

send young people into war, and that would be the last option.

As a member of the Liberal Party, I have been very supportive of all actions taken with respect to support of the United Nations and the Security Council and rejoice in the fact that, for once, the world is starting to stand up and speak with a concerted and joint voice about actions that are abhorrent to all of us. At the same time, I have serious concerns and reservations as I read the resolutions. I really would like some guidance and help from my hon. colleague.

First of all, in the government's business, Motion No. 24, the government intends to direct the vote tomorrow so that we would accept all subsequent resolutions that come out of the United Nations. I have a worry about that. Knowing my hon. colleague, I do not think he buys anything without seeing the contents or knowing the ramifications of the letter he might sign or the endorsement that he might give.

Knowing that about my colleague and seeing this suggestion to support subsequent resolutions, I looked very carefully today at the resolution that the United Nations is suggesting in its draft before the Security Council. That really has concerned and upset me because of what this resolution says, and perhaps the member can clarify. It authorizes member states, co-operating with the government of Kuwait, to use all necessary means to uphold and implement Security Council resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.

I ask him: can he define who can authorize this member state? Can any member state take an activity or an action that it deems worthy without going through the United Nations; and, second, who is and what is the area? Is that what the hon. member wants us to sign? I am really concerned.

• (1920)

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, it is an excellent question. I think that the wording is vague enough that it has given rise to several different interpretations. In a situation like this, it is most unfortunate that there would be any ambiguity because the stakes are very high in what we are dealing with.

I am looking at the text as it is printed in today's Order Paper. It reads as follows:

Government Orders

That this House, noting that the Government of Iraq has not complied with the United Nations Security Council resolutions concerning the invasion of Kuwait and the detention of third country nationals, supports the United Nations in its efforts to ensure compliance with Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions.

In other words, I take this, Mr. Speaker, to mean the resolutions that have been passed to date.

Mrs. Finestone: Not the resolution for tomorrow.

Mr. Boyer: That is correct. I raised this matter with the senior-most officials of External Affairs and others whom I consider to be knowledgeable, and this is also the interpretation. Therefore, I hope I can allay the hon. member's concerns about this. Certainly I do not feel that we in this House are being asked to, or for that matter ought to be asked to give some kind of blank cheque or to look into a crystal ball as to what subsequent resolutions might be passed at subsequent dates.

What I see this as being is another step in the systematic efforts of the Security Council and the United Nations to take this step by step. We are dealing here in the gulf with an extraordinarily complex and difficult situation which to date has been very well handled. It has been handled very well in great measure because of the comity of nations; the effort of Canada giving leadership to try to have unanimity at all stages and to take it step by step.

I will conclude my answer to the hon. member by saying very directly that as a Canadian and as a parliamentarian, I would not expect that the next stages where Canadians would be sent into a combat situation would be taken without the process being before the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the hon. member. I am very surprised at his comments. On this side of the House we feel that this is a declaration of war, that the Prime Minister has deliberately worded this in a vague fashion and in a manner to give approval to subsequent resolutions and to the present one, that is to allow any member state to take whatever action necessary.

The Prime Minister has a track record on this particular issue of authorizing deployment of Canadian military forces without the sanction of Parliament to the Persian Gulf.