

tions of the resolution are, is going to go back and try to figure it out with his department. That is fair. I am not calling into question his motives and his understandings, but there is a problem.

This House has a right to know what is on the government's agenda when it is going to ask Canadians to support its initiatives that are absolutely war-like.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has already, in all of his declarations, indicated that, as far as he is concerned, Canada is headed toward war. The presence that will soon be 400,000 American troops accompanied by 2,000 tanks, four aircraft carriers and the addition of other troops indicates that that is where we are going.

The Minister says that we are moving from peacekeeping to peacemaking. In other words, we are going to go from conflict co-operation to conflict resolution. That indicates that the government has in mind a policeman's role in the area. If the government is that willing to go forward, then will it come before the House and say: "We want to preserve peace, and here is our agenda?"

Has the member for Trinity—Spadina been given any indication from the government side, since it is so prone to looking at the examples of the 1930s and early 1940s, and even as far as 1950 and 1951, that the government is doing what the many governments of the western democracies were doing before the end of World War II at Quebec City, at Casablanca, at Yalta, with the Marshall Plan that emerged, and with McArthur plans for Japan, when they were beginning to reconsider a reorientation of the societies that were going to come after the war?

In other words, the government is making such hay in saying: "We want the opportunity to blow everybody up, because what we want to do is to ensure peace". Has it got a plan where it is going to plan for peace? What is that plan for peace? Have we been given any indication? Are we likely to get any indication from that?

Is the hon. member aware of any indication from the minister or the government that says that this motion is going to lead us in the direction where we are going to be talking about the way we establish and maintain peace in

an area where we have already destabilized an integral and strategic part of the world?

**Mr. Boyer:** We have stabilized.

**Mr. Volpe:** The parliamentary secretary is confused about what the resolution calls for, and he is unaware of what is going on. If he would like to answer the question for the member for Trinity—Spadina, let him do it. Maybe the hon. member could advise him as well on how to go toward peace.

**Mr. Heap:** Mr. Speaker, I will try to make a very brief answer to the hon. member.

Until today, I had not heard any sign of the willingness that the hon. member speaks of. But today, I thought I heard two signs. The remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, which I referred to, and some of the remarks of the hon. parliamentary secretary suggest to me that the reason that the word "subsequent" is so adamantly maintained—in a totally ambiguous sense in what the parliamentary secretary seemed to say, unfortunately—suggests to me that there is serious division in the ranks of the government party.

I hope that the letters that are beginning to come in to me and to others, and the public demonstrations that are going to be heard from, will press the government ranks and the back-benchers of the Conservative Party to re-examine that word and to press for a meeting of Parliament to settle this matter clearly, instead of ambiguously.

It is only a hope, but I said I believe the world was made good, and we should hope for change for the better. The signs are very small, and I will be watching carefully for more. In the meantime, the sign that would make it work would be for the government to adopt the amendment that has been put forward by the NDP.

• (2000)

**Mr. John Reimer (Kitchener):** Mr. Speaker, as we debate this motion tonight, the world finds itself intricately wrapped in a very serious international crisis. The stage for this crisis was set on August 2, 1990, the day that Iraq blatantly, ignoring international law, invaded its unsuspecting neighbour, Kuwait. Consequently, Canada, along with numerous other nations, finds itself facing the