

*Government Orders*

**Mr. Boyer:** I make that comment in response to the approach which the hon. member with his own distinguished military career has raised in this House. I hope that clarifies the point.

**Mr. Nunziata:** It doesn't. It doesn't clarify anything.

**Mr. Mifflin:** I do thank the hon. member for those comments and I am delighted that he does share this view. After all it is a very key consideration. If this has clarified it and if that is the true meaning of it, then certainly I am at least more sympathetic to the resolution as it stands. There are still some problems with it but that certainly was one of the major problems.

Again, if I could be permitted, the term 'all necessary means' has been equated by some to mean immediate force. I do not believe that, quite frankly. I am worried about the date. I am worried that there will be another debate. The hon. member, as Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, has assured me that there would be. I will take that as face value. I feel a lot more secure since he has mentioned that, and I mean that genuinely and sincerely.

All necessary means could mean a lot of things. It could mean force in the middle of September next year. There is an important element to this term and let it not be lost on the public that this surely means something to Saddam Hussein as well. I think in fairness to the government and in fairness to the resolution itself, surely that has to be one of the reasons for that term. I do not quarrel with the term. We may eventually have to use it. I do quarrel somewhat with the time.

**Mr. Howard Crosby (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Treasury Board):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not need to tell members of this House that there is a divergence of opinion amongst Canadians on our involvement in the Middle East crisis situation. There are those who would not support any military action of any kind and I understand and appreciate their view. All I can say is that it is not my view. I think it is the view espoused by the members of the New Democratic Party, but it was not the view espoused by the members of the Liberal Party when they supported the resolution on October 23, 1990. The member was one of those who did support that resolution which made our position very

clear. We support the United Nations actions. We condemn the actions of Iraq. We condemn the invasion of Kuwait.

Our difficulty and problem is what we do in light of that condemnation. Our colleagues in the New Democratic Party did not share in that condemnation so they really have no issue to raise in this debate. Surely we must appeal to our colleagues in the Liberal Party to continue to support not the government but Canada in this situation. We call upon all members to support the efforts of Canada because what is at stake is the peaceful settlement of the dispute. It is not governments that are on trial. It is not ministers of defence, it is the process of peaceful settlement.

How are we going to contribute to that process? I cannot believe that the member believes defeat of a resolution proposed in this House will contribute to the process of peaceful settlement. He saw, as I did, our service people sail to the Middle East. He knows the commitment that he made. Surely he will ask himself: What can I do to support the commitment that our men in the armed forces are making.

Does he really believe that defeat of this resolution now before the House will help? We still reserve the right to make the final decision on what our forces do in the Middle East, that is the decision that will always remain in Canada. He knows that. Why would he stand there and attempt to defeat this resolution which is really in support of Canada and our Canadian forces?

**Mr. Mifflin:** Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. friend from Halifax West, whom I have known for many years. He is not normally this garrulous. I am surprised at his question to me because the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs has indeed suggested and clarified the difficulty I had. When I read these terms, it is the clarification the House has been seeking to ensure the compliance of the Security Council resolution 660 and subsequent resolutions up to now, that is up to October 28. He said that, if I understood him correctly, and that the support should not be interpreted as approval of the use of the Canadian forces for offensive action until there will be further consultation. He definitely said that. So, that is the subject of our amendment. What we are trying to do—