

Government Orders

under United Nations auspices. In the event that those amendments are defeated, does the hon. member intend to vote for or against the government motion?

Or, Mr. Speaker, is he going to stand up and say: "Well, you know, we are trying hard to get an agreement. We are working really hard. We are hoping that there can be an all-party resolution." Is he going to be direct? Is he going to be straightforward? Is he going to tell the House whether he supports the resolution or not?

Mr. Pagtakhan: Mr. Speaker, I have always been direct in the House and I thank the hon. member for recognizing that fact.

The hon. member was trying to insinuate that I was consulting with my hon. colleague. Of course, I would like to consult with my colleague. In this particular instance, there was no consultation.

To answer the question, the hon. member was not listening very clearly to all the provisions that I indicated. I said, unless we can get the assurance from the government that it would be under United Nations stewardship, followed by debate in the House, we could not support the government's motion. The hon. member will see when the vote is called.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Comments are now terminated. On debate, the hon. member for Davenport.

Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, two days ago in the House an alternative motion was put forward at page 14250 of *Hansard* which contains three principles. One principle is that Canada is against invasions of all kinds. The second is that Canada supports the United Nations and its resolutions since the Kuwait invasion. And the third is that there will be a debate in Parliament should there be an outbreak of hostilities involving Canadian forces.

That resolution, it seems to me, is highly commendable. It contains a lot of wisdom. It is the result of negotiations that my party has initiated with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It has all the elements that would generate, I believe, a unanimous vote on the part of Parliament, which is extremely important if it is to have any impact at home and abroad.

We are against any form of invasion. In recent years, we have seen what happened in Afghanistan. You, Mr.

Speaker, and many present here tonight will remember the outrage in public opinion throughout the world against that invasion.

We also recall, perhaps a little further in the past, the invasion of Tibet which, unfortunately, did not provoke much of an outrage in the world community. Not only that, but it did not even provoke any movement of troops on the part of any of the superpowers to defend, protect, and restore the integrity of Tibet. I suspect that was due to the fact that Tibet does not have any oil wells. A comparison between the reaction of the world community to the invasion of Tibet and to the invasion of Kuwait is a very solitary and interesting lesson.

We have, in case of an outbreak of war in the Middle East, some horrendous consequences to contemplate, both in terms of human life and environmental damage. The debate here tonight does not lend itself to that kind of examination. I just want to make a very brief reference to that aspect which would horrify every thinking human being on this planet.

What disturbs us very much is that, in case of an outbreak, the line of command in that part of the world is not clearly defined. We do not know under whose command our troops and ships would be when the going gets rough. This is why we feel it is extremely desirable to find a way on Tuesday, when we vote on the motion, to adopt the proposed alternative put on the table only a couple of days ago. In that motion we have the establishment of a clear and important principle that it is under the flag of the UN and under the leadership of the world community as represented by the Security Council that our troops will operate.

We are in full agreement with the resolutions of the United Nations. We are in full agreement with the *modus operandi* of the United Nations. We believe there is a family of nations that function in this world, that it is a civilized one and basically very enlightened, and any territorial ambition or dispute, even the most legitimate perhaps within the boundaries of certain nations and public opinion of any given nation cannot be resolved by means of violence and invasion. This is the lesson of history which we have gradually, slowly, and painfully learned throughout time. Now, perhaps for the first time in a long time, the world community has coalesced behind this very important and critical point.