Estimates flowing from the United States practice attacks that have taken place in the Middle East against fortifications similar to those which are said to be in place in Kuwait and in parts of Iraq, place the casualty rate has been at upward of 50 per cent, of those who would have been killed in these mock exercises.

I have two sons—I have one who is 23 and another who is about to turn 16. How many children, how many young people from our country on ships, planes and on the ground in the Persian Gulf does she expect to die as a consequence of military action? Would she bring herself to answer that practical and down-to-earth question for her constituents in Bourassa? Would she bring herself to answer the question for constituents of all of us who face the prospect of sons and daughters dying in a war thousands of miles away, having to do with the price of petroleum, having to do with the national interests of the United States, and having very little to do with the national interests of this country? What is her estimate of the number of Canadians who will die in military action as a consequence of the armed recourse which she recommends?

• (2000)

[Translation]

Mrs. Gibeau: Madam Speaker, the hon. member has just managed to pull off a feat worthy of the great Greek tragedies. I would like to return the question to him: How many children is he willing to sacrifice in Kuwait? How many women and children is he willing to let starve through economic sanctions that we know are not 100 per cent effective because there are leaks everywhere. It is not only food that leaks into Iraq through Iran, but also military equipment. My colleague opposite knows that. Sanctions are not effective. Borders are not tightly closed. We are dismissing our responsibilities to save our necks. I am talking about mine and yours. How far will hypocrisy go to save whose neck?

The hon. member is saying that children out there are not important, neither those from Kuwait, nor those from Iraq and neighbouring countries seriously threatened because an individual has decided that starving his people to him.

Government Orders

I find it unfortunate that a person would use this House to raise fears that are real, but at the same time to hide behind those fears. And that person belongs to a party that claims to be responsible.

[English]

Mr. Ron MacDonald (Dartmouth): Madam Speaker, I have a question for the hon. member for Bourassa. It is quite simple. We are being intellectually dishonest here. We are debating a motion, pretending that it deals with a UN resolution so that we can all feel good in this place. In actual fact, we are debating a motion to give approval to send Canadian men and women of our Armed Forces to war.

What I want to ask the member, clearly and cleanly is if she believes that an affirmative vote on this motion gives the Prime Minister of this country, without further recall of this Parliament, the authorization to order Canadian forces into a theatre of war, in the event that American forces go into Iraq or Kuwait.

[Translation]

Mrs. Marie Gibeau (Bourassa): Madam Speaker, I have heard the words "intellectual dishonesty". I do not know to whom they apply. They do not apply to this side of the House. Maybe he wants them applied to himself. I have said in my speech at the very beginning that I had been impressed by the quality and by the serioussness of the debates heard up to now. I do hope we will not witness a deterioration as we get closer to the deadline.

My colleague's question has no link with the present debate. I fail to see why we are departing. The subject under debate refers to responsibility. Does Canada really pretend to belong to the international community? Will Canada really fulfill its commitments to the United Nations? Will Canada really respect its so-called principle that, all peoples are equal for the United Nations?

[English]

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in this very important debate. The motion under Government Business reads: