

S.O. 30

called. Even if the House unanimously endorses our motion or another motion further elaborating on it, we still, I think, must insist, and all nations like us in the world, and there are many, that we would want to see a full investigation conducted and the General Assembly called into special session to see if this could be made possible.

So from hearing absolute silence, to denial, to admitting that there were civilians aboard, to saying basically that they would do it again, to now vetoing a request to have the Secretary General of the United Nations conduct an investigation, we are, as many other speakers have said, really left to wonder whether the Soviet Union intends to conduct its further international affairs in a similar vein. Many have remarked that we do not want this terrible tragedy, this unwarranted attack, to colour the relations that nations must continue having together, particularly in the crucial area of arms control and disarmament. It seems to me that one of the good signs indicating that the United States will not allow this to interfere with arms control discussions is that it has not called off the negotiations. Indeed, on the contrary, it has encouraged the negotiations in Geneva to continue. It has not engaged in the kind of rhetoric that would so inflame East-West tensions that such negotiations would become impossible. I hope it does not engage in such rhetoric and I hope that we do not because, as many speakers have said, we must continue to find a peaceful resolution to our conflicts and disputes.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Axworthy) mentioned that there was not enough that was positive in our motion about what we are to do tomorrow. What do we do tomorrow to ensure the safety of passengers on civilian carriers on international routes including carriers that for whatever reason go off route? Actually, our motion said that we want action taken by the Government to ensure the protection of Canadians and citizens of other countries who travel on civilian aircraft on international routes.

We want Government action to be taken by this Government and other Governments, both in the United Nations and in the meetings of the International Civil Aviation Organization. That is what we are asking for. The Minister of Transport agreed that we must re-examine the rules relating to civil aviation, but all he had to offer was identification and communication. That is very important, but I could not help wondering about it since so many defence experts, particularly in the United States, have said several times over the last ten days that many airlines, Soviet, Cuban, Korean and others, do in fact allow their civilian carriers to participate in surveillance activities of military installations. That is electronic espionage, as some people call it. This comes from particularly knowledgeable people in the scientific defence community in the United States. Unless there are new regulations which will limit landing rights and over-flight permission to aircraft that are not engaging in such activities, then I do not think we can bring the kind of security we want to international air travellers. This is the message that I hope the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) will bring to the meeting of the International Civil Aviation Organization this week.

● (2230)

All of us in the House want to bring, above all—and I think all Members who have spoken so far and I am sure it will be true of the rest—our abhorrence of the Soviet action, our distress at its rejection of any responsibility, our wish that our voices along with the many other voices raised, to the attention of the Soviet Union. We hope they will allow a full investigation by the Security Council and will help all of us, as well as themselves, to ensure that such a tragedy will never occur again.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, we had some fruitful talks among House Leaders and I am happy to report an agreement. I would seek unanimous consent to interrupt the debate to allow the Leader of the New Democratic Party to move a motion.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House give unanimous consent to interrupting the debate?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair has some procedural concern about the motion before us.

Mr. Pinard: Mr. Speaker, the unanimous consent is to allow us to interrupt debate. We will have a separate motion and then we will revert to the debate. There may then be further consent to something else.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to recognize the Hon. Member at this point?

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding, and I am sure the Government House Leader will agree, that there is unanimous consent to interrupt the debate to hear a motion put by the Leader of the New Democratic Party, seconded by the Hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens), and then the question would be put. That is my understanding.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: By unanimous consent, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent).

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move a motion, but before doing so I want to clarify the understanding that was reached. It is an interesting consensus that occurs from time to time in the House, for which the people of Canada, I am sure, are profoundly grateful.

In speaking in support of the motion moved by myself earlier, the House Leader for the Conservative Party, speaking on a point of order, indicated the possibility of the House achieving agreement on an additional motion. As a result, there were discussions involving all three Parties which produced a motion that I wholeheartedly move, seconded by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) as follows:

That the attack on the Korean Airlines passenger plane on August 31 by Soviet military aircraft resulted directly in the loss of 269 lives including ten Canadians;