the minister I blame for his powerlessness and his sugary speeches. He tells us: "I met with President Aristide, I called him, I talked with him, I like him, he likes me and we will protect him." Yet, President Aristide is still in Washington and it is not the minister who will arrange his return to Haiti. So please, let us not engage in petty politics. Do not attribute to myself, my party and the Official Opposition the

slightest intention of undermining the honesty and selflessness of American motives.

(1620)

That said, it is not because we agree with the approach, because we are satisfied with the first results of this approach that we cannot be concerned about what is coming. There is cause for concern; I am sure that the minister himself is concerned and that it is only through considerable self-control that he manages to hide his anxiety. Because the minister knows full well that Mr. Aristide is now in Washington, that he denounced the agreement that was reached, that American soldiers are now in Haiti, powerless, their hands tied by an agreement they signed with a presidential impostor.

I come from the legal world but I am still surprised to see that this approach, this American operation in Haiti was based above all on the need to restore the legitimate president, the first president to be democratically elected in Haiti, that this was the real approach, the real objective, the basic justification. So I am surprised. The minister himself must have been surprised as a lawyer whose legal knowledge I had a chance to appreciate back in my university days. The minister must have been surprised as I was to see that the first page of the agreement contains only the name of the current president, the disgraced president, the puppet president appointed by the military junta despite President Aristide who was elected democratically a few years ago. So that is rather surprising. It is dangerous to recognize a usurper. The issue arises.

A practical question also arises. The Americans are now there. President Cédras is the one who really controls the situation, who is the trouble maker, the man who has denied all democratic freedoms, who is ultimately responsible for the massacres that we see on television. He has not signed the agreement. He has incurred no obligation. He walks around the streets of Haiti and continues to lead the military junta. On television last night, we saw someone being killed as an American soldier watched horrified, wondering what he was doing there unable to intervene.

There is a problem, basically. The minister is surely concerned about it. I am sure that once he is back in his department with his senior officials, he will continue to express his concern and call Washington and try to use Canada's diplomatic efforts to bring about a quick settlement of the situation, because it is disturbing.

October 15 is mentioned, but it is far off. How many more people will die in the streets of Port-au-Prince? How many will be beaten by the police, by those thugs in the streets of Port-au-Prince who hit unarmed people? How much more will the people have to suffer while the Americans look on powerless? They will not stand for it either. If we Canadians do not like to see that, imagine what the Americans think. What would we say if we saw armed soldiers wearing the Canadian uniform who had gone there from all over Canada and did not say a word but

Government Orders

watched powerless as those whom they had gone to fight strike helpless victims? What would we say? We would not be pleased.

The Americans are not pleased either, I am sure. We must push forward. The minister must intervene, he must speak publicly and tell it like it is; he must stop giving us syrupy speeches on his feelings for President Aristide, on the telephone call he made to him yesterday and Mr. Aristide's call back to him. That is not really serious. That is not the real issue. That is not what a government is responsible for.

The Canadian government must intervene forcefully, speak up and demand that President Aristide return there, and insist that the Haitian army be dismembered and dismantled, because what is going on? The Haitian army is still there, in control. But it has no more structure, no more effectiveness, no more operational integrity. How can President Aristide return under such conditions?

How can we imagine that President Aristide will return to Haiti in a few weeks and that the army, his enemy which fought him and kills and tortures people, will now work hand in hand with him and take his orders, and that General Cédras will go to salute President Aristide every day in his office?

(1625)

No one can think that. What will happen? Are necessary measures being taken to control the Haitian army? As far as we know, this is not the case. We do not know anything. All we know is that poor President Aristide, who denounced the accord a few days ago, today congratulated President Clinton, even though nothing had changed.

In conclusion, the government has the support of the official opposition to find a solution to this issue. We will not play politics with that issue. There are no votes to be won or lost. We are well aware that this is a matter of honour, a matter of respect for mankind, a matter of democracy. In fact, it is a matter of preserving the credibility of our peacekeeping missions and our role in this type of situation.

We have to intervene and we have to be credible. We have to act in an efficient and pragmatic way, taking our means into account, and our role must be redefined. How do we do that?

The first lesson to be learned from the Haiti operation is that we cannot intervene elsewhere if such a measure is not based on democratic legitimacy. We must not look to General Cedras but to President Aristide. We must not look to the impostor but to the real president. In our reviews, as well as in the criteria to be defined, we should include a requirement to justify any intervention on a democratic legitimacy in those countries. Secondly, and more importantly, we must not compromise with the enemies of democracy. In the case of Haiti, one cannot help but wonder if we made a move to protect the Haitian army rather

than the population. Indeed, the Haitian army and police continue to commit abuse.

Thirdly, I think that these interventions should be rigorously planned in a concerted fashion. What does that mean? It means that we should first clearly define the objectives and the tasking orders. What happened in the case of Haiti is that a response force showed up and, at the last minute, in extremely difficult conditions, I agree, an agreement was hurriedly negotiated. However, these people had no framework. No clear objective had been defined at the outset. A compromise was negotiated in the heat of the action, and that can sometime lead to an arrangement that does not take all the relevant factors into account. Unfortunately, this seems to be the case here.

I also said that these interventions should be planned in a concerted fashion. Indeed, even though resolution 940 was passed by the UN, the fact remains that there is only a national force over there, namely the Americans; this is certainly not what you would call a multinational intervention. I heard the Minister use the word "multilateral" several times in his remarks. This does not change the fact that the troops which are there are strictly American. Some will say that this is because the others were not brave enough to go. That may be so, but it is still the case that it is a national force.

What we must hope for the future—and it cannot be done right now, of course—is that the forces there will be more diversified and put under UN command. This is easier said than done. The UN must have the means to do it; we must redefine "peacekeeping"; we must find a new framework for UN missions. This is something we can do. It is better than the minister's speeches; it is a job for Canadians; it is a job for our diplomats.

We should be in New York right now, putting forward proposals to revamp UN mechanisms defining peacekeepers' mandates and mission objectives. This is a job for the minister, a job for his colleagues. Instead of crying on President Aristide's shoulder, let him do something constructive! Let them go to New York! Let them come up with a plan, present it and advise our friends to broaden the forces and to place them under the auspices of the UN, whose main role it is anyway. As long as we are relying on national policing forces—

Mr. Ouellet: It has been done already.

Mr. Bouchard: Did you present a proposal?

Mr. Ouellet: Yes, we did.

Mr. Bouchard: Well then, what are we doing to do now? What is the existing commission doing right now? We need much more than pious hope, we need proposals on how to share the financial burden. Countries should tax themselves, Canada should be a leader in that respect. If we do not take the lead in that matter, let us do it with others. It must be done.

Government Orders

As long as we depend on one national force, we will have complicated situations like the one we have now.

[*English*]

I would like to say a few words about that. Of course we fully support the maintenance of Canada's commitment in terms of peace missions. A basic creed of Canada is to be present all over the place when it is appropriate to do so. At the same time we have to improve the way it is done, not only by us but the rest of the world. We have to make sure that the credibility of our interventions is maintained. If we do not do anything now we will undermine the support this and other governments have been given by the public in terms of tax money and different interventions.

(1630)

It should be one of the fundamental tasks of the committees now working to define and shape new objectives and missions and to make sure that many countries will share the burden if it cannot be achieved through United Nations activities. We have to be very active at the UN and a strong supporter. We have to stop making empty speeches. We have to make sure the next mission will not be conducted by national forces like the Americans, but that many countries will work together efficiently in harmony so as to achieve clearly defined objectives.

I do not accept the accusation from the minister that we suspect the motives of the American administration. We agree they were courageous. They were the only ones to do it. They had the means to do it and they did it. They had the guts to do it and now they are there. It was possible for them to land on Haiti without any bloodshed. The problem is that now we have to go further because blood is being shed in Haiti every day, the poor people victims, and still the same people are hitting and killing them, those against whom the Americans decided to intervene.

That is why I strongly urge the minister to work closely with the Americans to make sure the commitment toward President Aristide will be fully respected.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the question to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment is as follows: the hon. member for Fraser Valley West—Immigration.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I thank the minister for having the opportunity to talk on this most important subject. This certainly is an example to Canadians when Parliament is allowed to speak on a subject of such national interest. I go along with the other speakers in terms of our reputation and the pride we have as Canadians in our peacekeepers.

Since the first peacekeeping mission in 1956 tens of thousands of Canadians have been involved in these missions. Some of them have made the ultimate sacrifice with their lives. We want to thank those people for what they have done; it is certainly appreciated. The millions of people around the world they have helped certainly know what we as Canadians have done. On behalf of the Reform Party and Canadians in general I would like to pay tribute to those people and say: Job well done.

As the House is aware since early this year the special joint committee reviewing Canadian foreign affairs, of which I am a member, has been travelling across the country to find out from Canadians what they think about foreign affairs and our international commitments for the coming decades. It has become very clear to me and to many members on the committee just how deeply concerned Canadians are with events around the world.

We want to stand up and be part of the missions that occur. We do not want to bury our heads in the sand and not take part in all of those things that affect our world.

(1635)

Canadians are not prepared to give up on their proud tradition of caring and intervention for the sake of peace. These times however cannot be seen from a purely international perspective. Our foreign commitments must be in harmony with our domestic needs. Therefore we must be sure when we do support peacekeeping that we are operating in Canada's best interests and within the very real financial constraints that must be the primary concern of any good government. We must pick our spots and we must choose wisely.

Today's debate is an example of trying to choose those spots and pick the ones that are of most interest. One thing we must make clear is that Canada cannot become the 911 phone number for the world. As much as we want to help others, this desire is tempered by the fact that we cannot be all things to all people. It is better that we help effectively in a few cases rather than spreading ourselves too thin. In this way Canada can protect its own vital interests and provide the most effective help for the international community.

As we examine the issue of peacekeeping it is worthy to note that since the end of the cold war the demand for peacekeepers around the world has skyrocketed. If the past few years has taught us any lesson it is that instability will continue. New hot spots will continue to crop up and Canada must be ready. If more requests come from Africa, southeast Asia or the former Soviet republics how will Canada respond?

Clearly, Canada must establish criteria to test the importance of each request for our help. While this is a sensitive issue and I do not claim to have all the answers, I would argue that the following should be considered by Parliament when deciding whether to approve peacekeeping missions.

Government Orders

First, Canada's economic ties are an extremely important factor when we determine how willing Canadians would be to commit our resources.

Second, the conflict's impact on the state of international stability is another obvious test of whether Canada should get involved. If the conflict has a serious potential to escalate or destabilize the whole region, we should consider this seriously when making our decision.

Third, geographic ties are important. For reasons of regional stability, the world would be a better place if countries co-operated to make sure that their own part of the world remains stable. Where peace does break down, regional organizations should co-operate to make things right. After all it will be the member nations of such regional groups that have the greatest interest in restoring stability. For logistical reasons as well, proximity is an important factor in determining whether a country can respond to a crisis in a timely and effective manner.

Fourth, humanitarian considerations must also be taken into account. While Canadians want bang for their buck, they also want Canada to maintain its tradition for compassion. While I could say more on this item, one of my colleagues will talk on that subject later on this evening.

Fifth, our prior commitments must be given more weight than is the current practice when determining what else we are going to do. We only have so many troops and a limited amount of high quality equipment. Therefore we owe it to our troops to be fair in our decisions where we send them and to make sure that we do not overcommit our forces. My fellow Reformer, the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt, will talk on that issue.

Another very important consideration which must be taken into account is that our judgment should not be clouded by the media spin in each crisis, the so-called CNN factor. There are many conflicts in this world which could use the assistance of Canadian peacekeepers however the media does not treat them equally.

The usual process involves one crisis headline becoming really big and bouncing everything else from the front pages. The media raises a hue and cry to be heard throughout the world: Why is the world not helping to do more? Then two weeks or a month later the media drops that story and picks up on something new. That is just the way it works and we have to be conscious of that. Just because the media likes this approach does not mean their priorities are always correct; nor do they always reflect Canadian interests.

(1640)

To the extent that Canadians do care about what they see in the media, we have to acknowledge the media will always be a factor. However, we must not let the headline du jour drive us into unwise or hasty action. Whether it is a sexy headline or not Parliament should do the right thing, period.

Now that I have outlined some of the basic criteria on which we should be judging our participation in peacekeeping, I would like to move on to two specific cases which we are discussing today, Rwanda and Haiti.

According to the six criteria which I have listed, I do not believe that Rwanda was a fully appropriate peacekeeping initiative for Canada.

First, Rwanda and Canada have virtually no trade ties. Therefore we certainly could not argue that our economic interests were at stake. Other central African countries are Rwanda's main trading partners and they are the ones who are having their trade disrupted.

While the massacres in Rwanda have had an impact on the neighbouring countries, especially in terms of creating large flows of refugees, I do not believe the crisis there represents a threat to regional or world stability.

In terms of my third criteria, geographic ties, Canada is neither close to Rwanda nor do we have a tradition of dealing with that country or its people. Therefore there was a long delay before the majority of our peacekeepers could even get there.

In the future Canada should encourage regional organizations such as the Organization of African Unity to build up their capacity to respond when a local crisis arises. Beyond this Europe has many more ties to central Africa than we do. This tradition makes it more natural for them to adopt a leadership role there just as France did.

When taking humanitarian considerations into account, clearly Rwanda is a case which required the world's attention and help. While Canadians will always help in such circumstances, do we always have to send in the troops to show we care? I do not think so.

Many thousands of Canadians spoke with their wallets and donated money to Canadian and international NGOs that were helping with humanitarian relief. This was an appropriate reaction. We would like to do more, but quite frankly others were better placed to provide the peacekeeping in Rwanda.

One of the main reasons that our reaction to the Rwandan disaster was so limited relates to my fifth criteria: our prior peacekeeping commitments. No other country has given more in the cause of peacekeeping or has been on more missions, but our forces are stretched to the limit. It simply is not fair to keep asking our soldiers to go on so many endless peacekeeping missions. They are the Canadian forces, not the Canadian foreign legion. If we scale back or shut down other missions, then perhaps we will have some reserve forces to be deployed upon need, but right now we do not.

According to the last factor, the CNN factor, it is beyond doubt that the extensive media treatment of the Rwandan disaster initiated the response from this and many other governments. Let us not forget that about two years before in neighbouring Burundi many thousands were slaughtered for the third

Government Orders

or fourth time since the 1970s but there was no media reaction, no hue and cry, and no peacekeepers.

In the future, Parliament must do a better job in assessing the seriousness of a crisis. An international crisis is more than the sum of the media coverage it receives.

Before I move on from the topic of Rwanda, I will talk about my experience with Rwanda. In 1971 I read an article in *National Geographic* about the mountain gorillas and the country of Rwanda. I decided I had to go there and 15 years later I managed to complete that dream.

My wife and I experienced a country with beautiful green covered hills and mountains and fertile volcanic soil. There were friendly people who were smiling and happy. I will always remember the markets we visited with the children playing and the people doing their weekly shopping. How can a country change so dramatically? We were aware of the two tribes but not of the hatred. What happened? NGOs and missionaries warned of impending problems but nobody listened. Nobody took the leadership to try to prevent the carnage which was to follow.

(1645)

If we wanted to get involved in Rwanda it should have been then, when our diplomatic negotiations and leadership could have been more effective. Instead the international community failed to act proactively and went to its old standby: when the damage was already done they called in the peacekeepers, Canadians included.

We must learn from this experience. Proactive measures through diplomatic channels or through international organizations are not only more effective and cheaper than expensive peacekeeping missions but they can save a lot of lives.

Let me go on to Haiti. Once again we have a situation which is seemingly thrust on us, a crisis that requires our immediate attention. However, on closer inspection a very different picture appears.

First, we have virtually no economic interests in Haiti. Neither is international stability threatened. In terms of geographic ties Haiti is certainly in our hemisphere, therefore we should have an active interest. But if we are going to get involved it should be under the auspices of the Organization of American States, not as part of the U.S. led adventure that may be opening a Pandora's box into which peacekeeping nations may enter, never to withdraw.

If Canada is going to Haiti, let us make sure that we know what we are getting into. How much will it cost? When do we get to leave? What are we trying to accomplish? Is Cedras a diabolical murderer yesterday and our partner for the reform of Haiti today? Not in my books he is not. I would gladly kick his butt but I would not shake his hand.

Clearly things are not going as the Americans first planned. Haitians are still being beaten and killed by thugs. Aristide is clearly unhappy. Haitians in Canada are unhappy. The American soldiers are unhappy. In fact the only ones with smiles on their faces are the coup leaders. If this is not a clear warning sign I do not know what is.

On the humanitarian side, there is no doubt that Canada can be of assistance to the poorest and most desperate people of Haiti. Once again, I argue that it is our NGOs that are best equipped to do this; not our soldiers who are already stretched to the maximum when it comes to peacekeeping around the world.

The Haiti crisis is a hot item today in the media. It may be hot tomorrow. However let us not forget that Jean-Bertrand Aristide was thrown out in 1991. This is not a new issue. Haiti's problems were not even new in 1915 when the Americans invaded the last time. Back then they stayed for a generation. Let us make sure that this time next year we are not watching the American troops pull out only to leave our Canadian servicemen and women there for the next generation.

Canada can be an effective world player and peacemaker. Canadians are proud of this and we do not have to prove it to anyone. If we decide not to go to Haiti the world will not hold it against us.

Let us do Canadians a favour and give the Canadian forces a break for once. We will keep our troops at home and instead take a leadership role in the OAS. If we build the strength and credibility of this and other regional organizations then maybe we can really solve the problems of countries like Haiti.

It is in this precise role that Canada excels. While other countries may be known for their strength or guile, Canada has worked long and hard to develop its image as an honest broker and leading middle power. We are a member of all of the strongest clubs, NATO, G-7, UN, OAS, et cetera, and yet we do not have the historical baggage of the world's great military powers. Therefore others look to us and trust in our ability to build up international institutions like the UN and the OAS. Canada will do a great favour for the world if we take this role to heart and help to bring about constructive change.

On a visit to Washington last week I asked the OAS and State Department the same question: Do you feel Canada has played a

Government Orders

strong leadership role in trying to solve the Haiti problems diplomatically? I got a negative response from both. Instead I was told that Canada is very timid and suffers from an inferiority complex when it comes to dealing with foreigners.

(1650)

We can play a strong middle power role and become a world leader in brokering peaceful solutions to international crises. However first we need government leadership to show the way, to demonstrate a commitment to diplomacy and playing a more active role. We have the education, the foreign staff and most of all a reputation as a reasonable, democratic society that can be trusted.

What we have been lacking is the political will to succeed. Such change would not only be good for the international community but would be good for Canadians, since affected international organizations could go a long way in preventing any future problems. Without a crisis there is no need to spend more money or risk the lives of members of the armed forces.

In conclusion, we should not enter Haiti or any other area until we establish, first, the criteria; second, the cost; third, a plan including the logistics, our specific job, how and when we will get out. We must be sure that Canadians support our actions and that we always debate this issue in the House of Commons.

The time has come for us to take a step back. Before we send our troops on yet another indefinite mission with uncertain dangers and an unknown cost, let us establish a credible set of criteria on which we can depend to make sure that we pick our spots wisely. Canada can make a difference in this world. Canada can still be an innovator and a leader in the area of peacekeeping but we have to make a choice. Any foolish government can say: "Yes, we will help", and it will think it is doing the best thing. It takes a strong government to say: "Meet me half way and then I will help; otherwise you are on your own".

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I understood there was a brief question and comment period. If so, I have a question for the hon. member.

Mr. Boudria: Madam Speaker, I wish to inform you that Liberal members from here on will be using the 10-minute and 5-minute provision; in other words, sharing the time as opposed to the usual format.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): There are no questions and comments for the first three speakers.

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I seek clarification with respect to the rules. My understanding was that there were no questions and comments following the initial speaker and then the speaker immediately following the minister. Certainly my understanding is that the rules do provide for a period of questions or comments after that.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): On your copy of the Projected Order of Business for today you will read:

Prime Minister, Leader of the Opposition, Minister moving the motion and Member replying immediately after the motion—unlimited time.

All other Members—20 minute maximum and speeches are subject to a 10 minute question and comment period.

I would also refer you to Standing Order 43(1):

Unless otherwise provided in these Standing Orders, when the Speaker is in the Chair, no Member, except the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition, or a Minister moving a government order and the Member speaking in reply immediately after such Minister, shall speak for more than twenty minutes—

(1655)

In this case orders of the day read that the first two speakers have unlimited time. As a member responding for the Reform Party he had unlimited time with no questions and no comments.

Because the wording reads "only a member replying immediately after the minister", we will allow the usual question and comment period for the member for Red Deer.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): Madam Speaker, I am not sure my question is that desperately important. However I do appreciate the opportunity put a question and make a comment with respect to the comments of the member for Red Deer as the official spokesperson for the Reform Party.

Certainly I share the deep concern that has been raised, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to this issue. In fact earlier during question period I spoke myself—

[*Translation*]

I pointed out that Sunday night's agreement between an illegitimate president, a straw man, Mr. Jonassaint, and Mr. Carter, an agreement made without consulting President Aristide or the United Nations, was in fact a tragic betrayal of the Haitian people.

[*English*]

I pointed out as well that President Carter just last week referred to General Cedras and his armed thugs as conducting a reign of terror, executing children, raping women, killing priests. As the dictators have grown more desperate the atrocities have grown ever more brutal.

Certainly many of us are deeply disturbed and angered by this deal which in effect refers to the great honour and integrity of these same people. There is talk of mutual respect. There is talk of a general amnesty, of honourable retirement and appealing to their sense of honour.

I want to ask the member for Red Deer for clarification. As I understand it, the position of his leader, the member for Calgary Southwest, was that Canada should be joining in the military invasion with the United States. In fact the member for Calgary Southwest said, and I quote that member from yesterday: "We can only play this game so long. We do not get our hands dirty at the front end. But we come in after". He suggested we should be going in with the Americans.

I have listened with care to the comments of the member for Red Deer who suggested that we should not be going in at all and

that the OAS was the body that should have accepted responsibility here.

I would like the member for Red Deer to clarify the position of the Reform Party. Who speaks for the Reform Party? Is it the leader of the Reform Party or is it the member for Red Deer?

Finally, I wonder if the member could clarify as well his position with respect to the issue of prevention. Certainly in the context of Rwanda, many of us believe that had the world acted earlier to prevent the genocide that much of the subsequent tragedy could have been averted.

Mr. Mills (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I really welcome the opportunity to answer that question. I would have thought that a member of such senior rank would know not to believe everything he reads in the press.

(1700)

To clarify, it is great that I have that opportunity. What my leader did say in response to the reporter's question was that Canada should have played a role in leadership in the OAS and in the United Nations and that if we were to be involved and entered the country we should be entering with an OAS force, not a U.S. force.

That makes a major difference because going in with the OAS and the United Nations is the big problem that we have. I welcome the opportunity to clarify that and to make very clear that the leader and I are speaking from exactly the same song book.

Regarding the preventive measures, I hope I have made that clear as well. In 1985 when I spent a month visiting Rwanda, the country was not in turmoil. Shortly after that and with the underlying problems, there were many NGOs and many government people warning that there was an impending problem.

It was at that point that we had to get in there and negotiate a settlement between those two tribes. When it comes to prevention, that is how one prevents those kinds of things, not waiting until they start killing each other because emotions take over as they did in Yugoslavia and as they do anywhere in the world when one has a problem like that.

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I would note that until 1992 the previous government was providing substantial government to government aid to the brutal regime in Rwanda. We allowed into Quebec City as a visiting professor one of the people who had been most vigorous in his incitement of genocide when he was living in Rwanda.

Government Orders

Mr. Flis: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We do need clarification. My interpretation of the standing orders is that when we divide a 20-minute period into 10 and 10, it is 10 minutes plus 5 minutes for comments and questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry. We have not yet started to divide our time. We will be dividing it after the defence minister's speech. Questions and comment for 10 minutes for the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Robinson: Nice try, Jesse. Madam Speaker, the member for Red Deer in his comments did not make any reference to the situation of Canadian peacekeepers in Bosnia. Obviously this is one of the important elements that the House is addressing.

I personally had the opportunity to visit our troops in Gradacac in Croatia. Certainly the men and women there were doing a very fine job under very difficult circumstances.

Could the hon. member for Red Deer clarify what his position and the position of the Reform Party is with respect to the role of Canadian peacekeepers in Bosnia and in Croatia? The hon. member is doubtless aware of the recent concerns.

Just today there was a report that some 750,000 Muslims and Croats have fled from Serbian held areas of northern and eastern Bosnia over the past two and a half years. According to the representative of the United Nations, hundreds of thousands of them are victims of ethnic cleansing.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but the hon. member for Red Deer has 30 seconds left in his questions and comments. Would you like him to respond to your question?

Mr. Robinson: Madam Speaker, I await with great interest the response to the question.

Mr. Mills (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, some of the money that is being sent out there is a major concern. We have to tidy up the whole CIDA program, that whole area. In answer to the very first question, that would be my answer. Yes, we have to improve on that.

Second, in terms of Bosnia and Yugoslavia, the hon. member for Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt will be speaking on the subject of divided countries. The hon. member will hear the answer. He will have to wait.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I would like to remind hon. members that the government has decided to divide its time with 10 minutes each. There will be 5 minutes for questions and comments after each speaker.

Government Orders

Hon. David Michael Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Madam Speaker, I will take 10 minutes. I will be succinct.

(1705)

I had some comments planned but I am absolutely shocked at what I have been hearing this afternoon, the cynicism of the member for Red Deer who just spoke on behalf of the Reform Party dealing with our engagement in Rwanda and Haiti. I understand my colleague, the Secretary of State for Latin America and Africa, will deal with that in her speech following me.

However I am even more shocked at the belligerent tone of the Leader of the Opposition both in question period and this afternoon in what had been until now really rational and well ordered debate. His belligerent criticism of what happened on the weekend, the agreement that former President Jimmy Carter ironed out in Port au Prince, is beyond belief. His shooting from the hip is incredible. If he conducts the affairs of his party that way then I do not know what the rest of this parliamentary session is going to be in for.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition should have reflected and been a bit more statesmanlike. He perhaps would have found that the deal that was made on the weekend had to be explained to all the parties and indeed has been explained. Shortly after three o'clock this afternoon, President Aristide issued a statement in Washington. I quote: "In the past three days something has happened in Haiti to uphold democracy which was the result of President Clinton's decision for the commitment to lead a multinational effort in carrying out the will of the United Nations to help restore democracy in Haiti".

He has thanked the United States for its military intervention to restore him to power. He said he will be back within 24 days. He also said that to help foster the environment of civil liberties and political stability he has asked his minister of defence, General Jean Beliotte, to head a transition team and recommend the next steps to be taken in order to ensure the quick restoration of constitutional order.

To listen to the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon one would have thought that he did not want President Carter to avert the disaster that would have occurred with a military invasion. I think the statement that President Aristide has just issued should calm everyone and help bring some rationality to the debate. President Aristide declared this afternoon that he will be back within 24 days. After he is restored to power, as we have said publicly on a number of occasions, we will take part in any effort to help reconstruct Haiti, certainly using the Canadian Armed Forces.

I will not give any details on what we will actually be doing because we will be part of an international reconnaissance team.

In fact a Canadian colonel will be leading as chief of staff that team in the days immediately following President Aristide's return and stability being established there to determine what requirements will be necessary of a UN peacekeeping engagement. Canada will be happy to take part in helping with the reconstruction of Haiti wearing blue berets.

I want to talk for a few minutes, since we have not got much time and have divided our time on this side, about the changing nature of peacekeeping in the world. We are seeing that the peacekeeping that was enunciated by former Prime Minister Pearson and the peacekeeping tradition that was established in the post Second World War era has drastically changed over the last number of years. We are facing situations around the world which are vastly more complex. They require a multiplicity of responses. In some cases, as we have seen in Bosnia and Croatia, the circumstances are incredibly dangerous.

In the past five years international operations have involved three or four different types of peacekeeping arrangements: humanitarian work in Ethiopia, Somalia and Bosnia. Let us not forget that our troops have been in Bosnia as a humanitarian effort under the auspices of the United Nations to bring relief and supplies. I think our men and women have done a remarkable job in the last two years in bringing that kind of humanitarian relief to Bosnia. They are still there as we debate this issue today.

We have been involved in demining and reconstruction in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Kuwait, Iraq and Haiti. We have been involved in nation building. We have been involved in embargo enforcement such as in the Persian gulf, the Adriatic and the waters off Haiti, and we have been involved in confidence building through arms control and verification.

(1710)

When we talk about peacekeeping we do not just talk about the strict conflict resolution and patrolling the line as we did in Cyprus for many, many years in a very civilized fashion. We use the word peacekeeping in a much wider context. For Canada to take part in the world governance through the United Nations requires a multifaceted capability on the part of our armed forces to try to discharge the missions that come forward.

One of the points I want to raise today is that there is an ongoing commitment of the armed forces. We have about 3,400 people actually deployed, not counting what we perhaps send to Haiti and which we can discuss in the next few weeks. With a whole group of people waiting to go, a whole group of people just coming back, and those who are being deployed at the moment, we are getting somewhat stretched. We have about 10,000 peacekeepers involved in this kind of rotation. One of the concerns the government has at the moment is how much of our resources should we continue to devote to these peacekeeping missions.

Government Orders

In particular I want to talk about the commitment concerning Yugoslavia, Croatia and Bosnia.

[*Translation*]

I will outline our contribution to the United Nations force deployed in the former Yugoslavia, which is our main commitment at present. The mandate of the UNPROFOR expires on September 30 this year, and will likely be extended.

Canada's commitment towards the force also ends on September 30, and it has not yet been decided whether to extend it.

[*English*]

In other words, we have not made the decision in fact to let the members of the House know. We do have about 1,500 to 1,600 personnel ready to go to Croatia and Bosnia starting in the early part of October, which is only about 10 or 15 days away. These are the Royal Canadian Regiment that will be going to Croatia and the Royal Canadian Dragoons that will be going to Bosnia. They have both been training in the last little while at CFB Petawawa.

This training is worth noting as more and more, because of the engagements that we are taking on, we are having to deploy reservists. This summer I spoke at a function in St. Thomas, Ontario, one of the constituency functions of my colleague, the member for Elgin. I was really quite touched by the fact that the members of the Elgin Regiment, a reserve regiment, will be offering nine people for this next engagement as part of the Royal Canadian Regiment to go to Bosnia and Croatia.

We may well ask why is he saying that they are ready to go? What is this debate all about? We want to know before we actually send our people that the members of the House of Commons are comfortable with a continuation of this arrangement. The purpose of the debate is to get the views of the men and women in the House who have been talking with their constituents over the summer to see if we should continue this engagement, how long, should we pull back a battalion or should we cut it in half? We have 750 people in Croatia and 750 people in Bosnia. The balance is near Split as a supply unit. We want to know whether or not we should continue that operation for the next engagement. As I said earlier, the engagement ends September 30.

While no decision has been taken, the government is very cognizant of the depletion of our resources. We are cognizant of the fact that the armed forces budget is under pressure. We are trying to find other, more effective, cheaper ways of discharging our duties in terms of peacekeeping. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs said, this government remains totally and absolutely committed to the concept of peacekeeping, of Canada playing a role as a bridge between other nations, whether it be at the sharp end, as we see it in Bosnia and Croatia, or whether we see it in terms of reconstruction as we have seen it in Rwanda and as we may see it in Haiti. The Canadian Armed Forces has the most

enviable reputation. When the Prime Minister was in Bosnia this summer the Prime Minister of Bosnia said we have outstanding troops and he wanted us to stay and be part of the effort to help bring peace to the area.

(1715)

We had the Serbian leader, General Karadzic, who said the same when we were faced with the problem of how we would relieve our forces in Srebrenica.

We have the best armed forces in the world. They have suffered as a result of some of the deployments. We have lost 10 people in the former Yugoslavia. We have about 50 wounded but those men and women are prepared to continue to discharge any obligations that the government will seek to discharge and those obligations will be determined by consultation with members of the House of Commons and that is why we are very interested in having the views of the members today.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the minister's comments and I too travelled to the former Yugoslavia and found there that our troops indeed are doing a magnificent job under extremely difficult circumstances and we should all be very proud.

As the minister mentioned, peacekeeping is not the only issue that the Canadian Armed Forces has to deal with and because the resources are very thin and we are downsizing the Canadian Armed Forces we have to look at the possibility of internal conflicts here on our shores in Canada.

You might say that Canada never has to worry about things like that but even in my own riding of Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt this summer we had a forest fire in that region and had to call out the Canadian troops and we had people from Calgary come in and do a job there. That was a very small contingent and just a small example.

We do not have to go back too far. We had a situation in Oka where we had great demands put on the situation there as well.

How can the minister or the ministry deal with ensuring that we keep our role in the world as a peacekeeper but also ensure that we have enough resources to ensure we have the people here to do the job as well?

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, that is a very good question. I thought I did address it although I am not used to having to speak in 10-minute periods. Perhaps I did not have the time to enunciate it.

More and more we discharge our obligations whether it be peacekeeping or whether in aid to the civil power, domestic crises such as the ones we saw this year. We helped in the search for a young Saskatchewan girl. We helped with the forest fires in B.C. We helped last winter with the floods in Quebec. We are going to have to turn more and more to reservists, those men and

Government Orders

women who train part time, on the weekends, the unsung heroes of the Canadian military tradition.

It costs money and to continue to do this we have to reorder our priorities, reshape our budgetary priorities.

I want to assure the hon. member that we will not be so stretched that we will not be able to discharge those very emergencies of which he speaks. That is why I have raised the subject of our future continued engagement in Bosnia and Croatia. We are getting not to the breaking point but to the stretching point. If we are to continue the multiplicity of peacekeeping engagements, and they have been coming fast and furious, we are now talking about the possibilities of Haiti and we have been in Rwanda, which was unforeseen certainly when I became minister, obviously we are going to have to redirect more and more of our budget to this. This could mean that we will have to take it from other very deserving components of the military budget.

I want to assure the member that when we have disasters such as the ones of which he spoke a little earlier we will be there. We will not let the Canadian people down.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer): Madam Speaker, I guess what I am concerned about is that there are so many areas that are going to erupt and I do not see us developing any criteria as to what our guidelines are going to be in the future.

(1720)

We are getting more and more letters telling us about the quality of our equipment. More and more letters are coming back home saying our equipment is not adequate. Could the hon. minister respond to that, please?

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, we would not send people outside of the country to do this work if the equipment were not good. I can assure you and all Canadians the equipment is good.

However, we do have some needs to replace various components of armed forces equipment. Those questions will be addressed in the context of the defence review. I know one of the points that the hon. member made for which he should be commended is he is trying to put our peacekeeping engagements in some kind of conceptual framework in terms of the priorities.

I do not particularly agree with the conclusions that he drew with respect to Rwanda and Haiti, but the fact is the defence review and the foreign policy review will I hope help set those criteria so that we will be able to answer the hon. member and the UN when it comes knocking on our door for future commitments.

Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa)): Madam Speaker, it is frustrating to hear some of the debate going around the House and have inadequate time to respond today. I was most disturbed by the comments made by the Reform Party with regard to Rwanda and Haiti. For a party

that is supposed to represent the interests of the Canadian people it is no wonder it is plunging in the polls today.

If the Reform Party had looked carefully it would understand from polls that have been done recently moral and ethical considerations are considered by Canadians the way that they would judge priorities in the world. They put Rwanda and Haiti at the top of the list. At the bottom of the list they put self-interest. I am quite appalled that the Reform Party bases its foreign policy on self-interest.

Canada's support to the United Nations and our commitment to peacekeeping remain strong. Our reputation worldwide for balanced and fair diplomacy, humanitarian and determined confidence building initiatives such as peacekeeping and our commitment to global peace and development all give Canada influence much beyond what our economy and population size would suggest is possible.

Canada must not squander the opportunities our reputation presents both for our own good and the good of the world. Canada does not earn this reputation through playing the role of the belligerent, unfortunately necessary as this role might seem to be from time to time. It is peacekeeping, the role so strongly associated with Canada, that earns us our enviable reputation and thus influence in the world.

However important peacekeeping is to Canada's foreign policy and defence policy, it is costly. We must continue in our role as peacekeepers but constantly look at less costly alternatives such as early warning systems, conflict prevention, management and resolution.

Granted, important initiatives are already being taken in this area by Canada and others around the world, thereby warding off the crises the public never hears about.

The government will continue to follow up good ideas and recommendations with diplomatic initiatives. An example of Canada's initiatives in this area of policy is our decision to send Bernard Dussault to consult in and around Rwanda not only to find appropriate and timely solutions to the crisis situation in Rwanda but also to address the political difficulties in Burundi, Zaire and the refugee problems in other countries in the region.

In the development of our strategy for Haiti Canada has been fully conscious of the need for a long term strategy to not only return democracy to Haiti through peacekeeping but to build and strengthen the institutions needed to support and sustain it in the long run.

I would wish that all members in this House had been able to accompany me to visit President Aristide in Washington last week to see the very warm reception that he gave to our Minister of Foreign Affairs and his effusive thanks for the leadership role that Canada has taken on the issue of Haiti and his return to Haiti to head a democratically elected government there which he represents.

Our role fits into a broad historic approach that Canada has taken to peacekeeping and emphasizes the contribution to be made to that category of international peace operations that the Secretary General of the United Nations has characterized as peace building.

(1725)

Once President Jean-Bertrand Aristide is returned to power in Haiti, under the terms of Governors Island agreement and UN resolution 940, Canada will participate in the United Nations mission in Haiti, UNMIH, by providing up to 600 military and 100 police personnel. Canada will assume a particular responsibility in police training and supervision.

Altogether UNMIH will assume the task of maintaining a secure environment which will provide the necessary foundation upon which to begin efforts aimed at establishing a durable and lasting democratic system in Haiti.

These are daunting objectives that will require a long term commitment. It is important to remember that we will remain in Haiti for the long haul. Establishing the foundations of a civil society in a country whose population has been numbed by years of desperate poverty, brutal violence and repression is an enormous challenge.

We have to build from the bottom up by providing assistance with basic education and literacy training, agriculture and health care and by creating employment opportunities that will put in motion the wheels of a healthy economy. The success of these initiatives is only possible when the political environment is secure and stable.

Our aid program has and will continue to reinforce these objectives through the provision of assistance to the development of civil society and good governance, including the respect for human rights in Haiti.

Our contribution to Rwanda has also been significant, initiated well before the conflict escalated in April. Canada provided the chief military observer to the first UN mission on the Uganda-Rwanda border. We fully supported the Arusha peace agreement providing for power sharing and integration of the armed forces.

The force commander for the UN mission assigned to oversee the implementation of this agreement was our Canadian hero Major General Romeo Dallaire. Through a coherent strategy formulated by the Departments of Foreign Affairs, Defence and the Canadian International Development Agency, Canada has also made a significant contribution to the peacekeeping and humanitarian relief effort in Rwanda through the provision of medical experts, engineers and the ongoing airborne delivery of essential supplies. Assistance from multilateral and non-gov-

Government Orders

ernmental aid organizations working on the ground has been invaluable.

In taking these initiatives to establish lasting peace and stability in Rwanda Canada is clearly focused on the task. Rwanda must have an acceptable, broad based government in power. It badly needs a functioning infrastructure, basic services such as water and electricity. The thousands of displaced refugees must return to their homes as soon as possible. These are all objectives of our peacekeeping mission in Rwanda.

Given the difficult circumstances peacekeepers have played an indisputably critical role under the steady and courageous leadership of Major General Romeo Dallaire and now Major General Tousignant. Peacekeeping must be broadened by committed political activities that do more than keep the warring factions apart. We must be proactive to build the institutional pillars of a peaceful and secure society and to assist Rwandan citizens to experience their fullest human capacities.

In our debate today we have to address the important issues of our extended peacekeeping role throughout the world in light of limited resources for peacekeeping. I am attempting to convey that despite our limited capacity to continue to respond to every crisis in the world Canada can continue to have an effective voice through concerted efforts to not only prevent conflict from erupting but in maintaining our commitment to fragile states once the peacekeeping phase is over. Peace building and conflict prevention are much less costly than war and crisis responses.

I cannot finish these remarks without a particular acknowledgement of the basic component of our peacekeeping effort, our peacekeepers, our Canadian Blue Berets. Canada would not have the enviable reputation for peacekeeping it has were it not for the professionalism, skill and discipline of our peacekeepers. Canada cannot take part in peacekeeping without our soldiers having the best training and adequate equipment and material support meeting the best standards for the protection of our soldiers and assuring that they have all the necessary tools to succeed in the task.

We must be grateful, as I am, for the women and men who volunteer to serve Canada as part of our important peacekeeping missions; grateful to them and their families for their sacrifice in helping to bring about global peace and security, to bring dignity and freedom to innocent men, women and children, the victims of conflict.

(1730)

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): It being 5.30 p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business as listed on today's Order Paper. The question and comment period of the secretary of state will have to take

Private Members' Business

place at 6.30 p.m. when we resume after Private Members' Business.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby—Kingsway): moved that Bill C-215, an act to amend the Criminal Code (aiding suicide), be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Madam Speaker, in the spring of 1991 a strong and healthy young woman from Sidney, British Columbia, Sue Rodriguez, received the devastating news from her doctor that she had amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, or Lou Gehrig's disease.

The following year in October 1992 Sue Rodriguez, whose condition had deteriorated rapidly in the interim, posed the following question to a committee of this House, a committee at which I was present: "I want to ask you gentlemen if I cannot give consent to my own death, then whose body is this? Who owns my life?"

With these eloquent words Sue Rodriguez embarked upon a journey that was followed by an entire country that led her to the Supreme Court of Canada in her quest for a change in the criminal law, unchanged since 1892, to allow death with dignity, to legalize physician assisted suicide.

Sue's objective is one shared by hundreds of thousands of Canadians who have personally witnessed or experienced the suffering, pain and indignity of the final stages of terminal illness or an incurable disease. Her struggle is supported by over 75 per cent of the Canadian population in public opinion surveys.

While ultimately the Supreme Court of Canada narrowly turned down Sue's appeal in a five to four decision, for many of us it was the powerful words of dissenting Judge Peter Cory that resonated, that were most persuasive: "State prohibitions that would force a dreadful, painful death on a rational but incapacitated, terminally ill patient are an affront to human dignity".

With this decision of the Supreme Court of Canada almost a year ago today, on September 30, 1993, elected members of the House can no longer avoid taking a stand on this complex and profoundly important question. In the spring of 1993 a motion by my former colleague, the member for Port Moody—Coquitlam, to undertake a study of this issue, merely to examine the issue from all perspectives, was overwhelmingly defeated with those opposed, arguing that the House should wait until the court had ruled.

The highest court in the land has now ruled. Indeed, if there was any unanimity among those judges and the judges of the B.C. Court of Appeal below, it was that it is now up to the House, to the elected representatives of the people of Canada, to take a stand on this issue.

In the week following the death of Sue Rodriguez in February 1994 the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice both promised that there would be a free vote in the House. I very much hope that free vote will take place early in the new year, certainly at the very latest by June 1995.

[Translation]

I would also like to point out that several members have already carried out consultations and held meetings with their constituents. By the way, the hon. member for Ahuntsic was just appointed the official Bloc Quebecois spokesperson on this matter and I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his personal involvement and his leadership on this important issue. He consulted his constituents, carried out several other consultations and is committed, I know, to scrutinizing this issue of tremendous importance.

(1735)

[English]

The leader of the Reform Party, the member for Calgary Southwest, has already taken a position on the issue. Despite his own personal views the member for Calgary Southwest has stated that he and four of his colleagues from Calgary will be voting for physician assisted suicide, even though they personally oppose it. I will quote the member from Calgary Southwest: "If a government bill were presented to Parliament tomorrow permitting physician assisted suicide under the conditions specified, the participating members of Parliament would vote for it in accordance with the expression of their constituents".

Those were the words on April 22 of the leader of the Reform Party speaking for himself and on behalf of four of his colleagues from Calgary. He conducted a survey in his own constituency. He found that 82 per cent of his constituents support doctor assisted suicide, 16 per cent were opposed and 2 per cent were undecided.

I understand that many of his colleagues from the Reform Party have similarly conducted surveys. The results are similar in their constituencies as well. I trust they will be taking the same position.

There has been considerable opposition in some quarters to this private member's bill. There are those who believe for personal religious reasons, for example, that it is unethical or immoral for anyone other than their God to end life. The Catholic Church has stated in its declaration on euthanasia: "Suffering during the last moments of life has a special place in God's saving plan".

Private Members' Business

No one is asking those who share that religious view to take any actions whatsoever that fly in the face of that religious belief, whether they be a medical practitioner or whether they be an individual who is contemplating the end of their own life.

I would argue that a law which imposes that personal religious philosophy on an entire nation is one which is both cruel and inhuman. I would argue that surely the time has come in this country to break the silence, to end the hypocrisy in this area. We know that every day from coast to coast in Canada doctors are illegally, without safeguards, helping people to end their lives at their request.

Here is an example. Dr. Ted Boadway, a doctor of the Ontario Medical Association, said at a recent Canadian Medical Association convention: "Doctors are doing it entirely underground and entirely unrecognized in great fear and anxiety".

Surely the time has come to bring the law into line with medical reality and with humanity.

Another very important study was a study that was published recently by a British Columbia social worker, Mr. Russel Ogden. Mr. Ogden conducted a study of the deaths of a number of people who died of AIDS and HIV disease.

In that study he demonstrated that between 10 per cent and 20 per cent of all people in British Columbia—at the very least—who were dying of AIDS died of suicide. In some cases the attempts were terribly botched. This caused profound pain and agony, not only to the individuals but to their friends, families and loved ones.

The Senate committee is studying this issue and will be reporting in the middle of December. I salute the leadership of Senator Joan Neiman on this issue. In its brief to the Senate committee, the Persons with AIDS Society of British Columbia said:

People with HIV disease who are choosing assisted death as a medical option are being forced, as a result of current legislation, to seek back street euthanasia. The access to medications for assisted death is limited to those who have underground connections. Those who have no such access have had to resort to violent methods of euthanasia, such as heroine overdoses, razor blades, guns and plastic bags for suffocation.

No one should have to die that way.

(1740)

A former nurse wrote to me recently: "The medical profession needs to be in the front line of openly helping people make these decisions and ensuring that it is safely done with as much dignity as possible so that people are not forced into the back alleys to secure drugs or denied the comfort of family and friends when they decide their time has come".

There are a number of possible models for new legislation. I am not suggesting that my bill is by any means the final word. It is not. It is certainly open to improvement, to amendment and to strengthening. I welcome the opportunity for that legislative process hopefully early in the new year.

I would commend to members of the House an article in the July 14, 1994 issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine* by some of the most distinguished doctors in America who set out a very carefully crafted proposal with appropriate safeguards for a new law in this area as one of the potential models.

I also want to take this opportunity to respond to a concern that some people have raised with respect to the issue of palliative care, of hospice care because there are those who say if only people would have proper palliative care there would be no need for physician assisted suicide or euthanasia. I want to be very clear. I believe very strongly and very deeply that there should be far more resources for palliative care in Canada. I pay tribute to the work that these dedicated health care professionals in the field of palliative care and hospice care are doing. We need more education in pain management. We need far more support for palliative care in the country.

However, at the end of the day, as even palliative care doctors themselves will tell you, there is some suffering, there is some indignity and there is some pain that no amount of palliative care can effectively respond to. Even the Canadian Palliative Care Association has recognized that some 16 per cent of patients cannot have all their symptoms controlled. It suggests that in some circumstances, from its brief to Senate: "The patient can be drugged to a degree which does not permit meaningful interaction with the family". There are some people who do not wish to live or die in those circumstances.

As well, Dr. Scott Wallace in his brief to the Senate committee has pointed out that the process of dying can involve some of the most miserable and distressing sensations known to man such as jaundice with intolerable itching, insomnia, hallucinations, constant unrelievable hiccups, the inability to swallow, paralysis of muscle groups requiring the insertion of multiple tubes, intense nausea and vomiting, incontinence of faeces and urine, just to name a few. Not all of these can be controlled or regulated by even the finest palliative care. The wracking pain of bone cancer cannot in all cases be responded to by palliative care.

Yes we must do far more in the realm of palliative care but at the end of the day I would argue in those hopefully very rare circumstances in which palliative care is not appropriate and with the necessary safeguards the option must surely remain to an individual to put an end to that suffering, that pain and that indignity.

Private Members' Business

One of the tragic ironies is that in many cases people who are terminally ill would be able to live longer if they knew that at the point at which they wished to end their suffering they would be able to call upon the assistance of a doctor to do so. Tragically there are people whose lives are ending earlier and who are taking their own lives earlier because they are afraid they may suffer needless despair.

I believe that the most powerful arguments for changes in the law to permit physician assisted suicide and euthanasia, to permit death with dignity, come from people who have themselves experienced the terrible suffering and death in their own families or who are suffering themselves.

In the time remaining to me I want to share just a few of those perspectives. I have received over 1,000 letters from every province and territory in Canada, profoundly moving letters from people who have lost loved ones, who have seen the suffering, who have seen the anguish and who are themselves suffering and are begging this Parliament to change the law.

(1745)

The letters include one from Dennis Kaye, who is living himself with ALS and is the author of the book *Laugh, I thought I'd Die: My Life With ALS*. He said:

The will to live cannot be measured, metered, or for that matter, legislated by others, least of all by those whose frailties have never been tested. So when the bystanders fall silent and you move to cast your vote, base your decision on the testimony of those most directly affected. I implore you, resist the temptation to make this debate into something it is not. It is not about Henry Morgentaler or blood stained fetuses, it is not about Adolf Hitler or the extermination of society's most vulnerable. Neither is it about palliative expertise, medical ethics or murder. Most importantly, it is not about euthanasia. It is about suicide, the taking of one's own life and whether an individual, imprisoned only by physical limitation, can legally request and receive preparatory assistance in their final endeavour. In the end, suicide may not be an option you or I would exercise, but it must be an option. If I am to live, let it be for something more than a statutory requirement. May rational heads prevail.

[*Translation*]

Let me quote this letter from Mr. Pierre Lussier, son of Doris Lussier, a highly respected comedian and author in Quebec. Here is just a brief excerpt. I will circulate the letter later. "Some politicians, who are barbaric because they do not know any better, would have me believe that the terrifying cry of excruciating pain you gave, while unconscious, on your death bed, when we were away from your room, at the other end of the hallway, was the expression of a clinical state of well-being. Spare me! No, your pain was cruel and unfair."

[*English*]

Erwin Krickhahn who died recently wrote:

Every time someone who is terminally ill or severely disabled commits suicide behind a shroud of secrecy, they are preserving hypocrisy. The terminally ill person who comes after them must then undergo the same gauntlet of loneliness, desperation, guilt and fear, precisely because nothing has changed.

He went on to indicate he would like to be remembered for having made a contribution to the right to die movement in Canada by speaking out in favour of honesty in dying.

Finally, there is a letter from a gentleman in Winlaw, British Columbia, who wrote of the death of his father:

My father died as a human vegetable. When his life was threatened they put him on life support and when he kept ripping out the tubes, they put him in a restraining jacket. He stopped eating and finally died.

No one should have to die that way. I will be circulating to members of this House these and other letters I have received. I beg them to read them and to reflect upon them.

In closing let me pay tribute to the many groups and individuals who have dedicated their energy and their commitment to this struggle: the Right To Die Society and John Hofess, Dying With Dignity, Marilyn Séguin, other societies like Goodbye, the Seaton Royal Commission, people like Rochelle Pittman and the others to whom I have referred today.

Most of all, I want to take the opportunity of this debate to thank and pay tribute to my late friend, Sue Rodriguez, for the courage, the dignity, the strength and the eloquence with which she devoted her final days to the struggle for death with dignity. In her final public words Sue Rodriguez said: "I hope that my efforts will not have been in vain and that the Minister of Justice will introduce legislation into Parliament soon so that terminally ill people will have another option available, thereby permitting physician assisted suicide for the terminally ill".

I deeply hope Parliament will respond positively to this very powerful plea and that it will respond very soon indeed.

Mr. Dan McTeague (Ontario): Madam Speaker, it gives me a great sense of privilege today to be able to speak on this very important and very controversial proposal put forward by the member for Burnaby—Kingsway.

As a new member of Parliament with a fresh mandate, and as a member of Parliament for one of the most populous ridings in the country, it is interesting that this Parliament is prepared to consider the issue of euthanasia, given the fact it had considered the issue not two years ago and had dispensed with it.

This is an important issue which strikes to the heart of the idea of what we believe the state should be doing in the lives of ordinary individuals. Euthanasia very clearly, categorically and unequivocally rather than allowing people to die naturally makes them die and that is a travesty. I believe that is a wrong.

(1750)

Death on demand has no place for consideration in Parliament. If Parliament wants to consider this issue then it can do so through a royal commission since Parliament has already considered this matter.

Despite the sincerity and emotion for which this issue has been put forward by the member proposing the bill I do not believe we should put on the state the right, indeed the obligation to put people to death. That leaves blood on the hands of the state.

It is almost Orwellian if taken to its logical conclusion as we have seen for example in Holland. A commission there discovered quite recently that 1,030 people were put to death involuntarily. These people did not make a request to die. They did not ask to die and the state put them to sleep.

We also face a problem which was revealed in the very long and exhaustive deliberations this very same House undertook some months ago about the impact of definitions. We all know too well from the various debates on the abortion issue what happens when terminology and definitions are left in the hands of the judiciary. In many respects definitions, ideas and terminology are the playthings, if I could put it that way, of those who interpret definitions.

Let me give some examples: death being imminent, therapeutically useless, informed consent, incurably ill, security of the person. All these issues, all these ideas and all these statements may have some impact in trying to find what is just and equitable. However it may also mean we are on the slippery slope of something far more pernicious than the intention of the bill. Euthanasia is the state actively participating in the death of individuals.

The hon. member discussed the importance of palliative care. I know many people who are involved in this area. I think all of us in the House have been deeply moved by the commitment those people attach to that very noble end. Death by natural causes is presumably what we are looking for. My impression of the issue is not based simply on the recognition of what they do, but let us talk to some people in the field.

[Translation]

Dr. John Scott, who heads one of the largest palliative care centres in Canada, namely the Elisabeth—Bruyère Centre here in Ottawa, spoke eloquently of life's fragility and the need to offer compassionate palliative care. He said:

There is an urgent need to look into the unrelieved suffering recorded in Canada through a palliative care strategy including a major awareness campaign, research and bedside services. Death-related fear and pain can and must be alleviated in Canada.

Private Members' Business

When we witness suffering, we also hear complaints. When death is at our door, we raise our hands in horror and sometimes we even call for death, but we must resist the temptation to kill. We must not remain insensitive to the will to live trying to make itself heard above all the moaning. Neither the physician nor the legislator must be so presumptuous as to respond to the complaints by silencing forever the complainer.

Canada must choose between the trend seen in the United Kingdom and the path chosen by the Netherlands—which I just explained. The United Kingdom was one of the first countries to open hospices and offer palliative care; it is also recognized throughout the world for its humanitarian care and symptom relief. The Netherlands did not succeed in developing hospice care programs and is therefore known for the poor quality of its palliative care and symptom relief. In desperation, they turned to euthanasia as a function and easy solution to relieve suffering."

(1755)

[English]

We will hear much about the fact that many people support the right of a terminally ill patient to die, but I ask the House: What if that right becomes an obligation? I ask the House more emphatically: What if the potential for corruption is there by impatient heirs who want to see that person dead? Handicapped individuals, people in wheelchairs, people who are not genetically perfect according to some, people suffering from Alzheimer's.

This is more than a tempest in a teapot. We are opening more than a Pandora's box. We are indeed deciding as a state who should live and who should die. The member from Ontario riding believes that is wrong. I will vote against any legislation which comes before the House which promotes that kind of insidious proposal.

[Translation]

Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to speak given to me by the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. I, of course, respect his position but, as a member of Parliament elected in the 1990s, I have an obligation to represent the future and not the past.

[English]

I represent all Canadians. I represent them until they die naturally.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Daviault (Ahuntsic): Madam Speaker, as the Bloc Québécois and official opposition critic on this issue, never have I felt the weight of my responsibility as a legislator as I do now with this bill on aiding suicide. The ten minutes allocated to discuss this issue are totally insufficient.

Last April, I held a discussion on this bill with my constituents. This public forum allowed us to discuss the issue from the wider perspective of euthanasia. Several questions were raised regarding the definition of terms such as "palliative care", "living will", "aggressive therapy versus cessation of treatment" and "assisted suicide".

Private Members' Business

The answers to these questions were found to be difficult, if not unsatisfactory. Some participants defended the right of a person to die in dignity, while others challenged the right to choose to die. All essentially feared a lack of control over their destiny when death becomes imminent.

First, what is euthanasia? Allow me to give a definition among many others. Euthanasia now refers to the responsibility of a health professional or a close family member as it relates to the death of a sick or handicapped person. In that context, and according to the *Encyclopédie Universalis*, it includes the commission or the omission of an act which deliberately provokes the death of a patient in order to put an end to a life of suffering.

Given the progress in medical sciences, we, legislators, cannot avoid dealing with this new social reality. The point is not to make suicide commonplace, since respect for life is one of the fundamental values of our society. However, science is increasingly changing our lives as it intervenes with new treatments, drugs and technologies, when we are born and towards the end of our lives.

Furthermore, this House is about to examine the issue of genetic engineering and cloning, the Parliament of Canada had set several debates on the issue of abortion, and a royal commission of inquiry has looked into reproduction technologies.

We also have a responsibility to protect the right of any person to die with dignity. In our society which is based on the rule of law, the right of patients to make their own decisions like anyone else is also a fundamental value. We must also look at the difference between the right of patients to choose the moment of their death and the right to refuse aggressive treatment, something everyone is afraid of.

We must look at all sides of this issue. We must discuss it from a moral, medical and legal perspective. That being said, the bill should not be used either to make helping someone to die commonplace. I am referring here to the potential for abuse by certain physicians or members of the family.

We should also define the meaning of informed consent. How can one intervene in the case of a person who is legally incompetent? This is a difficult issue, but it cannot be ignored.

(1800)

The cases of Sue Rodriguez and Nancy B. have helped to publicize a situation that is being experienced daily in our society. With respect to aggressive treatment, under common law, an adult who is competent has the right to refuse medical treatment or demand that it be interrupted, irrespective of the ability of the medical profession to provide the treatment, I might add. We are not talking about suicide in this case.

In its judgment handed down in January 1992, in the case of Nancy B., the Quebec Superior Court decided that an adult patient who was legally competent, suffering from an incurable disease and bedridden for life, had the right to ask her physician to take her off the respirator that kept her alive. This case is also about the criminal responsibility of the physician.

After referring to sections 216, 217, 45 and 219 of the Criminal Code, the judge concluded that the physician could not be accused of extreme negligence if he unplugged the respirator at the request of the patient and let the disease take its course. He also made it clear that the physician would not be helping the patient to commit suicide and would not be committing murder, since the death of Nancy B. would be the result of her disease.

So what do we do about people who are no longer able to give their consent but who previously expressed their wishes in what is commonly referred to as a living will? This is a document in which a person requests in advance that if that person should be diagnosed with an incurable disease that would be fatal, no treatment to prolong life will be given. So far, this document has no legal standing.

Would it not be appropriate to recognize the legal value of living wills and to make them more binding, precisely so as to prevent treatment to prolong life?

With respect to assisted suicide, section 241 of the Criminal Code states that every one who counsels a person to commit suicide or aids a person to commit suicide is guilty of an indictable offence, although suicide itself is not a criminal act. It was this section 241 that Mrs. Rodriguez contested in 1992 under section 7 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Mrs. Rodriguez argued that her right to life, liberty and her security of the person, which in her view included the right to control the time and manner of her death, were denied her by section 241.

The court ruled in a majority of 5 to 4 that although section 241(b) deprived Mrs. Rodriguez of her right under the Charter, this deprivation was justified under the principles of fundamental justice.

Mr. Justice Sopinka, writing for the majority, stated that to allow assisted suicide would undermine the principle of the sacred nature of life and suggest that the state sanctioned suicide. He also added that the fear of possible abuses and the difficulty of formulating guarantees to prevent abuses oblige us to ban assisted suicide. But should we just stand by and force the terminally ill to go through the courts or quietly take matters into their own hands?

I will conclude these comments of a legal nature with a reference to the dissenting opinion of Chief Justice Antonio Lamer in the Sue Rodriguez case. Even though the judge said he feared that decriminalization of assisted suicide might increase the risk that individual with a physical handicap could be manipulated by others, he also said that neither such conjectures

nor the argument that this might be the thin end of the wedge, could justify imposing restrictions on individuals who are not vulnerable and who willingly wish to take their own lives.

Of course we fear abuse, but is it reasonable, at this time, especially if a piece of legislation limits the scope and the modes of intervention of practitioners?

Some professionals oppose palliative care and request to die. Still, they all recognize the limitations of pain killing techniques for some patients terminally ill. All agree that for 1 to 5 per cent of terminally ill patients, extreme cases, pain cannot be adequately controlled. Others put that number much higher.

I would like to quote *La Presse* from this morning which quoted Dr. Rapin:

At the present time, only 40 per cent of the pain suffered by patients during their hospital stay is adequately controlled. Yet, with the recent developments in medicine and health sciences, we could go to 90-95 per cent.

There is no agreement on the numbers.

Is it true that only 5 per cent of patients who need it have access to palliative care?

(1805)

Is it reasonable that patients whose pain cannot be controlled are kept asleep artificially? Because, in extreme cases, that is exactly what palliative care means: induced sleep.

I would like to quote the journal *Palliative Care* which said: [English]

“The prevalence of this situation is controversial and has been invariably estimated at between 5 and 52 per cent. In one study, 52 per cent of terminally ill patients develop otherwise unendurable symptoms as dyspnoea, pain, delirium and vomiting requiring deep sedation for adequate relief”.

[Translation]

A philosopher once said that between duration and consciousness, one must choose the latter.

You are signalling me that I am running out of time, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. Lalonde: You chose consciousness.

Mr. Daviault: According to the specialists I met yesterday in Montreal, at the 10th International Conference on Palliative Care, artificial sleep is closer to euthanasia than to treatment cessation.

It is virtually impossible to suppress pain during the last days in the presence of terminal agitation. I want to congratulate the member for Burnaby—Kingsway for his courage in presenting this bill to the House of Commons. I will add that I would also like a special House committee to review the report of the Senate committee on euthanasia and assisted suicide. This is a very substantive document.

Private Members' Business

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): I am sorry, but the hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Daviault: Madam Speaker, is there unanimous consent to let me go on?

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu): Is there unanimous consent to let the member continue for one minute?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Daviault: Yet, since it is a private member's bill, it is not binding on the government and does not allow for a full-fledged debate on euthanasia, either active or passive. We must have such a debate in order to shed the best possible light on this social issue not only for us law-makers, but also for the population at large.

I take advantage of this opportunity to congratulate the Senate committee headed by Mrs. Neiman for its work. Its report will undoubtedly be useful to elected representatives in their review. In this context, I hope that the government will hold a broader debate on the issue of euthanasia, with the participation of all the parties represented in this House.

To conclude, I would like to say that during my visit to the palliative care unit of the Notre-Dame-de-la-Merci Hospital, which you know, Madam Speaker, I met several health care professionals. I was deeply moved by the work they do. I hope that our debate on this issue will be characterized by the same compassion and respect these people show for the terminally ill.

[English]

Mr. Russell MacLellan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I rise today to comment on Bill C-215, an act to amend the Criminal Code (aiding suicide), which has been introduced in the House by the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway.

Let me preface my remarks by indicating that I commend the hon. member for his efforts in trying to deal with what he perceives as a weakness in the current provisions of the Criminal Code that deal with assisting suicide.

I also want to extend to the hon. member my sympathies upon the loss of a very good friend, Sue Rodriguez. Ms. Rodriguez was a courageous person who worked diligently during an extremely difficult period in her life to bring into public focus the issue surrounding euthanasia, in particular physician assisted suicide.

It is clear that this is a matter of particular concern to our colleague. As members may be aware, this is not the first time he has attempted to bring this issue before the members of the House for discussion and debate.

It is evident as well that there is a growing public interest in issues surrounding the end of life. We must bear in mind, however, that there are many perspectives from which to examine these issues be they medical, legal, social or ethical.

Private Members' Business

In addition, we must remember that these issues are not confined solely to an analysis of physician assisted suicide. They can include a variety of questions which deal with such subjects as palliative care, cessation or withdrawal of treatment and the nature of the patient's consent.

(1810)

These and other related questions will be examined by members of the special Senate Committee on Euthanasia and Assisted Suicide which was appointed on February 23, 1994.

Before I turn to specific provisions contained in Bill C-215, I would like to speak of the work that has been undertaken by this Senate committee. Very briefly, the terms of reference of that special committee provide that it examine and report upon the legal, social and ethical issues relating to euthanasia and assisted suicide with a view to presenting its final report to the Senate no later than December 15, 1994.

Let me move along to the bill itself and give a brief analysis of the particular provisions contained in the bill proposed by the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway. I think this will help to explain what a comprehensive study of this issue must encompass.

Bill C-215 provides that no qualified medical practitioner commits an offence of counselling, aiding or abetting suicide or any other criminal code offence where the practitioner aids a terminally ill person to commit suicide at the request of and with the voluntary consent of that person and with the approval of at least one other practitioner.

While some may think at first blush that this provides concise and sufficient guidelines, I am rather of the view that more work is needed to give Canadians the appropriate legal framework for this kind of decision. Since assisted suicide would remain an indictable offence with a maximum of 14 years imprisonment, the circumstances in which the protection would operate must be clear.

I would suggest that as the term terminally ill is not defined and there is no generally accepted definition, this could very well be problematic.

A further concern arises from another aspect of the proposal before us for consideration in this House this evening. This is set out in Bill C-215. As set out a patient must provide voluntary consent without spelling out what constitutes voluntary consent. One potential difficulty is that there is no requirement that the patient must be competent to consent. I would suggest by way of example that persons suffering from depression may not be competent and still may provide voluntary consent. There are also no provisions in the bill regarding the situation of the incompetent patient.

In oral argument in the Rodriguez case the Supreme Court of Canada asked how the case of the incompetent patient would be dealt with if competent patients were permitted to request assisted suicide.

I should point out to hon. members as well that the bill does not deal specifically with children. They are included through the general language of the bill but there are no provisions on substituted consent in the bill. Are children who may be able to give valid consent to be permitted to request assisted suicide? If substituted consent is to be provided who may validly give that consent? Are both parents to agree or one parent to give that consent?

We are aware that family and friends of patients are sometimes prevailed upon to assist the patient in dying. As written, Bill C-215 would provide no protection for even the most sympathetic cases of this kind. It would provide protection only to those in the status of physician.

I am not suggesting that this is or is not the manner in which this House may wish to proceed to deal with the issue. It is important to ensure that when we deal with these issues we are cognizant of and discuss all situations where the need to address the question of assisted suicide may arise.

(1815)

It is simple to state that these issues are viewed in varied ways by persons examining them from different perspectives. Lawyers are more likely to address them as acts which must be addressed in terms of current legal definitions and boundaries, whereas physicians are more likely to view these issues as elements of a continuing process of treatment for their patients. In my view, it is important that these issues be examined from all relevant perspectives.

I commend the hon. member for Burnaby—Kingsway for the steps he has taken to see that parliamentarians turn their minds to these questions and these issues, however he recognizes that the proposals contained in Bill C-215 do not address all the questions and concerns which must be addressed in the examination of what, in the broader sense, we refer to as euthanasia.

As I mentioned earlier, the Department of Justice has undertaken a comprehensive study in this area which includes an examination of the intricate legal issues surrounding euthanasia, assisted suicide, palliative care, and cessation of treatment, in order to determine whether any amendments to the Criminal Code are needed.

It would be my recommendation to the members of this House that it would be inappropriate to deal with the amendments proposed in Bill C-215. Rather, it would be more appropriate to gather as much information as possible about the difficult underlying issues and await the completion of the Senate hearings to allow the members of the other house the opportunity to examine the subject in a comprehensive manner.

We have been assured by the Minister of Justice that all parliamentarians will be given the opportunity to consider these issues in a meaningful way. I am confident that in due course we will be presented with the opportunity to do so.

Ms. Roseanne Skoke (Central Nova): Madam Speaker, life begins at the moment of conception and continues until natural death. Respect for the sanctity of life and the dignity of human suffering, together with the recognition of the moral, ethical and spiritual values is well founded in both natural law and Canadian law.

The Criminal Code of Canada forbids aiding, counselling, or assisting suicide. This law does not merely exist to regulate our behaviour. Rather it articulates and symbolizes our values and beliefs as a nation.

In recognition of all the heroic individuals who silently suffer the physical pain and endure the emotional torments of this life from day unto day until natural death, I demand that the existing laws of the Criminal Code respecting assisted suicide be strictly enforced to ensure that our nation's values and moral conscience with respect to life not be fettered, for not to do so will create a greater injustice to mankind than any human pain or suffering could possibly inflict.

Initiatives like the introduction of this private member's bill for assisted suicide or euthanasia, find some support in our culture because of the value that is given to individual freedom and personal autonomy. However, this perspective cannot justify the taking of human life. Historically the protection of human life has long been the fundamental value of our society. The killing of another person, even with that person's consent, is a very public matter. To accept killing as a private matter of individual choice is to diminish respect for human life, dehumanize society, and it is unconscionable.

Writing for the majority in the Supreme Court of Canada Rodriguez case, Mr. Justice Sopinka noted that respect for life is a fundamental principle on which there is substantial consensus in Canadian society. The prohibition against assisted suicide reflects this consensus and is designed to protect the vulnerable who might be persuaded to commit suicide.

To allow physician assisted suicide, Mr. Justice Sopinka observed, would erode the belief in the sanctity of human life and suggest that the state condones suicide. Furthermore, concerns about abuse and the difficulty in establishing safeguards to prevent abuse make it necessary in this country to prohibit assisted suicide.

Private Members' Business

(1820)

What we are talking about here is giving a doctor the right to kill. In the 6th century B.C. the Greek philosopher, Hippocrates, wrote an oath to which physicians have been bound since. It says in part: "I will give no deadly medicine to anyone if asked nor suggest such counsel". Interestingly enough these words are immediately followed by "and in a like manner, I will not give to a woman a pessary to produce abortion".

In modern times this oath has been rewritten as the Declaration of Geneva which says in part: "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life—even under threat, I will not use my knowledge contrary to the laws of nature".

These oaths have existed for 2,500 years. The laws of nature must be upheld and the values of our society must be protected. I conclude with my opening statement. Life begins at the moment of conception and continues until natural death.

Mr. Myron Thompson (Wild Rose): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak for a moment to the particular issue.

Most members know by now what is the policy of the Reform Party when it comes to moral issues. We do our utmost to seek a consensus of our constituents in order to determine how to place our vote. I personally have made an effort at that. I am unable to really come to a consensus, as it seems to be very close to 50:50. It may very well be that when the time comes to vote on such legislation that I will vote my personal belief and my wishes.

Therefore it is important that my constituents know what are those wishes and I would like to express them at this moment. My personal wishes and belief would be totally against this type of legislation. I would oppose it. That belief would be based, probably more than anything, on my upbringing. I have an evangelical background of good, decent parents who taught me from the very beginning that the most precious thing that you can receive from your creator is your life, and that the giver of life is the only one who should have the authority to take it. That belief has stuck with me over the years. I have to say today that I have come to believe that more than ever.

In my years of education I have dealt with a lot of young people. I have seen young people depressed and become very concerned and worried about their attitudes because suicides were taking place far more often than we desired to see as a society. It was on the increase.

Over the last quite a few years it has become a dreadful thing in the eyes of our society: due to family breakdowns, due to family disasters, due to deep depressions for whatever reason and possibly even illnesses. At the time this became known as a problem which we ought to deal with, societies all over asked

Government Orders

churches, schools, social services and other institutions to work together to try to prevent suicide and to do all we could to prevent it.

We engaged in that for years and years. We had special programs, special speakers, special activities and special things in place to try to identify young people in trouble. When one loses one of those young people and is the administrator of that school one has to ask oneself: "Where did we go wrong? What brought that all on?"

(1825)

Then, in the midst of all these things, you receive a call from your brother and sister-in-law and they are broken up because their 19-year old son, my nephew, had decided to destroy his life that very night. We all sit back and say: "Why? What was the reason?" In that particular case we could not identify any reason whatsoever. It very well might have been that my 19-year old nephew discovered through a doctor on his own that he had an illness and maybe this illness was terminal. We do not know.

However, we do not believe for a moment, and I do not believe for a moment, in all cases of suicide that it was a dignified way to die. Dignity is the most misused word when we talk about ending life in that manner.

They say you should not talk until you have been in the shoes of those who have lost loved ones. I watched my Dad suffer for a long time and especially a sister who died at the age of 54 after two long, hard, struggling years with terminal cancer. I watched her go from 140 pounds, healthy, black hair, a beautiful girl, to old, grey, 58 pounds and in deep pain. I heard my sister many times say: "Oh, Lord, let me die. I can't stand it". With certain medication the pain would be reduced and then she would say to us all with a smile: "Don't pay any attention to me when I get that way. At that time I sure felt like it. It was pretty tough, but have faith in me because it really isn't any worse than labour pains".

Where is the lack of dignity? That was the most dignified woman I have ever met in my life, even if she was my sister, and I am proud to say it. Right to the very moment when she closed her eyes and left she had something to offer. Even through her suffering there was a benefit to those of us who loved her the most.

That story is true as well as those who say: "I can't stand it. Why don't they do something?" Do not get my wrong. In the case of my father and my sister, they both said: "Please do not put me on anything that is going to keep me alive longer than I normally would be naturally". We would ask the doctors not to do so. The doctors would very patiently say: "We must do our best to make them comfortable and we can guarantee you that we will bring about lots of relief. They will not suffer from pain but we must warn you that it could possibly hasten the death and that it could make them incoherent at times". That was certainly the

case but I never saw for a moment that either one of them died without dignity. I really think that should never be used.

As politicians we sit and make this kind of decision. I really get nervous about it when 295 people are going to decide about this sort of thing. It bothers me very much because what you are doing is changing the terminology of suicide to something else. It no longer is suicide if it is assisted. Somebody helping you does not make it suicide. Suicide has always been, in my belief, taking your own life. If that is done with any assistance whatsoever I would not want to mention what kind of term might replace that.

If we are the people who are going to make this kind of decision, we should be careful about imposing it on our medical people. I have by good sources been told that the medical association, from the voting level, strongly indicate no support for this position.

(1830)

Instead of being doctor assisted suicide, if such a legislation is passed, it probably should be called politician assisted suicide and maybe the politicians would be the ones to have to administer it.

I believe that we have to be totally accountable for the decisions that we make in here and I do not believe for a moment that I would want to engage in some kind of venture that would make me accountable for something that we could very possibly regret, terribly regret, down the road if it turns into the kinds of experiences that my colleague across the way mentioned in the Holland experience. Some terrible tragedies happened there.

It is my belief and it is a quote that I have heard several times that when people ask to die or to be killed we should throw them a lifeline, not a noose.

In my closing remarks, I would ask that when this particular proposal comes forward you search your souls to the deepest and may your conscience be your guide.

The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Mahu): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 96(1) the order is dropped from the Order Paper.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*Translation*]

PEACEKEEPING

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Mr. Paul Crête (Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup): Madam Speaker, as we resume consideration of this motion, I would like to remind the hon. members of this House that it reads as follows: "That this House take note of Canada's current and future international peacekeeping commitments in the world,

with particular reference to the former Yugoslavia, Haiti and Rwanda”, the current sites of Canadian involvement.

When discussing international commitments, we talk about the country, all of Canada, naturally, but we also talk a lot about the people involved. These include of course the people from the countries where missions are carried out, but for us Canadians and Quebecers, this term refers mostly to our armed forces members sent out on these missions.

In my own riding, we have 17 military who are now back from the former Yugoslavia. It was not all roses for them over there, but they contributed to the peacekeeping effort and I wish to thank them for that. Another 30 soldiers will embark upon training, come January 1995, to prepare for a peacekeeping mission somewhere in the world. These soldiers are reserves, which means that they were not trained specifically for that role originally. I find it important that we take into account the human factors affecting these individuals as we debate this motion.

Canada has a proud tradition of international commitments. I shall spare you the long list of missions. Let it suffice to mention Kashmir, New Guinea, Yemen, the Sinai, Cyprus and, more recently, the former Yugoslavia. We can also expect to be kept very busy in the future, as global changes cause local conflict hot spots to multiply because of unresolved inequities in our societies, our planet, the entire universe, inequities that often result in hostilities erupting between citizens of the same country who are striving to resolve their problems.

I think that the one thing everyone agrees on is the need to have a corps specialized in these kinds of operations. We have learned a lot from trial and error and various experiences over the years. We have the duty now to make sure that our operations are increasingly structured, relevant and striking. Let us try and learn from experience in those places where our forces are currently deployed. I think that we realize from the outset that the situations in the former Yugoslavia, Haiti and Rwanda are very different from one another and will require very special preparation of our soldiers. It is a very big challenge.

(1835)

Barely six months ago, earlier this year, we had a debate here on the appropriateness of the intervention in the former Yugoslavia. I think that what I said then is still timely: “The issue of the security of our troops cannot be dissociated from the transparency and relevance of the mission with which they are entrusted”. If that sentence is applied to Yugoslavia today, we can say that last January we helped to clarify the mission.

But in the field today it is difficult to see what has been gained and what has been lost. The information in the press is very discouraging. The situation drags on and air strikes are threatened to relieve Sarajevo again. We feel that we are watching an old war movie, but it is the sad reality today. The Serbs are still threatening to attack the Bosnian Muslims. Also, the embargo on arms for the Muslims may be lifted.

Government Orders

As almost all of us said in January, the operation in Yugoslavia must go on in order to avoid even worse catastrophes. But on the other hand, when the government decides on extending the presence of troops there, we must ensure that they are not bogged down and make the battle drag on even longer. Ways of intervening must be found that will make it possible to get out of that situation as soon as possible and they are not necessarily very obvious.

The other example that we have before us and in which the transparency and relevance of the mission entrusted to them, of which I spoke before, is less obvious is Haiti. We saw it in question period and we saw it in the type of agreement between Washington and the puppet government in Haiti. We are faced with a situation where we want Canada to participate in an international force, but we do not really know what will come of this agreement because some basic principles are not being respected in the present situation.

An elected president is involuntarily exiled and an agreement is signed with a government that never had any legitimacy. It is said that a compromise is better than nothing, but this compromise must be examined very carefully by Canadian authorities to make sure that we do not favour an unacceptable situation.

If the American forces now landing in Haiti are but mere spectators, and if the unacceptable regime of terror in that country continues to prevail, we will only have helped the negative and unacceptable side of that government. As the Minister of Foreign Affairs said, Canada has always done its best to respect Mr. Aristide's mandate in Haiti. I believe we can still ensure that our interventions help protect the legitimacy of the genuine institutions in that country.

The problem is that the agreement reached by the Americans and Haiti's puppet government looks like a piece of Swiss cheese. The putschists are not required to leave and we do not know when Mr. Aristide can go back to his country, nor if the army chief in place will step aside. The positive aspect of the agreement is that a bloodbath was avoided, while the negative one is that we do not know for sure if democracy will come out a winner.

We must avoid giving credibility to the puppet government. If we allow it to linger on, this could be perceived as a giving it credibility. It is in that context that we must look at Canada's role in Haiti.

(1840)

If we send police officers there, they may do their job with the best of intentions, but if they have no real power, we will have contributed to the deterioration of an already bad situation and we will have killed all hope for Haitian people. Ultimately, we must make sure that these people, who hope for a return of democracy, get a clear message that their hopes can come true and that they can count on the concrete support of the international community.

Government Orders

So, I think that we must ask ourselves if the conditions of Canada's support and participation are adhered to. When we will send the police officers, we must not make the same mistake or the same compromise that the Americans have made. We must ensure that Father Aristide, the president of Haitians, will agree with the sending of these police officers in Haiti, because otherwise, we will endorse the making of agreements with a puppet government without the approval of the elected president of Haiti. That would really put us in an absurd situation. It is as if someone could come to Canada and make an agreement with a non-elected person and say that it could apply to Canada as a whole. I think that we would not tolerate that sort of thing for very long.

There is at least something comforting about that. You can recall, I believe, the commitment that the minister of Foreign Affairs has made in response to a question from the leader of the Opposition. He said that nothing would be done without Father Aristide's approval. I hope that the minister's commitment will be kept and I think that it is important that it be kept so that the situation can be improved and solved appropriately.

The third example of an intervention at the present time is Rwanda and Burundi. Canada has been present in those countries since 1960, when they became independent, and our mission there is very different. In that respect, we must refer mainly to what I would call the legacy of General Dallaire and be able to draw major lessons from it. The human catastrophe that happened there was something the world had not seen since the two world wars. A wave of insanity caused the death of hundreds of human beings and what I call General Dallaire's testament has shown us how much we still have to learn about the ways to intervene in such crises.

In this regard Canada, with its experience, should take the initiative and contribute to improve considerably our different means of intervention, our ability to intervene rapidly and adequately in various situations, in order to prevent crises from becoming totally uncontrollable and intolerable.

There are some lessons to be learned from the three peacekeeping missions in which Canada is presently involved. We could learn about what we could or should do as well as what we should avoid doing.

I believe that the first thing that must be avoided is to get bogged down in a situation. In Yugoslavia, there are times when one must ask if we are not helping to keep the conflict alive rather than bringing it to an end. I think it is important to ask the right questions and to make sure that our interventions do not drag on, in order to bring the conflict to an end as soon as possible.

The second thing that should be avoided is to tolerate unacceptable situations. I talked earlier about Haiti. If our intervention in that country serves only to recognize a puppet government, we will in no way have helped the cause of the Haitian people and they will become even more desperate about their future.

To me, the most important lesson to learn is that we must give a clear mandate to our intervention groups.

(1845)

General Dallaire said it quite clearly and I think it applied in Yugoslavia, it applies in Rwanda and it will apply in Haiti. If the mandate is not clear, if we do not give them definite orders, the armed forces being sent to those countries risk dispersing themselves and marking time instead of properly executing their tasks and reporting accurately on the results of the operation.

Another lesson is we must trust the professionalism of our troops. We have seen a few sad incidents involving Canadians, but why did they happen? Those missions are certainly not easy. There might be human hardship but we cannot tolerate in any way our soldiers getting into circumstances that would tarnish Canada's or Quebec's image or commit acts contrary to human rights or humanitarian standards in general.

To that respect, I think we should make a special effort to ensure that our troops know exactly what they are getting into and that they are prepared accordingly. We must make sure the soldiers being sent abroad are faultless in that regard. I have seen the possibility of right-wing extremists infiltrating our ranks. That danger is always present and we absolutely must succeed in preventing it. We must remove such troublesome elements, and it is important that it be done quickly.

One other lesson we must learn, and on that I am referring to a Senate Committee report entitled "Meeting New Challenges: Canada's Response to a New Generation of Peacekeeping". That report contains various recommendations on peacekeeping interventions, one of which says the following: "The Subcommittee recommends that the Department of National Defence undertake a comprehensive inquiry into the possibility of creating reserve units based on logistics, transportation, communications, and engineering functions, which could be used in peacekeeping, as distinct from wartime actions".

I think this is probably a very good way to use the various reserve groups we have across Canada. It would be a way to deal both with the cost problem and to develop a force that would be more and more involved in peacekeeping missions and perhaps less and less in combat missions. This is probably one of those compromise solutions that would be extremely useful in making a contribution towards bringing peace to the world around us.

Government Orders

We have resources in our various regions. There are military facilities that can be used. These young people in the military reserve have far less experience than professional soldiers, but by giving them the proper training, which would include some historical background if they are sent on a mission to an Islamic country, to Africa, in a situation with which they are not familiar, so that they know what to expect. Whenever we send soldiers on these missions, we must make sure they have received this kind of training.

I think the Senate's recommendations for making greater use of our reserves is very meaningful, and I have every confidence in the quality of these troops. Since I was elected, I have had occasions to meet them in my riding and in Eastern Quebec generally, especially the Fusiliers de Saint-Laurent. I was impressed with the strength of character and discipline of these soldiers. I said to myself that if these soldiers were sent on these missions, they should first be given additional training to ensure they can fulfil the mandate they are given. They have the potential. It just has to be developed and refined.

I would also like to draw your attention to another recommendation by the Senate which I think is very relevant to the situation, and it concerns obtaining clear and detailed statements of the cost of our participation in peacekeeping operations and of the amounts recovered from the UN or other agencies in connection with such activities. The statements could be tabled with the annual Estimates, to help Parliament exercise its right to examine matters of national security.

(1850)

The proposed motion deals only with existing facts. It mentions our interventions in Rwanda, in the former Yugoslavia and in Haiti, but it also considers the future, although we are not given any figure on the cost of such interventions. These financial considerations have a bearing on the resources allocated to defence. One may very well consider that the defence budget is too high, but if we can say that 5, 10 or 15 per cent go to peacekeeping missions, then it gives a different view of things. I believe that Parliament should be informed, as recommended, of the real cost of such activities so we could learn where the money goes. Does it go to training? Is it used mostly to pay for transportation? This would allow us to find out where we are going.

To conclude, I refer you again to the speech I made in January because it is still very much valid today. I will simply repeat that the people of my riding would support the Canadian government's participation in international missions if they were convinced that such interventions are needed, that our troops are adequately prepared and that our diplomatic efforts are effective, because the diplomatic front is also very important.

I will conclude on the situation which, I believe, is the most urgent, the situation in Haiti. The government must take action. Making choices is not easy. We all have a role to play in this situation. However, we must never make official or strengthen a non-elected government which forcibly seized power. This principle bears repeating. We would not tolerate such a situation at home and I believe that we should not tolerate it anywhere else. We may accept a compromise which allowed armed forces to intervene in that country, but this should not be seen as an opportunity to perpetuate the situation. We must see to it that deadlines are not disregarded once again.

Let us remember that last year President Aristide was supposed to go back, but did not. The same thing could happen this year. Should this occur a second time, the international community will lose all credibility. In this respect, it is important for Canada to play a role with Haiti and the Americans in order to reach a long-lasting solution enabling that country—one of the first ones in Central or Southern America to become independent—to regain its *joie de vivre*. In the next few months, we will be judged on how well we succeed in doing that. I believe that the government must make sure that it respects the agreements reached between the UN and Canada on one hand and President Aristide on the other.

[English]

Mr. John Williams (St. Albert): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the member on our peacekeeping role around the world. He did say that we should avoid getting stuck in some particular situations. We should ensure we are not in a situation that is dragged out. He talked also about making sure that our mandate is clear and perhaps we are not always meeting that mandate.

As far as I am aware war and peacekeeping is a difficult and dirty business at times. It is risky business and the lives of Canadians are quite often at risk. I am sure that I speak for many Canadians and our hearts go out to these Canadians who are putting their own lives at risk for the benefit and hopeful improvement in some areas of the world that we have not even thought of until the conflict has arisen.

While the hon. member talked at length about the whys and wherefores of peacekeeping he did not say quite specifically what his opinion is.

(1855)

Is he suggesting that we be in Rwanda and be in Yugoslavia and be in Haiti? Or is he saying that because we might get stuck in there or perhaps it is going to drag out for a long time, these things are kind of a nuisance and therefore we should not get involved at all?

Is he saying that we should be in or is he giving us a long list of reasons why we should just mind our own business and stay home?

Government Orders

[Translation]

Mr. Crête: Mr. Speaker, I think I should go back to some of the arguments I raised earlier that may have been misunderstood. I think that Canada's record shows that we made a major contribution to international peacekeeping missions and that we should maintain and protect the enviable reputation we acquired in this area.

That said, we must also learn from the past, particularly from the last few years' experiences in Rwanda, Yugoslavia and Haiti. I think that every time the international community feels that action must be taken, we must say yes as long as it is done in acceptable circumstances. So the mandate should be as clear as possible, the forces we send should be trained to fulfil this mandate, and we should see to it while we are there that the goals set are achieved so that we can help end the war and restore order.

In response to the hon. member's question, it is quite clear that the problem in Rwanda was not that we were not there. I am not saying that Canada is necessarily more guilty than the rest of the international community. But we did not react quickly enough to the situation. As far as the former Yugoslavia is concerned, I think it is a matter of understanding history. The problem is very hard to understand. There are many players, and it has been going on for a very long time. So there are lessons to be learned from this.

In Haiti, it is more a question of respecting principles and using diplomatic means as much as possible. To the hon. member, I say yes, we must get involved when needed, but in a way that we can guarantee the efficiency of our participation as well as provide protection for our troops.

We must look to the future. In future international missions, will ad hoc interventions be absolutely necessary to settle specific conflicts? Are we not at a stage where we need to provide the UN with an intervention group that would be responsible for dealing with such situations throughout the world? Canada could offer to train members of this international corps. Past deeds speak to the future. Canada's contribution has always been appropriate and much appreciated throughout the world. I think we should continue in this direction and ensure that nothing happens to tempt us to withdraw from such operations. We must continue to ensure that the principles underlying our peacekeeping missions are upheld.

[English]

Mr. Janko Peric (Cambridge): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to speak once again on the future of Canadian

peacekeeping and in particular our role in Bosnia–Hercegovina and Croatia.

While I do have strong personal ties to Croatia I believe that the safety of our Canadian peacekeepers is fundamental to the decision on whether they should remain in Croatia and Bosnia–Hercegovina.

Since the deployment of peacekeeping troops to Croatia and Bosnia–Hercegovina there has been a visible decrease in hostilities in the two countries. However, I would hesitate to call the mission in either of the countries a success by any means. UN peacekeeping forces have failed to fulfil the mandate set out in UN resolutions 743 and 769.

(1900)

To date, displaced persons in Croatia and Bosnia–Hercegovina have not been able to return to their homes. In Croatia alone there are 250,000 displaced persons and over 300,000 Bosnian refugees. Some, like a man named Zvonko from Petrinja, have been looking at their homes for three years but have been unable to return.

In June I had an opportunity to travel to Croatia with my colleagues from Scarborough—Rouge River and Regina—Qu'Appelle. We visited three refugee camps in Osijek, Split and Karlovac where we spoke to many refugees and displaced persons.

Their message was clear. They wished that UN peacekeepers could help them return to their homes. To date, approximately one-third of Croatia remains occupied. There have been no efforts on the part of UNPROFOR to reintegrate those areas into Croatia or to return displaced persons to their homes. Instead, UNPROFOR has established itself as a buffer between Croatia and the occupied areas of Croatia where it is simply maintaining the status quo. That is not its mandate.

If peacekeepers are to remain in Croatia, or for that matter in Bosnia–Hercegovina, they must begin working toward fulfilling their mandate. I have spoken to several officials in the Croatian government regarding their views on this matter.

The Croatian government is grateful for the participation of Canadian peacekeepers in the UNPROFOR mission. They believe that a peaceful settlement to the situation in Croatia can only be achieved with the assistance of the United Nations peacekeepers and, in particular, Canadian peacekeepers. However, if countries like our own begin to pull their peacekeepers out of Croatia, I fear and I have been told that the situation will quickly deteriorate.

While the Croatian government would like UNPROFOR to remain in Croatia, the Croatian foreign minister, Dr. Mate Granic, has stipulated that several conditions should be met.

First, UNPROFOR must assume control of Croatian borders as was spelled out in UN resolution 769 of August 7, 1992.

Second, steps must be taken to demilitarize UNPA zones in the occupied territories of Croatia.

Third, sanctions against Serbia and Montenegro must be enforced to prevent the influx of arms and other supplies to the occupied areas of Croatia.

Fourth, a concrete effort must be made to reintegrate the UNPA zones in Croatia and to return displaced persons and refugees to their homes.

During my visit to Croatia I heard several stories from Croatian residents which made me proud of our Canadian peacekeepers. For instance, the chief fire marshal for the area around Sibenik recalled how helpful Canadian peacekeepers were during severe forest fires in the area and how in their spare time they assisted a local community by ploughing a very uneven dirt road.

I strongly believe that Canadian peacekeepers can play a very important role in Croatia only if UNPROFOR can begin to fulfil its mandate. If it cannot, then we must question whether we can financially afford to keep our peacekeepers there.

I would urge the government to allow Canadian peacekeepers to remain in Croatia. However my desire to see troops remain in Croatia does not mean that I would not support a reduction in the number of peacekeepers stationed there.

With respect to Bosnia–Hercegovina, this weekend we heard news accounts of more ethnic cleansing by Bosnian Serbs, renewed shelling in Sarajevo and of the hostage taking of French peacekeepers.

(1905)

While the situation in Bosnia–Hercegovina is much more dangerous than in Croatia, I am confident that our men and women are making a valuable contribution to the mission.

There is an uneasy peace to keep in Bosnia–Hercegovina. We are needed there. However, if the safety of Canadian peacekeepers becomes an issue, those peacekeepers must be pulled out. In particular, if the arms embargo is lifted, we must assure that the safety of our peacekeepers is first and foremost.

With respect to the situation in Haiti, the decision to relocate Canadian peacekeepers from Croatia and Bosnia–Hercegovina to Haiti is a difficult one. Although I believe there is a role for Canadians to play in Haiti, I do not believe that we should participate in an invasion of any kind. Until that issue is resolved I feel that we should hesitate sending any Canadian troops to Haiti.

In closing, I believe the decision on participation in peacekeeping missions should take into consideration the following questions: Can we afford to participate? Can the lives of our

Government Orders

peacekeepers be adequately protected? Can we really make a difference to the situation at hand? If we answer yes to all of those questions then we must participate.

Mr. Ted McWhinney (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing in our debate the problems that arise from living in an era of transition. It is one great historical period. The old order is apparent but the patterns of the new order are still to emerge.

One of the difficulties in dealing with this issue of peacekeeping is that we are using precedents that were well developed and tested in another era, the era of the cold war. Peacekeeping, as the former Prime Minister then foreign minister Lester Pearson developed it, was a weapon for the cold war era for non-cold war conflicts or at least situations in which the superpowers were not directly engaged.

It was a way of allowing combatants to retreat from a political–military situation where they had exhausted themselves without intolerable loss of face. Therefore the concept of unarmed troops standing as a living barrier between the combatants, who wished to withdraw anyway, was meaningful and capable if exercised to the full. Of course it was.

The Canadian record, and one must add those people who so often served with us, the Poles and the Indians, was based on this particular experience. They essentially involve the peacekeeping chapter six of the United Nations charter although it was not usually referred to under those terms.

The other form of peacekeeping, which is more strictly now called peacemaking, was rarely tried during the cold war because the two superpowers had developed a species of balance of power between themselves. They never went into direct combat except through mistake, error or misunderstanding.

The perfect example of that is the Korean conflict in 1950. It was not called peacemaking then but it was a direct invocation of chapter seven of the charter and the very much larger legal powers that were developed then for that purpose.

If we look at the case studies that have occurred in the last few years and which have been referred to during the debate today, we will find confusion regarding the two aspects of, let us call it, the peacekeeping mission of the United Nations. We will find the confusions are present. In the Yugoslav situation it is clear that when Mr. Mulroney responded to the request to intervene there, he was going into a situation in which there was no political consensus. In fact the European powers, as we would now recognize, missed an opportunity for establishing a consensus to post-communist success in Yugoslavia and the independence for the new states. He was going into a situation which I think he thought was peacekeeping in the classic sense but very clearly involved peacemaking, the putting of Canadian forces into a situation of armed conflict. I think we can say that only the superb training and good judgment of our military commanders

Government Orders

has enabled us to pull out of that situation without a major tragedy occurring.

(1910)

In the new role in Yugoslavia that seems to be emerging what is now proposed seems to be essentially peacekeeping in the classic sense but that is a later stage in the conflict.

In Somalia on the other hand the conception was from the beginning that it was peacemaking. We sent a crack airborne regiment—many countries have them—into a situation where they were expected to be peacemakers. The tragedy that resulted there I think resulted from failure in the intelligence aspects of governments initially devising their role. That goes back I think to an examination of how and why the predecessor government to the present one decided this.

I have listened with great interest because all of us are with goodwill and we are committed to this Canadian mission in support of the United Nations, our larger peaceful mission in history. I have listened with great sympathy to much in the debate but again I think it is based on misconceptions and a misunderstanding of the art of the possible of what can be done and what cannot be done. That is a military logistical decision among very many other things.

I heard reference in the debate on Haiti to the desirability of using the OAS instead of the procedures now used. I do not believe an OAS role involving military intervention in a direct peacemaking sense was ever possible in that situation. It may be later on. If you remember the last time the OAS was engaged as a regional security agency under chapter VIII of the charter, it was in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962. The OAS admittedly acted several hours after the military decisions were taken, but the ratification was complete and virtually unanimous. Very clearly the regional security agency operated although the military enforcement power was delegated to somebody else. However the OAS role was never meaningful.

Similarly one would say in the Rwanda situation an OAU, the other relevant security agency, military role was never again in a peacemaking sense relevant or possible.

Our government situation in those two conflicts which are now with us was making the decision on how to act with what was militarily possible in the situation. We have a very small army which under pressures from I think many parties in this House may be subject to further reductions in military expenditures. We have limited forces. We cannot be everywhere in the world. We also face the fact that political conflicts in the post cold war era are not as simple as they were in the cold war era where everything was black and white. The monarchy and

hierarchy, one was good and one was bad, but these conflicts are very mixed and very hard to assess in terms of giving blame here and allocating responsibilities there.

Therefore, our government is faced with military forces that are really not equipped, unless we want to send airborne regimes in again, to a peacemaking role in the direct military sense. It is only realistic therefore to say, given the limitations on power and the limitation of our resources, we will in the Canadian tradition do our best. That is to say, we will provide humanitarian assistance. We will send in that logistical support after military operations are completed. But we do not have the manpower and we do not have the present organization to do it. Should we in the future? That is the subject of the debate.

(1915)

It will involve an increase rather than a decrease in expenditure on the armed forces. It will involve a larger role for the armed forces, more education because these disputes are 50 per cent political and 50 per cent military. Frankly we cannot afford to send soldiers again as was done in Somalia. We cannot send them into a situation where they do not speak the language, they do not understand the religion, the culture or the people they are dealing with, where they are all at sea, a tragedy waiting to happen. In a certain sense it is a Canadian tragedy.

The debate realistically should concentrate on accepting the fact that if we want expanded military operations, for heaven's sake if we want to send the marines in with guns blazing, we have to develop a marine force and we do not have it. I do not think Canadians want that.

The more limited military role still requires a larger military commitment, more expenditure, a more selective process to engagement in peacekeeping missions abroad. It requires the ability to understand that the soldiers have to be better trained, better paid, a class of specialists. There I think we have a continuation of the Pearson role in the spirit of the end of the century.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated the comments from the hon. member opposite. I recognize too his expertise in international constitutional law and international events generally.

Last week members of the foreign affairs review committee spent some time at the United Nations. Down there they refer to the CNN factor, where it seems that the UN concentrates its efforts on where the television cameras give the most coverage. Then other people suggested, and this was just people talking, that the U.S. at this time needs something to shore up a dispirited U.S. foreign policy and a dispirited U.S. commitment to the UN because of the Somalia experience.

Government Orders

Does the hon. member have an opinion as to why the Americans are champing at the bit so bad to get into Haiti right now?

Mr. McWhinney: I thank the hon. member for the very thoughtful question. Clearly there are aspects of American domestic policy at work. One is the obvious factor of the flood of immigrants or refugees from Haiti in the present period of political disorder. It would be wrong though to say that this is the basis of American foreign policy.

The United States, for better or for worse, has always assumed a special responsibility for the American hemisphere. It is one of the reasons many of us urged for years that Canada join the Organization of American States, because we are being privately told by many Latin American states: "We like the Americans, but their embrace is overwhelming. You will provide a voice of reason and balance when they decide to take action".

But Haiti is part of us, too. We are part of the hemisphere, we are in the OAS. Haiti is a French speaking country. There are 60,000 Haitian Canadians there and frankly I do not think we can ignore what is happening. If we do go in, this is where the hon. member's reference to the CNN factor is so important because there is a tendency to live with today's tragedy and then move on to the next one. The attention span is small.

The good thing about our commitment in Yugoslavia is that we had reservations almost from the beginning, certainly the generals did, of whether it was a wise mission. Once committed however we have said we will not abandon it just because it is unpopular or the public whim is against it.

If we go into Haiti we are going to be there for some time and I think it is an honourable commitment to maintain. We are all part of this hemisphere and we will have to accept responsibilities for hemispheric conditions. The hon. member's party, when asking about the OAS, did look to a future larger involvement of Latin American states as well as ourselves.

(1920)

Mr. Strahl: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for that comment. Perhaps he could help the foreign affairs committee. As members are aware one of the things we are charged with is to try to establish whether we should have regional priorities in our foreign policy. That involves all things, including peacekeeping, trade emphasis, and other things as well.

Is it a valid consideration to limit our future peacekeeping roles to a hemispheric idea or is that too simplistic? The member mentioned earlier that we do not have a common language, roots, religion or historical frame of reference with Somalia that perhaps we do have with Haiti. Is it reasonable in tight budgetary times to limit it to those areas that we have? That would cut out a good part of Africa. Does the member think that would be a logical way to divvy up very limited resources?

Mr. McWhinney: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for a further valuable question. The problem in Somalia was that the only people who really understood the local political conditions were the Italians. It was an Italian colony and the Italians have managed to maintain good relations with their post-independence colonies. They understood the situation.

It is clear the non-Italian powers were all at sea. I would also say that the UN command which was headed by an American admiral was even more at sea than others. Somalia is an example of somewhere we should not have gone into. We should have been selective. We have to be selective. We cannot be in a dozen countries at once with our present resources. So far we are not in any inter-American areas except Haiti, so it is logical to give a certain priority to that.

The United Nations says that the regional route should normally be exhausted before taking the larger international route. That is a sound principle. Do not forget that for better or for worse by virtue of the free trade agreement and the trilateral free trade agreement with Mexico, our economic fate and increasingly our political fate is linked with the Americas. Therefore I would not envisage our doing things solely in Latin America or the Caribbean.

We do have links to the English speaking Commonwealth countries including Commonwealth countries in Africa and we are respected there. We do have links to the francophone civil law countries in Africa. I just viewed Somalia as a bad example. The wrong force was sent by political leaders who did not really understand the situation and did not know how to appraise the advice they were getting.

It is a tragedy. However I welcome the Haiti operation. With the limited resources we have and the situation we now have it is the correct decision to do what we have done. We could not have done more. I do not think we should have done less.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I will start off this evening by making a comment regarding the remarks of the hon. Minister of Foreign Affairs. One thing which is very important is that we debate matters in the House. I wonder about the process we are going through this evening. It is obvious to me that decisions have been made prior to having this emergency debate.

It sounds like a *fait accompli* that we are going to keep our troops in the former Yugoslavia. It is written right in the minister's text that we are sending 700 Canadians to Haiti: 100 RCMP and 600 members of the Canadian Armed Forces. My whole point on that before I get into my comments is that when you people were on this side of the room it was quite obvious that you raised holy old hell when the Conservatives pulled things like this. I think you should sit back and reflect on that for a few minutes and maybe for the next couple of years.

Government Orders

(1925)

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not think the member was in the House yesterday when members were constantly saying "you" across the floor. The reason remarks are addressed to the Chair, and I think the member probably knows this, is to try to defuse tension.

I would ask the member to address his remarks to the Chair, referring to members of the other party in the third person, please.

Mr. Hart: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will do that.

The inscription on the back of the United Nations medal people receive reads: In the service of peace. That is a worthy role for Canadians to pursue. I would like people to keep that in mind, in the service of peace.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs has put together a motion that this House take note of Canada's current and future international peacekeeping commitments in the world with particular reference to the former Yugoslavia, Haiti and Rwanda.

As a Reformer and as a member of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy, I strongly believe we must get our direction from the people of Canada. With the special joint committee on defence and the special joint committee on foreign affairs I hope this goal will be achieved through the consultation process.

The joint committee on defence will present its recommendations to the House and to Canadians at the end of October and it is long overdue. Canada's defence is based on the old cold war policy. Little of it has changed as far as defence policy is concerned within the last 30 years. It is long overdue because much has changed. There is the fall of communism in the former Soviet Union and of course the post cold war period we are into now.

What makes this defence committee report so important? The committee has spent months hearing testimony by Canadians from all walks of life. Hundreds of testimonies have been heard and there have been many presentations.

By rushing into this peacekeeping debate the government is sending a very clear message to the taxpayers of Canada. It is saying: "We are not really listening to you". My perception is that what we are doing this evening is just smoke and mirrors.

The committee travelled to the former Yugoslavia where we saw first hand exactly what our peacekeepers have to face. In the midst of bullets and land mines of the order of 2,000 Canadian men and women have performed above and beyond the call of duty, and our peacekeepers have had to do it the hard way.

Earlier today we heard mention of the equipment problems in the Canadian Armed Forces. There are some real equipment problems in the Canadian Armed Forces which have to be addressed. Imagine having to change helmets at the airport while one group of Canadians is going home to Canada and a new group is arriving. There are not even enough blue helmets to make sure everyone has their own. It is the same with flak jackets as well.

Another area is our armoured personnel carriers. These are so old and outdated. They are made of magnesium aluminum and can be penetrated easily by bullets and certainly by land mines which are a constant threat in areas like Croatia.

Canadians have put their lives on the line in the cause of peacekeeping in the former Yugoslavia. They have done it because they believe so much in what they are doing.

I will take a few moments to talk about my recent trip to the former Yugoslavia at the end of May. I travelled with the defence committee reviewing Canada's defence policy. When I first arrived I thought about all the news reports and things from around the country and Canadians saying that we should get out of there right away. I thought we should probably just pack our bags and go. But I spent some time talking to the dedicated people and hard workers. I mention particularly the PPCLI from Calgary and also the Lord Strathcona Horse Canadian Battalion One and Canadian Battalion Two who were our hosts during that trip. Those people were dedicated to the job they had to do. We should all as Canadians congratulate those young men and women on the fine work they are doing in a far away foreign land.

(1930)

I will never forget the young fellow I met from Kelowna, British Columbia, Captain Derek McAuley. He was in charge of a group of Canadians who were at the back of Eachy hospital in Bosnia. Captain McAuley when they first came upon the back of Eachy hospital, which is a mental hospital, when the Canadians first found this hospital there were no doctors, nurses or people helping these mental patients because they had all fled in fear of their lives. They fled and left the mental patients to fend for themselves. There was no food, little medicine and they were on their own.

When the Canadians found them they went in and buried the dead. They cleaned up the hospital. They fed the hungry. They made sure that the adequate medical prescriptions were filled for those people.

Canada carried out its function there, a humanitarian role. They did an incredible job. Today the medical staff is back at that hospital. The Canadians are still there because they still get threats from the belligerent forces threatening that the soldiers

Government Orders

need the food, medicine and bedding and anything else they can get more than the mental patients.

I had the opportunity to ask Captain McAuley if he felt the job that he was doing there was worthwhile. He said: "Absolutely, yes. We are doing something that has to be done. We are here in the service of our country and the people here, the civilians, do appreciate the work we are doing".

I would like to move along and talk about what happens next. During the period of time that we were there visiting there was relative calm. There was peace, ceasefires and agreements. It seemed like there was hope for peace.

Now the situation has changed again. I remember one soldier telling me all they are doing right now is stocking up for the winter because they are going to grow their food during the spring and summer and then they will be right back into it once things cool off again. That seems to be the case in that situation.

Keeping in mind what I said earlier, the service for peace is an honourable role to play, are we really in the service of peace in the former Yugoslavia at this point?

If the embargo is lifted I would have to say that Canadians must come out of the former Yugoslavia as soon as possible. There is no way that the former Yugoslavia, if that embargo is lifted, needs more weapons, more land mines. It does not need any more tanks or implements of death in that particular area.

That is why Canadians must come out if that happens. I think we seriously have to look at the situation now. Are we accomplishing what we were sent to do? I think Canadians across the country, I know in my riding, are getting a little tired of this particular conflict. They are getting worn out because there does not seem to be an end to it.

We have to establish criteria. The belligerent forces in a country like this, if they want Canada to be there, must show signs of wanting a negotiated settlement and being at the peace table and doing it on a daily basis until peace is found.

Just this morning the Minister of Foreign Affairs suggested pulling peacekeepers out of Bosnia so that Canada could send troops to Haiti. What does this tell us? It tells us that we have some very serious limitations. It tells us that there are not enough troops to go around. It tells us that we are having difficulties meeting our current peacekeeping commitments. It tells us that we have to be careful about our future commitments.

Do we have the resources? The Department of National Defence suggests that Canada will commit some 3,300 troops in various countries including Croatia, Bosnia, the Golan Heights. We have troops in the Adriatic, Somalia, Cyprus, Cambodia, the West Sahara, the Sinai Peninsula, Mozambique, the Middle East and Kuwait.

(1935)

Demand is being placed on our French speaking troops for peacekeeping in Rwanda. Haiti is also in the works. I guess it is a fait accompli.

Can we meet this demand? It is essential that Canadians are aware of what is involved in the peacekeeping equation. I am afraid it comes down to dollars and cents and manpower. Defence budget cutbacks, we all know that we have gone through that and there could be more. It means we have to spend our money wisely and if peacekeeping is going to be a major emphasis we have to spend it very carefully as well. The size of the Canadian Armed Forces is being significantly reduced. As I have already pointed out, we only have so many troops to send on peacekeeping missions. We will be faced with critical decisions.

Do we have enough soldiers, enough money to participate in peacekeeping efforts? Is this mission impossible? I believe that if we manage both wisely—and I stress wisely—we can still maintain this vital role.

Canadians have established an enviable reputation throughout the world as peacekeepers—26 missions. Since 1956 we have participated in every one of them. The very demand which has been placed on Canada to participate in peacekeeping efforts is proof itself.

We have had the responsibility as a G-7 nation to contribute our fair share. Mr. Jim Leamy of Victoria who made a presentation to the defence committee in Victoria said: "Canada must, if it is to keep its position as a strong middle power, be prepared to maintain a credible defence establishment". If we are going to have any say at the conference tables of the dangerous new world, either politically or economically, we will have to have paid the price of our seat.

I would re-emphasize that there are limitations. Considering the size of our great nation—we have only a small population of 27 million people—our defence budget ranks 15th in the world; Nepal's is 14th.

The land element, the army as it used to be called, has some 20,000 personnel, of that about 8,000 are combat ready. One-third of those people are in the theatre of operations now. One-third have probably recently returned from missions and one-third are in training.

Simple arithmetic says either we do not have enough troops for foreign missions or we are putting too much pressure on those troops by rotating them far too often.

Also, what happens in the event of an emergency in this country? Many people will say that not much happens in Canada so we do not have to worry about that too often. In my own riding this summer we called in the troops to fight a fire and we also not too long ago had to send troops out to participate at Oka. That was a tremendous. Could we do that today if such a situation arose again?

Government Orders

Canada must establish criteria and guidelines for its involvement. We must ask ourselves some fundamental questions. Is it in the interest of Canada? What is the purpose of the operation? Do the countries involved want peacekeepers? Will we be peacekeeping or peacemaking? Do we have the equipment and the expertise to fulfil the mission?

We are all aware that the size of the regular Canadian Armed Forces is being reduced to 66,700. This is of course because of cutbacks. Now that the budget has been reduced the government is asking the Canadian Armed Forces to do much more in this unstable world with much less.

One way to compensate for this would be to reduce our top heavy defence department. I think it has been pointed out several times that we have far too many generals and not enough foot soldiers in our present system. The Minister of National Defence has admitted that there is going to be more reliance on the reserve personnel in the Canadian Armed Forces. That is fine. That is honourable. Remember when we say reserve forces we are talking about the guy at the corner who pumps gas or the girl at the grocery store who is checking food.

(1940)

These are not regular soldiers. We have to make sure that they have the proper training. The Auditor General has pointed out some deficiencies in his 1992 report and these things have to be answered. We cannot simply throw out a statement saying the reserves will do it. That is easy enough to do. There have to be clearly defined ways that we ensure they are brought up to speed on the roles of the regular forces personnel. Before we put our reserves in the potentially dangerous peacekeeping situations we need to provide them with the additional training they need. We will also have to deal with a number of other issues probably in the House regarding legislation with reserve issues which will be a topic for another debate another day.

Our defence policy or foreign affairs policy cannot be dictated by the media. We have heard it a couple of times here tonight, the CNN factor, and it is a reality. We must have clearly defined criteria for which peacekeeping operations we can participate in and which ones we cannot.

Decisions must be based on Canada's best interests. We have been a world leader as peacekeepers because we trained for war. We are respected around the world and the world is changing. Instability is increasing and we will be called upon more in the future. However, let us ensure that if we are in a foreign land where the people of that country do not want us there for peace then we must leave.

I started with the words found on the back of the peacekeeping medal and I will end with those words: "In the service of peace".

Mr. Milliken: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think you will find there is consent in the House to extend the hour of sitting, notwithstanding the order in respect of today, from 8.30 p.m. until 9 p.m. with the late show to continue at 9 p.m. as it would have at 8.30 p.m. We are adding an extra 30 minutes to today's debate to accommodate speakers who wish to participate.

The Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment in reaction to my colleague's comment across the floor. I want to ask him a question.

I was with the member on that trip and I think his comments reflect accurately the feeling that those members of the special joint committee studying defence policy had as we visited the former Yugoslavia, including Zagreb, the headquarters of the United Nations protection force, our troops based in Visoko and Sarajevo and our troops in Croatia.

There were a number of things that struck me. Perhaps the strongest feeling was—again reflected by my colleague from Okanagan—that the Canadians who were there were very young, very dedicated and very professional, but to a man and a woman, those to whom we spoke, certainly in my case and I think I can attest for my colleagues, they all believed they were there for a purpose. They all believed in what they were doing. While there was some concern that some were on their third tour of duty, they believed they should be there and believed that they were responding to what Canadians saw to be in their national interest.

I am talking about May. As it is now September I can only assume that those feelings may still be there. I hope they still are there, but I would have to be realistic and say to myself that there is a lot of anxiety as those young Canadian men and women in uniform listen to this debate or hear about this debate to see the direction of their Parliament.

(1945)

I hope you will indulge me, Mr. Speaker. As a Newfoundlander, I have to report something that was very poignant to me and the other two Newfoundland members of Parliament on the committee. Including the First Battalion of the PPCLI in Croatia, the Lord Strathcona Horse and the 600 sailors serving on the *Preserver* and the *Halifax* at sea, very close to 25 per cent of them came from Newfoundland.

Government Orders

You might find that out of proportion with the 2.2 per cent that we represent of the population of Canada, but as a Newfoundlander, I stand here this evening to tell members that I felt very proud to be among them and to see what they are doing.

I hope my question will be instructive. I was delighted to hear my hon. colleague mention the need for some criteria to guide our peacekeeping efforts. The criteria would have to be broad enough to be applied in a general sense but we may need a subset of criteria, depending on whether it is a peacekeeping operation in its traditional sense as indeed it is in Croatia, whether it is a peace, humanitarian type of effort as it is in Bosnia or whether it is the kind of operation that we may consider in Haiti or Somalia—they all seem to be different these days.

The scope and range is increasing. I wonder if he would accept that there should be a general criteria. Depending on what kind of a peace operation, maybe there should be a subset of criteria. In the general criteria there are a set of conditions that we would like to see. If they are not met within a certain time frame, then we will withdraw, providing we have a codicil for exceptional circumstances. I certainly would support that and I would like to see that.

I would ask the hon. member to lend his comments to this aspect of the debate. I believe it is key to the issue.

Mr. Hart: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's comments. Over the past few months, we have worked closely together on the defence review.

The hon. member is referring to the fact that because Canada has performed so well in peacekeeping operations we should take a leadership role and look at the possibility of being the first ones in, while on the other side, set a timeframe to set it up and be out of there.

I would support something to that effect because I do not think Canadians will accept another Cyprus where we find ourselves there for 30 years. We have the capability to set it up to show other countries how to do it and possibly get out of there as soon as possible once those goals are achieved.

Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to join in the debate tonight on this very important subject.

I am concerned that it will be seen as smoke and mirrors or a useless debate. I certainly do not see it that way or I would not be here. I guess I wonder why anyone would participate in something that they view as that. That was probably a comment caused by indigestion and not by careful thought.

This is a debate that is very important to all Canadians. After careful reflection, all members on all sides of the House have something important to offer.

It is clear to me that Canadians overwhelmingly support and show great pride in our record as a peacekeeping nation. It was mentioned earlier today that this tradition goes back to Lester B. Pearson and to the leadership role that he demonstrated at the time of the Suez crisis in the creation of the UNEF force. The international community recognized that leadership by awarding him the Nobel peace prize, the only time that honour has been accorded so far to a Canadian.

My city of London has been much involved in peacekeeping over the years being until just recently the home of the Royal Canadian Regiment. It is a subject that has some particular relevance to me and my constituents, as it does to all Canadians, but in a special way because there was considerable involvement by that regiment.

(1950)

No country is our equal or matches our record in the vital activity of peacekeeping. We are proud of that record and we ought to be proud of it. But as has been said by some of my colleagues, this is a changing world. We live in a time of transition. The cold war is over. Fortunately we are no longer wedged as the ham in the sandwich, if you will, between the two antagonistic superpowers with nuclear weapons pointed at each other, the U.S.A. and the former U.S.S.R.

However, the fact that the cold war is over does not mean we do not live in a dangerous world. It is very dangerous but in a different way. We face many more regional conflicts and internecine conflicts, namely civil wars in various countries.

The question is very relevant and I think our comments are very relevant. Should Canada continue to be involved in peacekeeping? My answer, the answer of the government and the answer I believe of most Canadians, is most categorically yes, we should continue to be involved.

The question needs to be posed; can we be involved in every conflict where our presence is requested? As things unfold it is obvious that we cannot be involved in every single conflict. We are going to have to be selective. I share the sentiments I have heard from members from all sides of the House. Budgetary realities are budgetary realities. Our resources are stretched and we are simply going to need some criteria and be selective.

I have heard some members opposite say they want some kind of an airtight guarantee. That to me is somewhat naive. It goes beyond a set of criteria. Exactly how much money will we expend? Exactly how many days will we be in that conflict? Is the interest of Canada involved? These are curious questions. Canada has always known, and I hope always will know, that if there is an opportunity to contribute to peace, particularly in this hemisphere, then the answer is yes, Canada's interests are very much involved. No country has a greater stake in world peace.

We know it is a humanitarian effort in Rwanda. Canadian flights have carried food, medicine, badly needed drinking water. We have led the way in that regard. Canadians have supported this effort. The proof is the millions of dollars

Government Orders

donated by Canadians privately. There can be no better demonstration in these tough times that people from all parts of the country support a government initiative than their willingness to put their own hard earned money behind it.

However, we do hear from time to time what I would call the inevitable victim argument. Are we not wasting our time in Rwanda? Can we make a difference there? Are these people not going to starve anyway? That is actually heard, fortunately from very few Canadians, but I have heard it and was somewhat nauseated by the statement. I reject that notion out of hand. It is an excuse to do nothing. It is an excuse to ignore the pain of other people who need Canada's help. Fortunately there are very few people with that narrow, selfish point of view. I am glad to say I have not heard it enunciated in the House tonight. Nor do I hope we ever will in the future.

The Yugoslavian situation is much more dangerous than the Rwandan one for our armed forces. We have made a difference there but the question is, can we continue to make a difference? Is there a true desire for peace? If the answer to that is yes, then we ought to continue our presence. But if the decision is no, we are not making a difference, it is a hopeless situation if such a one exists or there is not progress for peace, then perhaps the government will have to look at making another decision.

I come now to Haiti. Again we have heard from members opposite. I was shocked and disappointed to hear from the Leader of the Opposition comments which seemed to me to be very ill thought out. He used the phrase that Canada ought to intervene and intervene forcefully. I hope that forcefully was a slip of the tongue. I do not think it was one of his better oratorical efforts. He was so interested in attacking the Minister of Foreign Affairs that logic escaped him. Canada ought not to involve itself forcefully if you take that word literally.

(1955)

I was very pleased with the way the Minister of Foreign Affairs dealt with this matter and his expert handling of a difficult situation in Haiti. As a Canadian and as a member of Parliament I am doubly proud that he made it very clear that Canada would not participate in an invasion of Haiti. Canada is not in the invasion business, we are in the peacekeeping business. If that is what the Leader of the Opposition meant by forcefully he had better think again or he had better choose his words more carefully.

The Leader of the Opposition was a minister in a government which was all too quick, when the President of the United States called, to snap to attention, salute, say yes sir, and merely follow along with the American course.

That is not the tradition of the Liberal Party. It is not the intention of this government. It is not the intention of this Prime Minister to do anything other than to chart an independent Canadian course, putting forward what is in our best interests in deciding what our contribution will be, regardless of any phone calls from the President of the United States.

Members may have had the opportunity to see retired General Lewis MacKenzie in the media recently cautioning that if we are going to go into Haiti that it could likely be a very long term commitment and he drew the analogy to Cyprus. That is probably quite accurate.

I believe the government is going to weigh carefully what will be our involvement in Haiti. My own belief is that we should go in. We said we will. Canada is a country of its word and we have a constructive role to play. Likely it will be a the long term commitment and that will be factor in the size of the contribution we will make.

In closing, I would like to indicate that I had the opportunity a few months ago to speak at an international conference where 110 countries were represented. They very much wanted to know what Canada's review of our defence situation and our peacekeeping effort would be in future. I tried to indicate the concerns I have heard from all members tonight as well as indicate those concerns at that conference. I indicated to the members that obviously Canada rejects the fist of war but we have always extended the hand of peace.

This world needs Canada to continue as a peacekeeper. We have a vital role to play. We have to be more selective and carefully examine all requests for contributions to peacekeeping efforts. We can never define to the nth degree every single aspect of that commitment. If we want that beforehand we might as well pull out of all peacekeeping operations now. That is just simply naive. That does not mean we ought not to establish criteria as clearly as we can.

We have a role to play. I am confident we will continue to fulfil that role and do all we can to promote peace in the world because that is the Canadian way.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the member opposite what is the moral difference between applauding the United States invasion and saying we will be there to pick up the pieces, thereby never ever tarnishing our hands in conflict.

I do not understand the difference. Are we to pat the Americans on the back and tell them to go in, slaughter the works, do what is necessary and encourage them to do so, and after they have finished we will be happy to move in with a thousand peacekeepers of some sort and mop up the remnants.

Government Orders

I would like to know if there is a difference. I do not understand what it is. It is like hiring someone to do your dirty work and then saying you would like to come in afterward and sweep the lawn when the place has been thoroughly thrashed.

I do not understand the moral difference. It seems to me that if you are encouraging someone to do something you may as well have done it yourself. I do not know if there is a difference.

(2000)

Mr. O'Brien: Mr. Speaker, it is an interesting question. I think my colleague is engaged in a little bit of hyperbole. I would remind him that fortunately the invasion did not take place.

Yes, my understanding is that Canada was backing a multinational invasion if necessary as a course of last resort to remove a brutal junta that was killing people to try to stop death and destruction unfortunately with the last resort which sometimes is available, military force.

To me there is a world of a difference and I think we only have to reflect on our tradition as a nation since World War II. There is an enormous difference between actively going in and involving yourself in the taking of life and honing your skills, your expertise and training your people to be those who go in to try to build peace, to try to prevent wherever possible such a conflict from taking place.

To me, there is an enormous difference that the last 50 years demonstrates very clearly.

Mr. Jim Hart (Okanagan—Similkameen—Merritt): Mr. Speaker, I have just a brief question regarding the whole concept of Canada being involved in peacekeeping. I think that is a role that we perform very well. Now we are into a new type of world. There is more instability now than we have seen in quite some time in history.

Does the hon. member have any ideas or concepts of doing something differently? For instance, the UN has suggested that maybe countries should look at preventive deployment of troops before it gets out of control. What are the member's comments on that?

The Deputy Speaker: What are the member's comments on that? The hon. member for London—Middlesex.

Mr. O'Brien: Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in your comments some time on that as well because it is an interesting question.

My view is that Canada has indeed been a leading nation in the United Nations from day one. If there is a sensible initiative that is under serious consideration in the United Nations I am sure Canada is going to fully participate in that.

If in any way we can help to prevent conflicts at the invitation of a nation to come in to try to do that, then that is probably an idea well worth exploring. It is far cheaper to do that than try to go in later.

With all due respect to my colleague, I do not think as I have heard from some members in his party opposite that we can define to the nth degree exactly every fact and every dollar it will take. We just cannot define it that clearly before we go into a mission or we might as well forget it now.

Mr. Sarkis Assadourian (Don Valley North): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to ask you a question. Is it possible to continue this debate without any members of the opposition parties here to continue?

The Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is a new member and may not realize that members are not to comment on the absence of a member in the House. I think that would include all members of a party in the House because they may be doing proper business. The feeling is from a long tradition. That goes out to the people watching on television. It is not that members are not bothering to be here.

I would ask other members to please keep in mind that one is not to comment on the presence or absence of a member of the House of Commons.

Mr. Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, I did not ask about a specific member. I asked about the party. Is that the same?

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. member's time is being used, I might remind him, in this exchange. I think I answered that in my comment before.

Mr. Assadourian: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to take a moment to recognize some members of the Montreal community from Quebec who are present in the gallery. They were together with us a few minutes ago.

Today's issue is very important. It is a new form of government for us, the Liberal Party, and for the government. This is the third debate we have had on issues like this one. The first one was Bosnia and then we had a discussion about the cruise missile. This is the third one. Everyone in the country appreciates the fact that we have a new beginning and a new way of governing the country.

(2005)

There is a phase one and a phase two aspect of the issue with Haiti. Phase one is peacemaking. Phase two is peacekeeping. Since the 1950s Canadians were involved in peacekeeping. I would assume that is the reason why we did not get involved in the peacemaking process of this, although we are going to be involved in phase two of this operation.

I know this agreement may not be 100 per cent perfect. Of course we say that in hindsight after what happened. Let us go back three or four days to Saturday or Sunday night to see which

Government Orders

one of these members of Parliament—especially in the opposition—was prepared to stand up and complain about the deal that was struck between the U.S. former president and the Haiti government.

It is very important to keep that perspective in mind. If we do not do that then we do not appreciate the fact that this situation saved so many people from being slaughtered in Haiti.

Earlier today I was listening with curiosity to comments made by a Reform Party member. He said that last week when he was in Washington he asked American congressmen, senators and state department officials if they approved of the Canadian position.

I was surprised when he asked the Americans that question and not his constituents. That is what counts. We have to ask Canadian citizens what their appreciation is of this situation. We do not have to act on what the Americans tell us to do.

Everybody has complained for the last 20 or 30 years—maybe more—that we follow American foreign policy. When the Americans sneeze we catch a cold. We catch cold no matter what the case may be.

In this case we took our own stand, a unique stand. We said no where we had to say no. We said yes where we had to say yes in phase two. We were still blamed for not keeping the Americans happy. I do not think it is our job to keep our American cousins happy.

They may be good friends to us, but it is our job to run our own foreign policy. If they are not happy with it, we cannot really help it because we have to run our own department. We have to run our ship.

Delaying this agreement for 25 days gives the opportunity for this regime to wrap up things, so to speak. It also gives the president—in—waiting in Washington time to organize himself so he can go back to his country and get control of the situation.

One thing I really liked in this deal. The fact is that the Americans are buying back the arms from the civilians carrying guns. There is a name that I cannot remember. When they go back on phase two, our soldiers and the RCMP will not have to face the un—uniformed civilian population. We will not have any clashes with them.

It is the participation of 24 countries as far as I remember. It is not only American participation. Some of the 24 countries that are going to participate in this invasion are in Europe. They are coming in gradually. There are South American countries, Caribbean countries and European countries. They cannot say it is only the U.S. It was mentioned earlier that the invasion is being led by the U.S. government.

We are going to be there for the second phase. It is the most difficult phase because democracy means election. If we cannot do the election right, if we cannot prepare the country for the election, we have failed.

I do not think we should fail. We cannot afford to fail. For the sake of keeping our hemisphere safe and democratic we have to go all the way with phase two, doing whatever we can to make sure democracy prevails and Aristide returns to his country.

Mr. Jack Frazer (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, during his remarks the member opposite mentioned that we had been able to debate Canada's participation in Bosnia. We have debated various other aspects of defence.

I would point out that we did not have the opportunity to discuss the commitment of troops to Rwanda. Today the Minister of Foreign Affairs committed some 700 Canadians to Haiti, or he proposed to do so. He did this without any discussion with this House as to whether that was appropriate or not. I am not saying that we would have disagreed but we did not have a chance. I suggest that the present government when it was in opposition was quite unhappy with the commitment of Canadian troops to Bosnia without discussion. I believe they would have said something about that.

(2010)

It is one thing to talk about a government doing business in a different way. It is quite different to watch how it does business in a different way.

Mr. Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, in Rwanda in two weeks' time one million people died. Bodies were floating in the rivers. Do you expect us to come here and ask Parliament in that situation with people dying every day by the hundreds of thousands what to do?

I do not think it is fair to expect that we would do so in a situation like that. There are 200,000 people dying every day, more or less. In 10 days one million people died. We did the best we could. We were there at the very beginning. There was nobody there except Canadian soldiers. One of them was here today.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. member. Certainly I would like to list my number four in terms of the item which was: Be sure that Canadians support our actions. That was one of the serious criteria that we must follow.

As far as consulting with the OAS and the state department, it was a matter of asking: Have we played the leadership role in getting the OAS involved? That tokenism that is involved with the U.S. proposed invasion is nothing more than that.

I do not see what is wrong with setting the criteria and I would like to know the member's response. Why can we not set criteria? The Canadian people are not prepared to give us a blind

Government Orders

trust, just saying: "Politicians, go out there and go everywhere, spend whatever, don't have a plan, don't know what it is going to cost, don't know how long you are going to be there".

I think the Canadian people are asking those questions. That is what I am hearing. Are you not hearing that?

The Deputy Speaker: I assume the hon. member is asking the hon. member who just spoke.

Mr. Assadourian: Mr. Speaker, I think the course we have taken to be involved in phase two speaks for itself. That is our tradition, that is our way of doing things, that is the Canadian way of doing things.

We do not want to get involved in a war in each and every corner of this planet. We want to be involved in peacekeeping, not peacemaking. We are there to keep the peace, if there is a peace after this invasion is over. That is all we are doing. That is our way of doing it, middle of the road, and we will continue to do it. We did it for the past 40 or 50 years and we will do it in the next 50 years.

Mr. Chuck Strahl (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to enter this debate tonight. Although I may at the end of my remarks question some of the timing of this emergency debate, I do at least appreciate the opportunity to enter into it.

I rise first of all to read some excerpts from a letter written to me by a very special person with a compelling interest in Canada's peacekeeping functions. The author of this letter is special because is the father of a young man who was recently killed by a land mine in the former Yugoslavia. That young man was a constituent of mine. The pain suffered by his father jumped out of the pages as I read them.

I attended the funeral of this brave soldier last summer. It was a sorrowful, sobering time that was especially poignant for me because of my membership on the Standing Committee for Foreign Affairs and International Trade. The policies that committee writes will affect more young men and women like Mark Isfeld for many years, perhaps decades to come.

It is therefore fitting that parliamentarians scrutinize our involvement in this latest hornets' nest of political unrest, Haiti, before we enter that battlefield for a so-called peace.

Mark's dad had some hard questions for the government, questions that will never receive satisfactory answers for him, I am sure. But he asks: "Who is in control here? Is it a politician or a bureaucrat? Is it a commander situated far from any particular trouble spot? Is it someone from another country within the United Nations? Is it people like Mark who will carry out the tasks regardless of the danger?"

Indeed, these are excellent questions because they point to a fundamental weakness in the Canadian peacekeeping function, and that is the loss of control over our own armed forces.

(2015)

Once Canada commits to involvement as part of an international force political decisions begin to intrude on purely military or Canadian interests and we begin to consider issues like our standing in the UN or saving face or chalking up international Brownie points.

Are our people safe enough? Is their training and equipment adequate for the task at hand? When and where should peacekeepers move within war torn countries? What should their duties be? With a multinational force these purely military decisions are made at least in part by people who are not Canadian and who have other interests in mind than the Canadian interest. That is why these questions are really questions about Canadian sovereignty and ultimately Canadian lives.

Let me give examples of what I mean. Soldiers in the former Yugoslavia are using 31-year old personnel carriers with telecommunication equipment that frequently breaks down. It can only be repaired in Canada. Better armour for the vehicles is just now arriving, three years too late and a few months too late Mark Isfeld. We hear that the old engines of the carriers may not be able to move the personnel carriers with the added weight of the new armour. That is ironic.

Here is another example. Unbelievably there are not enough binoculars to go around so the soldiers must look through the rifle sights to watch for dangerous activity. Can you imagine that? It would almost be funny if it were not so serious. Of course even a friend who saw someone pointing a rifle at them might fire in self-defence or what they thought was self-defence. Our troops are forced to invite hostile fire just because they do not have a pair of binoculars.

Why are Canadians sent into battle situations equipped in this way? To maintain our international prestige as peacekeepers? To fulfil a political commitment to get someone re-elected back home? If so, political decisions have overtaken military considerations and these decisions have been costly and my own constituent paid the ultimate price.

It should be clear to all of us that Canadian sovereignty will diminish as our involvements in multinational peacekeeping efforts increase. The more we mire ourselves in international conflict, the more we surrender control over the Canadian interest to other interest, no matter what they may be, the more expendable our troops will become. The more casualties we will experience the more difficult it will be to pull out of war torn countries even if our efforts are not successful. No one cares about Canadian troops like Canadian commanders.

Mr. Isfeld rightly concluded in his letters: "No, my friends, I believe that the control lies with us, citizens of Canada and the world". We can still decide how deep our involvements will be

Government Orders

but demands upon our peacekeepers will increase as struggles within states intensify.

Are we going to keep jumping from situation to situation on an ad hoc basis without any criteria, without any policy? If we continue to shrink from developing any policy for fear of offending a special interest group or another nation we will never have any rationale that will provide a basis to say no to some of the involvements. We will continue to get sucked into the vortex of global demands, all to the detriment of Canadian interests and Canadian values and, more important, the safety and effectiveness of our own soldiers overseas.

The subject before us tonight at least in part is Haiti. The cause of peace in Haiti is undeniably a noble one. The prospect of bringing some measure of political health and economic stability to that tormented land tempts us to throw our resources into the fray without a backward glance. I am especially concerned about Haiti because the potential for a lengthy, worsening disaster there may outweigh any potential for good. Haiti seems to lack that one characteristic that underlies all working democracies, self-restraint. There is no real commitment to peaceful political action by anybody, by either side. Any leader must retain that power not by the will of the people but by the number of his guns and the willingness of his henchmen to repress political enemies with brutal force.

Is there a possibility of developing peace there or must we sit there year after year like we sit in Bosnia, keeping a fictitious peace that neither side actually wants?

I am not convinced that the deal pulled together by Mr. Carter and Mr. Clinton will bring lasting peace. The government they are bringing in may not be a whole lot better than the one that is being deposed. A member of my own constituency who has lived there since 1942, until recently, mentioned to me that during the last set of so-called democratic elections in Haiti government supporters burned alive a number of victims, including one Protestant pastor who was one of 13 presidential candidates without anyone voicing any objection.

(2020)

My constituent claims also that during this time many of the people of Haiti who offer the only hope of running Haiti's economy, those who have some education and expertise, Haitians themselves, will be very reluctant to return to Haiti if a poor type of so-called democracy is instituted there.

From his letter, they understand that Aristide's threatening language on his shortwave broadcast to Haiti has caused many of them to leave already. Aristide is also schooled in Marxist liberation theology.

That is a doctrine that advocates bloodshed in order to redistribute wealth and power within a country. In effect, I fear that the U.S. led forces may be unwittingly supporting a form of government that will probably have the worst of both worlds, a quasi-democratic, propped up government that would leave the

unfortunate Haitians with more years of uncertainty and violence and will force peacekeeping activities, as Mr. MacKenzie said for many years to come.

I am appalled at the American vacillation in Haiti. The Americans waited and waited. When they finally went in because of the horrifying human rights abuses supposedly to restore justice and good government somehow they left the old government still in power.

These henchmen need not surrender weapons and the government will be allowed to stay in Haiti even after they step down. Mr. Clinton will remove these American troops just after Mr. Aristide returns to power.

What we are really doing is cooking up a fine recipe for a potential civil war. It is no wonder that Mr. Aristide refuses to comment on the deal worked out by Mr. Carter. He knows he will be walking into a potential powder keg. The people who are in power there now have already demonstrated their cruelty.

Once the Americans are gone they will push for power again in not, I assure members, a democratic way. We read in today's *Globe and Mail* that: "This is just what General Cedras wanted. Cedras will not budge. He will remain and is likely to lead a new political force in Haiti".

As if this were not enough. Now that American troops have arrived their soldiers for some reason must sit back and watch government police beat and kill innocent citizens. This is truly a travesty. We thought America went into Haiti to correct human rights abuses but I have been profoundly disappointed by the inability or inaction of the American government forces.

The point of all that is that because of the impotence of the American forces and the continuing presence of General Cedras, the safety of our own forces who will be attending in Haiti is very much in question.

Once the Americans are gone from Haiti, our people could be viewed as the enemies by General Cedras and his people. Canadians and other UN forces could be viewed as political liabilities by the former government and become targets of vicious attacks.

Our Prime Minister should inform Mr. Clinton and the coalition forces that if instability in the country continues, we will consider our own forces unprotected and we will not participate in any further efforts in Haiti.

Yes, on the broader term, as demand for our help grows there is a growing need as we have been talking about tonight to define our peacekeeping functions, to set limits before Canadians are sent into these life threatening situations and do not do it afterwards.

Allow me to suggest some practical guidelines that would allow us to limit our involvements. The first limit is the goal of the venture which would include a measurable way of deciding when our goals have been achieved. When these goals are

Government Orders

realized, we would have to withdraw from the theatre. It is as simple as that.

The goal should not necessarily be only to restore a Canadian style democracy. In some countries real democracy is impossible at this time because there is no tradition of non-violent political action and there is no commitment to populous government by any of the factions that are warring for power.

Our goals at least in the peacekeeping aspect of foreign policy should not be solely to impose our perception of good government in a country since our forum may differ radically from the centuries of practice there.

Our goals should be non-ideological, to help and protect suffering civilians, to negotiate conditions under which human rights may be improved.

(2025)

Our goals should be less political and instead concentrate on basic human needs and infrastructure to establish peaceful, humane and safe conditions within the disputed territories and to promote dialogue between the enemies, not to fight their battles or to impose the form of democracy where the substance of democracy does not already exist.

The second limit is command. Who will control our troops? It must not, I believe, be the UN, the United States or some other country. We must be guaranteed complete command over our own forces because no one cares about Canadian interest and Canadian soldiers like other Canadians.

The next limit must be the cost. How much are we willing to commit beforehand to the effort, assuming that our troops will be well supplied and well trained? Once we have set aside an amount it will help us to specify the fourth limit, the size of our peacekeeping contingent.

The fifth essential limit is the duration of the commitment. We need to specify a maximum time that our peacekeepers will stay in a given situation, a time when they must withdraw if there has been no real progress toward peace.

The sixth limit is the duties our troops will undertake in co-ordination with other international participants. I should mention that in the foreign affairs trip to the UN last week, the UN representatives suggested that we could concentrate on specialty units, our communications ability, our engineers, the things that Canadians do well and are known for.

Regardless, whether it is regular troops or specialty units, as peacekeepers we must remain neutral or our ability to act as effective peacekeepers in whatever situation will quickly dissolve and our worldwide reputation as effective peacekeepers will be eroded. That is why I have much less support for the so-called peacemaking aspect that has been discussed here

tonight where the United Nation forces effectively move into a country and do battle with its government.

The seventh limit is with regard to risk; the intensity levels of the conflict to which our troops should be exposed. I believe that we should, as a matter of course, commit our troops only to situations of low intensity warfare. In a high intensity situation there is at best marginal hope for any kind of peace. Therefore, if a war situation increases from a low intensity to a danger level, a high intensity, our troops should be withdrawn or at least in a position to withdraw especially when those men and women may need to deal with changing equipment requirements and so on.

How could these limits be formalized? That question has been raised across the way several times tonight. What would be an avenue by which they could be made public, explored and discussed before the government made the decision? The answer is simple. We could develop a process for formalizing our peacekeeping commitments by allowing Parliament to decide these questions.

For several decades Canada has taken on informal commitments as a peacekeeper and it has done an admirable job. I can think of no greater international task for a government than to assist in the cause of peace. We have in part defined ourselves as Canadians by our peacekeeping efforts but the time has come I believe to be overt about it. The time has come to formalize our role in the world and to formalize the approval process by which Canada becomes involved in peacekeeping efforts.

Canada needs to identify itself in a formal way as global peacekeepers through the introduction and passage of a peacekeeping bill, an act that would limit this government and successive governments to specific prior peacekeeping commitments after full parliamentary debate and approval rather than a speech or two on a Wednesday night. It is a disservice to this House, to our allies abroad, to the Canadian people and above all to the brave men and women who daily risk their lives on the firing lines not to protect them by prescribing limits through a peacekeeping bill.

Let us take an example. If we would have prescribed limits on our involvement in the former Yugoslavia we would have known exactly how many troops to deploy. That number has been shifting now for three years. I have people in my own riding from one CER, from CFB Chilliwack, who have gone for six month stints over to Rwanda and then home for one month. They are so over committed that the government seems to have no idea where they are heading. These people have not been home in almost 18 months. We would have been able to budget for it, had we known ahead of time. In reality, costs especially in the former Yugoslavia have ballooned astronomically without any real accomplishments. It seems as if we are back to square one

Government Orders

again today. We may be simply forestalling the inevitable final conflict and the victory for one side or the other.

(2030)

If we had this peacekeeping bill we would have been able to prescribe a time limit for our efforts. I suggest we would have been out of Bosnia by now if we had a peacekeeping bill to guide us. Most Canadians agree. Back in January of this year a poll showed that nearly six in ten Canadians wanted Canada out of Bosnia. Now the percentage must be even higher since we are struggling along day after day in a worsening situation without any prospect of peace in sight. We ought to be pulling out of Bosnia. We ought to pass a peacekeeping bill before we become involved in other conflicts around the world.

Yet in March of this year another poll showed that almost 60 per cent of Canadians wanted Canada to increase its involvement in peacekeeping generally. The opinions are the same in various regions of Canada. This shows there is a broad support for Canada's role as a peacekeeper, but there is less support for situations where Canada gets enmeshed in an irreversible situation.

Allow me then to repeat the possible contents of this peacekeeping bill that tries to reconcile these two things: the wish on the one hand of the Canadian people to be involved in peacekeeping efforts around the world, and on the other hand not wanting Canadian troops to be committed in these irreversible situations. There are eight main limits.

The first would be to set out the goals of the mission. When these goals were realized we would have to withdraw from the theatre.

The second would be to specify that all Canadian troops must fall under Canadian commanders.

The third would specify the cost of the action. When Canada has expended its funds it would have to withdraw or seek approval again from Parliament.

The fourth limit would be the size of the Canadian contingent.

The fifth would set out the duration of the effort.

The sixth would specify the duties of our troops within the broader international force.

The seventh is the risk of the exposure of our peacekeepers.

The eighth and final limit is perhaps the most important one. Any peacekeeping involvement over a certain size and duration would require approval of the House by a resolution of Parliament before the commitment was made. This would ensure proper discussion. It would ensure that we know where we are

going. It would mean that our commitment would be clear to our allies and clear to the folks back home, clear to our troops. It would be clear that Parliament and all members had been able to contribute to decisions about Canada's peacekeeping efforts.

What should the government do now about Haiti?

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry. The member's time has expired. I should have indicated earlier that his time was expiring.

Colleagues, there are three members who wish to speak in this debate. As it happens, there are two Liberals and one Reformer. I wonder if everyone might agree so that everyone who wants to can speak to have 10-minute speeches with no questions for any of the speakers. Is that agreeable to all members?

I think it would be implied that the member who just spoke will not have a question and answer period as well. Is that agreeable?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased tonight to address in this House the issue of peacekeeping and the role of Canadian peacekeepers.

As a member of the Joint Committee on Foreign Affairs responsible for developing a new foreign policy, I am glad to see that most interventions only confirm the numerous comments and briefs received by our committee.

Throughout our hearings, and especially in Quebec City, we were told again and again, I must repeat, that Canada cannot and should not get involved in any armed conflict or even be part of each and every peacekeeping mission across the world.

Canada's role must be redefined according to our resources and our capacities and should only concern peacekeeping. But even though this peacekeeping role cannot be fulfilled blindly, participation criteria should be made clear and applied strictly.

(2035)

We must also make sure that this peacekeeping includes a training phase. Why? Because Canada must also learn to limit the duration of these peacekeeping missions. In order to do so, Canada will have to show leadership in the training area by helping inexperienced countries, either through symposiums or national training programs.

That is why I commend our minister of Foreign Affairs for his view of the role Canada should play in the current Haitian crisis.

Canada took no part, not even symbolically, in the multilateral landing in Haiti. Yes, not even symbolically, and this was very

Government Orders

important; this to me means a lot and represents a very big step in a new direction, that is a Canadian commitment to peacekeeping in the world.

Canada will participate in Haiti in the preliminary planning of the UN mission. This planning is not only important but crucial and shows that Canada does not want to commit itself blindly, without knowing the consequences.

What is more, and this is something new and important, as early as mid-October, Canada will train a contingent of up to 100 Haitian police officers in Regina. Here is a clear sign that this government is changing course and I am sure that it will find the needed support among Canadian people.

[*English*]

Mr. Bill Graham (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to participate in this important debate. Like the member for Red Deer and the member for Fraser Valley East who spoke here earlier this evening, I too have been participating in the foreign affairs review. As members of that committee, we have seen how interested Canadians from all walks of life are in the changes that have taken place in the world and the participation we as Canadians are making in it.

The member for Vancouver Quadra spoke eloquently about the end of the cold war and what the effect of that has meant. What it has meant for Canadians is not that we have had a peace dividend as a result of the end of the cold war, but that there has been a creation of a state of instability. There are more local and regional wars going on around the world today than at any other time in the 20th century.

The reason for that was explained to us when we were in New York at the security council and I think it is evident to all. At the time of the cold war there was a need for the superpowers to ensure that local conflicts did not arise. Now whole continents like Africa are subject to enormous strains, stresses and conflicts, without any need for a superpower to ensure that peace is kept there. This can move to other areas. We have seen it in Cambodia; we have seen it elsewhere. We see it in the former Yugoslavia.

Canada has an interest in this problem. The member for Red Deer seemed to think these problems of pestilence and famine and refugees were a long way away from us and were not our problem. The problem is that in today's world, in an integrated world, everyone is our neighbour. And when our neighbour's house is on fire we had better be part of the fire equipment trying to put it out or we are going to get burned and consumed by those flames, whether they come to us in the form of disease, in the form of refugees or in the form of the violence which is occurring in other parts of the world.

When we look at the type of violence occurring in various parts of the world we see a new form of war. A very eloquent spokesperson at the United Nations told us that these were no longer wars between fighting militias, that most of the casual-

ties are civilians. The Bosnian snipers are not sitting sniping at one another. They are sniping at women and children trying to get water from a well, trying to conduct their normal lives.

Does the House know there are something like 110 million mines presently sown around the world, with another 2.5 million being sown every year? There is no capacity to remove those. The amount of agricultural land that is being removed and unavailable to people is creating a social problem down the road which is going to affect us all.

Canada not only has its own interests involved, we have a moral obligation in these circumstances. We also have expertise and values that make us desirable. All of us today were proud today to recognize Major-General Dallaire in the gallery. It is clear that his type of professionalism and expertise is the type of role Canadians can play on this extraordinarily complicated stage of world affairs into which we are entering.

(2040)

When we were in New York with our committee we heard from the United Nations' authorities about the need for Canadian peacekeepers because of our values, because we are not American, because we are not a great power. We bring a certain expertise and a certain value of being conciliators to our role. They need at the United Nations particular types of troops. They need communications personnel. They need medical personnel. They need police. The role of the RCMP in the former Yugoslavia is incredible.

I attended a lecture recently given by Michael Ignatieff who some members may have seen with his television program on the problems in that area. He spoke eloquently about the extraordinary role that the RCMP played bringing order to a community and enabling people to be able to live together.

This is a Canadian story. This is why it makes sense to be where our government has chosen to be. Our government is to be commended for being in Rwanda. Our government is to be commended for being in Haiti. Why? It is because the United Nations asked us to be there. We responded to a United Nations call.

There is a new reality in this world. We are partners in the United Nations. We are partners in peacekeeping in those parts of the world with our United Nations' partners. Part of the reality is that there is a reform of the United Nations' institutions presently taking place that will correspond to the new type of peacekeeping of which Canada can be a leader. There is a reform of those institutions. There will be a reform of the Security Council. There will be a reform of the way in which the United Nations delivers these peacekeeping operations.

If Canada participates fully she can be a leader in offering a way in which that reform will take place. It will be of benefit to us as Canadians and to the world as a whole. It will include providing intelligence at the UN. It will include UN monitoring. Some of the reforms are there. Other reforms are to come. We

Government Orders

are a participant in it because we participate in peacekeeping activities and are a leader in those activities.

We also will be a leader in what I would call the new areas that we must examine. There are the traditional peacekeeping activities that we have heard a great deal about in the House today but I want to urge the House to consider some of the evidence that we heard in New York about the need for humanitarian interventions that, if exercised at the right time, not militarily, still have an effect.

We heard the story of Dubrovnik where UNICEF went in. They were not men with machine guns but UNICEF members who went in to save children. They went in with publicity. The effect of that was to stop the bombardment of Dubrovnik in 28 days.

There is no reason why Canadians with their expertise in participating in peacekeeping activities, why these reserves that we have heard about with the tremendous experience that they have in their civilian life, cannot be brought to bear in a way to create novel, new ways to participate in peacekeeping without the old militaristic way of doing it. Can we not bring in a sense of Canadian values that will enable others to resolve their problems peacefully.

It is something that we can be leaders in urging the United Nations to adopt. I am sure that other members, including members from all parties in the House who have been actively participating in the committee's activities will be anxious to pursue and examine those opportunities.

[*Translation*]

In concluding, I would like to mention something that I think is rather strange about tonight's debate and it is the lack of a national dimension in our speeches.

I was deeply touched by the Leader of the Opposition when he said that Canada's work for peace is one of the finest things it does—I believe that I am quoting him correctly. That is true. But, as a Canadian, as a person born in Quebec and very proud of our armed forces, for instance the Royal 22nd Regiment, I ask myself a question.

(2045)

When we take pride in these organizations, when we see what we could achieve with a united army, the Royal 22e Regiment from Quebec City and the Princess Patricia's from Calgary, when we see what we can do as a united country, we wonder what role an independent Quebec and what role a divided Canada would have in peacekeeping.

I think that what we have here is an example of the way Canada can change the world. We can change the world if we

remain united, if we participate with the strength of a united economy and a united people. We cannot achieve that if we are divided into smaller parts; the world would be poorer and we would be poorer as well.

[*English*]

Mr. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to finish off a long day today for everybody to speak on Canada's role in peacekeeping.

We are all very fortunate to be a member of this great country that has had an exemplary reputation in its role of peacekeeping and peacemaking throughout this century. It is a part of our international identity and one that has enabled us to have enormous gains both economically as well as diplomatically. It has allowed us to exert a power in this world beyond the size of our country.

All around the world Canadians have been working long and hard often risking their lives to bring peace to areas wracked by civil strife, conflict and human suffering. We are fortunate in this country to be in a very special situation. Few countries in the world share the international reputation that we have in Canada as being honest brokers.

Few countries in the world have the vast connections, enormous peacekeeping and human rights experience without the aggressive colonial history. We are also looked upon as being straight shooters and honest in our dealings.

It is this special and unique situation that has enabled us to be a world leader in foreign affairs. In fact I believe that we as a country can change the face and the way in which countries interact with each other in the 21st century. It will be a need, mark my words, that will be placed on our shoulders. It will challenge us and it will be a need that we cannot ignore because few countries in the world with the exception of some European countries have the ability to do this.

It will enable us to have a proactive foreign policy instead of a reactive one. No country in the world has a proactive foreign policy. They are all reactive, the United States included. This costs more because as conflicts occur, they boil up and get out of control. It costs us a lot less to get into these situations earlier than later.

I will come back to this later, but let us first look at our need for peacekeeping and peacemaking in the world. It is patently evident that the number of conflicts that exist in the world are going to escalate in the post cold war era. Rather than getting a peace dividend we have an era of greater uncertainty than we have had in recent memory. No longer are the antagonists and protagonists so easily defined. Also, security must be redefined.

Government Orders

I would submit that as well as military security must involve the environment, economic, political and social. But when a nation's security is being threatened as I have defined it either through military intervention or otherwise, we get the mass migrations of people as we saw as a consequence in Rwanda. With the absence of human needs and resources conflicts are bound to erupt and escalate.

Diminishing resources, civil strife, political and social disintegration, poverty and mass migration such as we have seen, all these combine to create environments that produce conflicts which call for greater demands on our international assistance role. It is international assistance that we will be asked to give and it will increase in the future. But we as a country must decide beforehand what conflicts we are going to get involved in and which ones we will not.

We have already dealt with this and speakers in my caucus have eloquently spoken to this, so I will not deal with it. Suffice it to say we must develop a criteria as to which ones we will get involved in and which ones we will not.

By being selective we will be able to fulfil our obligations in peacemaking and peacekeeping in an effective fashion as opposed to trying to be all things to all people and be unsuccessful in doing so.

(2050)

This is a double edged sword, for it will produce a crisis of conscience in the Canadian people as the number of conflicts that we are forced to engage in will increase, Nigeria, Cuba, Kashmir, South Korea. They are all potentially going to blow up in the future. Be forewarned that it is going to be very difficult for the Canadian people to turn their backs when they see the carnage which is going to potentially occur on the television set.

In order to avoid these crises of conscience, in order to save money we must avoid the problem. Herein lies the solution. I would submit that we must decrease the number of conflicts by getting involved in them earlier. That is where our special role as a country comes in.

In my capacity as a physician I believe it is a lot easier to involve preventive medicine than to treat a disease when it happens. I think we ought to apply this idea in our foreign policy.

This is where Canada's role comes in, where our expertise and our special relationship in the world can be used as an honest broker to diffuse these situations before they happen. Canada must involve existing multinational organizations such as the UN, the OAS and the OAU. We must strive for diplomatic solutions and put pressure through multinational organizations and through diplomatic efforts to arrive at diplomatic solutions

to ease these conflicts. We must also decide beforehand on what graded levels of intervention we are going to have.

I also believe that a regional solution is better because the people in the area understand the social and cultural dynamics of their region. In addition, I believe it is also in their interest and responsibility to share in the security of their region. Canada cannot nor should it foot the bill for conflicts all over the world. That is why we have regional organizations and that is why they must share the costs of these endeavours to avert disasters and catastrophes before they happen.

Where peacekeepers are necessary I believe the first role of Canada should be to convince regional organizations to put forth their troops and equipment in the field in lieu of Canadian troops. Canada and other non-regional organizations can then provide technical assistance where necessary.

Another aspect I would like to deal with, and it is of a personal nature I must admit, is in view of the Cairo conference on population development. Populations are expanding geometrically on this planet and with this increase in population comes the increase in human activity and utilization of finite resources which in turn causes competition for resources. This in turn will cause political, economical and social instability and ultimately civil strife and mass migrations from areas that have to areas that have not. This would in turn produce a demand on our country for our peacekeeping needs and also for developmental assistance.

I would implore this government to look at giving a larger section of our dwindling foreign aid package in favour of family planning endeavours and education which are critical to address this problem, for only by engaging in this, along with our foreign aid and trade policies, will we be able to ensure that basic human necessities of people are met and that civil strife and conflicts are averted.

This is not about morals. It is about caring. We as a country consider ourselves to be a kind and compassionate society. I am not asking us to look into the future five years, but let us look fifty and one hundred years into the future. It took from the beginning of time to 1950 to create a population of 2.5 billion. It took a mere 37 years to double that to 5.7 billion. By the year 2030 we will have 11 billion people on this planet.

This growth is unsustainable and will produce conflicts in those regions. That is why we are obligated to address this problem right now.

The Deputy Speaker: It was an excellent debate. May I have your permission to call it nine o'clock?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

*Adjournment Debate***ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS***[English]*

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. Randy White (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to reidentify the question that I asked in the House on Monday past. The question I believe was perhaps misunderstood or perhaps the minister of immigration just did not know how to answer it and I would like to represent it.

My question was when will the minister stop holding out as one of the last lone defenders of a policy that a vast majority of Canadians, even his own officials, see as being out of touch.

The response I got was that it would be very unfortunate if we were simply to draw wild conclusions from every single document coming from any department.

Perhaps I should put the question a little plainer. It is about drawing conclusions. The issue I have at hand is a Mr. Salinas Mendoza, an individual who has been in this country since 1988. He has had 12 criminal convictions. He was deported. The reason he was deported is that a young lady who was sexually molested had agreed with crown counsel and immigration to have the charges stayed on the condition that he be deported and, lo and behold, he was escorted out of our country and two or three months later he was back in our country. The young lady virtually ran into him in a grocery store.

The question is obvious. Is it really a wild conclusion that this individual should be back? He actually identified himself at the Douglas border crossing in Vancouver and he was told to apply for his refugee status at another hearing.

By the way, I am into the fifth or sixth hearing with this fellow and I have to ask the question is it just a wild conclusion that this individual should not be back?

I want to ask as well in conjunction with that if it is a wild conclusion that the young lady who was sexually molested has virtually no help from government funding and so on to help her with her feelings. After six hearings and there are three more coming up, what has happened is that taxpayers' money has been found to provide for a refugee hearing officer, two refugee board members, an interpreter for this fellow, an individual from legal aid. We also found a way at his request to find an individual from the United Nations to observe.

Is it a wild conclusion that this illegal immigrant criminal is treated better than the young lady? Is it a wild conclusion that I find myself under investigation by the privacy commissioner at the request of this illegal alien, this criminal, who has 12 charges and one outstanding rape charge?

Is it a wild conclusion to think that my rights are probably a little less than those of this individual? You have a member of Parliament duly elected by Canadian citizens who is actually the one under investigation. It sounds a little reversed. I am wondering if that is a wild conclusion.

Finally, is it a wild conclusion to assume that in one week in July this individual is considered by an immigration adjudicator to be a danger to the public? An appeal is made and seven days later another immigration adjudicator lets him out on the street. Is it a wild conclusion to think that one hand in that department does not know what the other hand is doing?

My question remains what on earth is going on in this department and is the answer that I am drawing wild conclusions from the minister of immigration?

Ms. Mary Clancy (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I stand here to ensure that the minister of immigration is neither lone nor lonely.

The minister has already stated very clearly in the House his department has just concluded an unprecedented eight-month consultation process during which he has heard the views of Canadians from all walks of life from all across the country.

During these consultations he has been advised to limit family class immigration and also to increase it. Some people want him to reduce the number of refugees admitted and others want him to expand it. A broad section of the people in the country have come forward with their views and now it is the responsibility of the minister to study these recommendations and to devise a long term immigration strategy that will serve the needs of all Canadians.

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West): The guy is on the streets.

Ms. Clancy: I was kind enough not to interrupt the hon. member. Perhaps he could do me the same courtesy.

This will continue to meet our longstanding objectives of reuniting families, bringing economic benefits to Canada and providing protection to those who need it.

While these consultations have been taking place all government departments have been required to review the operation of their programs in order to determine their cost effectiveness, appropriateness and efficiency.

During the review of these programs in citizenship and immigration officials have considered recommendations which reflect those heard during the consultations. However, it is important to remember that these are parallel and not competing activities. They do not cancel one another out. They are both necessary and valid sources of advice and information upon which the minister will make his decisions on the long term strategy.

Adjournment Debate

Furthermore, they are not the only things which the minister must take into account. He must also factor in Canada's international obligations and the positions of the provinces.

Decisions on the future immigration strategy have not yet been taken but this House can rest assured they will be taken by a minister who will act in the best interests of all Canadians, not on the basis of occasional opinion polls.

The Deputy Speaker: Order. Time has expired.

Pursuant to Standing Order 38(5), the motion to adjourn the House is now deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 9.02 p.m.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Wednesday, September 21, 1994

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Government Services

Mr. Bellemare 5935

Canadian Economy

Mr. Crête 5935

Agriculture

Mr. Williams 5935

New Directions

Mrs. Terrana 5935

Railways

Mr. DeVillers 5936

The Environment

Mr. Collins 5936

Manpower Training

Mr. Paré 5936

Rod Hay

Mr. Breitkreuz (Yellowhead) 5936

Canada

Mrs. Stewart (Brant) 5937

1999 Pan-American Games

Mr. Walker 5937

Michael Strange	
Mr. Pillitteri	5937

1992 Referendum	
Mr. Duceppe	5937

The Reform Party	
Mr. Johnston	5937

Referendum on Quebec Sovereignty	
Mr. Gagnon (Bonaventure—Îles-de-la-Madeleine)	5938

Haiti	
Mr. Robinson	5938

Terry Fox Run	
Ms. Guarnieri	5938

Radio–Restigouche Community Radio Station	
Mr. Arseneault	5938

Presence in Gallery	
The Speaker	5938

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Haiti	
Mr. Bouchard	5939
Mr. Ouellet	5939
Mr. Bouchard	5939
Mr. Ouellet	5939
Mr. Bouchard	5939
Mr. Ouellet	5939

Collection of Unpaid Taxes	
Mr. Brien	5939

Mr. Anderson	5940
Mr. Brien	5940
Mr. Anderson	5940

The Economy

Mr. Manning	5940
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5940
Mr. Manning	5940
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5940
Mr. Manning	5941
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5941

Duplication and Overlap

Mr. Loubier	5941
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5941
Mr. Loubier	5941
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5941

National Unity

Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	5942
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5942
Mr. Harper (Calgary West)	5942
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5942

Francophones in Kingston

Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	5942
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5942
Mrs. Tremblay (Rimouski—Témiscouata)	5942
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5942

Canadian Security Intelligence Service

Ms. Meredith	5943
Mr. Gray	5943
Ms. Meredith	5943
Mr. Gray	5943

Tainted Blood

Mrs. Picard	5943
-------------------	------

Ms. Marleau	5943
Mrs. Picard	5943
Ms. Marleau	5943

Gun Control

Mr. Crawford	5943
Mr. Rock	5943

Immigration

Mr. Hanger	5944
Mr. Marchi	5944
Mr. Hanger	5944
Mr. Marchi	5944

Unemployment Insurance

Mrs. Lalonde	5944
Mr. Chrétien (Saint–Maurice)	5944
Mrs. Lalonde	5944
Mr. Martin (LaSalle—Émard)	5945

Dangerous Offenders

Mr. Thompson	5945
Mr. Rock	5945
Mr. Thompson	5945
Mr. Rock	5945

Port of Quebec City

Mrs. Brushett	5945
Mr. Dupuy	5945

Canada Labour Code

Mr. St–Laurent	5946
Mr. Lincoln	5946

Health

Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5946
--------------------------	------

Privilege

Bill C-41—Comments during debate

Mr. Robinson	5946
--------------------	------

Points of Order

Alleged Unparliamentary Language

Miss Grey	5946
Mr. Gray	5946
The Speaker	5947

Comments during Question Period

Mr. Hill (MacLeod)	5947
The Speaker	5947

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions

Mr. Milliken	5947
--------------------	------

Interparliamentary Delegations

Mr. LeBlanc (Cape Breton Highlands—Canso)	5947
Mr. Rompkey	5947

Canada Elections Act

Bill C-267. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5947
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	5947

Plain Language Act

Bill C-268. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5947
Mr. White (North Vancouver)	5947

Canada Pension Plan

Bill C-269. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5948
Mr. Szabo	5948

Members of Parliament Retiring Allowances Act

Bill C-270. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5948
Mr. Solomon	5948

Yukon First Nations Land Claims Settlement Act

Bill C-271. Motions for introduction and first reading deemed adopted	5948
Mr. Hill (Prince George—Peace River)	5948

Membership of Committee

Mr. Milliken	5948
Motion	5948

Foreign Policy

Motion	5949
Mr. Milliken	5949
(Motion agreed to.)	5949

Petitions

Violence

Mr. Duhamel	5949
-------------------	------

Human Rights

Mr. Grubel	5949
------------------	------

Abortion

Mr. Grubel	5949
------------------	------

Assisted Suicide

Mr. Grubel	5949
------------------	------

Indian Affairs

Ms. McLaughlin	5949
----------------------	------

Assisted Suicide

Mr. O'Brien	5949
Mr. Kerpan	5949

Human Rights	
Mr. Kerpan	5949
Assisted Suicide	
Mr. Robinson	5950
Bill C-91	
Mr. Solomon	5950
Human Rights	
Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	5950
Child Abuse	
Mr. Adams	5950
First Nations	
Mr. Adams	5950
Human Rights	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5950
Euthanasia	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5950
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Hill (Macleod)	5950
Human Rights	
Mrs. Jennings	5950
Divorce Act	
Mrs. Jennings	5950
Rights of the Unborn	
Mr. Finlay	5951
Human Rights	
Mr. Finlay	5951
Official Languages	
Mr. Frazer	5951

Euthanasia

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) 5951

Abortion

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) 5951

Human Rights

Mr. Harper (Simcoe Centre) 5951

Mr. Johnston 5951

Private Members' Bills

Mr. White (North Vancouver) 5951

Questions on the Order Paper

Mr. Milliken 5951

Motions for Papers

Mr. Milliken 5952

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Peacekeeping

Motion 5952

Mr. Ouellet 5952

Mr. Bouchard 5955

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) 5959

Mr. Robinson 5962

Mr. Collenette 5964

Mr. Hart 5965

Mr. Mills (Red Deer) 5966

Mrs. Stewart (Northumberland) 5966

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Criminal Code

Bill C-215. Motion for second reading 5968

Mr. Robinson	5968
Mr. McTeague	5970
Mr. Daviault	5971
Mr. MacLellan	5973
Ms. Skoke	5975
Mr. Thompson	5975

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Peacekeeping

Consideration of motion resumed.	5976
Mr. Crête	5976
Mr. Williams	5979
Mr. Peric	5980
Mr. McWhinney	5981
Mr. Strahl	5982
Mr. Hart	5983
Mr. Mifflin	5986
Mr. O'Brien	5987
Mr. Strahl	5988
Mr. Hart	5989
Mr. Assadourian	5989
Mr. Frazer	5990
Mr. Mills (Red Deer)	5990
Mr. Strahl	5991
Mr. Patry	5994
Mr. Graham	5995
Mr. Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca)	5996

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Immigration

Mr. White (Fraser Valley West)	5998
Ms. Clancy	5998

Appendix