

Special Debate

should be able to operate unimpeded. The fourth was that there should be a ceasefire in place and holding.

All of those conditions have been violated. Atrocities are occurring, Canadian hostages have been taken, UN patrols have been fired on, so-called safe areas have been fired on, landings at Sarajevo have been stopped. We have ethnic quarrels going on all the while. In fact, the ethnic quarrels are at the very root of our objection to this whole situation. There will be no basis for peace in the former Yugoslavia until the residents decide they want peace. If it is going to be ethnic group against ethnic group, religion against religion. It is going to go on and on.

Canadians found themselves as peacekeepers in Cyprus for 29 years with no way out of it. We finally pulled out and the situation is no worse now than it was before. I am not trying to simplify this situation. It is fraught with danger.

Let me speak to the other side of the coin. How much danger is there? I ran into Major-General Lewis MacKenzie of Yugoslav fame a week or so ago. He sent me an article which he had had published in the *New York Times*. I would like to read part of what he wrote. He was talking, by the way, in favour of the UN leaving, certainly in Croatia. He wrote:

If President Tudjman gets his way and the UN withdraws from Croatia, war will follow and it won't be a short, local war between Croatia and the Krajina Serbs. The Krajina Serbs have been "assisting" the Bosnian Serbs in the battle for the Bihac pocket and they have recently signed a co-operation agreement for common defence which includes provisions for a joint defence council.

General MacKenzie's knowledge, having been on the ground there is far superior to me.

● (2035)

He concludes in favour of keeping troops there.

Surely this is the real litmus test for the UN in the new world order. It is up to the permanent five of the Security Council, led by the U.S.A., to make sure the UN is not found wanting on this issue. Failure to do so will sentence the Balkans to an even bloodier future.

This is a knowledgeable statement from a knowledgeable person. It says to me, why should Canada interpose itself to the degree we seem to be doing and saying we are responsible for the whole safekeeping of that area? It is a UN responsibility. I quite agree with General MacKenzie that pressure should be put on the UN, led by the U.S.A., to do something about the situation.

I would go beyond that and ask what is NATO's role in this. NATO surely has a role to play. It must exercise its influence in the area. Going beyond that, I would ask about the contiguous countries, about Greece, Turkey, Albania and all those that are

affected. Where are they? They must take some responsibility in this whole thing.

We wind up with this problem. Unless the situation can be orchestrated by the UN, by NATO, by the countries in the area and by the ethnic groups in that troubled area saying "we want peace", Canadians cannot impose it on them.

Our military situation is well known. Our troop rotation is too frequent; the equipment is inadequate; the troops are carrying too big a load for the resources they are being given. We have the Jeffries report out of Petawawa. We have the Oehring report out of FMC saying there are problems within the Canadian forces. These problems are of morale and leadership. We had better straighten up that situation on our own home ground.

To conclude, if there is no chance for peace, if there is no desire for peace by the people who are there, we cannot impose it. It will do our country, NATO, the UN and the countries in that area a lot of good if we are seen to be stopping now. Blow the whistle and say: "Whoa, let's start over. Let's see what it is we are doing. Let's give notice now and take it from there".

Mr. Janko Perić (Cambridge, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening to discuss once again the issue of Canada's role in peacekeeping operations in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In preparing to speak today I reviewed my notes from two previous speeches on the same matter. I came to the realization that not much has changed. The United Nations is no closer today to implementing its mandate than it was on January 25, 1994 when I first spoke in the House on the issue.

One-quarter of a million displaced persons in Croatia alone are no closer to returning to their homes. Croatia's international borders remain unsecured. One-third of the nation's territory is currently occupied. I have been advised that since January 1995 the army of Yugoslavia has moved in over 900 troops, 25 tanks and ground to ground missiles, all under the watchful eye of the United Nations.

While all-out war did subside with the original arrival of the United Nations protection force in 1992, little else had changed. We must ask ourselves, is it any wonder that the Government of Croatia wanted to terminate the United Nations mandate? We must ask ourselves, are we accomplishing enough in Croatia to warrant our continued presence there and our continued expenditure of Canadian taxpayers' money?

● (2040)

I am certain that most members can understand Croatia's frustration. I am not so sure that we can answer the second of my questions quite so easily.