

They promised a more open process for making foreign policy. They promised to expand the rights of Parliament to debate major Canadian foreign policy initiatives such as the deployment of peacekeeping forces.

The government is not only violating its own principles, it is acting like the Mulroney Tories during the gulf war. Why has the government broken its red book promises? Will it commit, here and now, to have a full parliamentary debate on Bosnia before we send more troops?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for the first time we have had debate in the House about our presence in Bosnia before the decisions were made. Today I am standing here saying that the Americans, the British, the French and others have asked us if we would participate. We told them we would consider it.

**Mr. Hermanson:** And we said yes.

**Some hon. members:** We said yes.

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** The decision has not yet been made because I have not taken the problem to the cabinet and to the House of Commons. The only thing we know for certain is that the Reform Party does not know anything about the facts and it is already against it.

**Mr. Bob Ringma (Nanaimo—Cowichan, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, let us go from France and other countries to Hungary for a moment.

Last May at a meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Association in Budapest I spoke with representatives of that fledgling democracy in Hungary. Hungary will not permit military movement without consulting Parliament. It will not even allow military planning for deployment without consulting Parliament. When it comes to troop deployment, Hungary is more democratic than Canada.

Will the government do more than pay lip service to this fundamental principle of democracy, which is consultation, which it preaches so eloquently but violates so consistently?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, for a person who has spent his career as a high ranking officer in national defence—who as a member of Parliament is double dipping by having his pension from the army—he should know there are always discussions at the military level on how to deploy troops. It has never been done by parliamentarians. It has always been done by the military under instructions by the government.

At this time peace is coming to Bosnia, which we hope will be a permanent peace situation. Canada is always there when there is a need for peace. If we are needed we will look on it favourably. However, I have not made up my mind. If Parliament were to tell us not to go there, we would not. However, it would surprise me if the people of Canada did not want to be in a

place where we can save lives, have peace and make progress for the poor people who have suffered so badly over the last four years.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

## REFERENDUM CAMPAIGN

**Mr. Michel Bellehumeur (Berthier—Montcalm, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister.

We knew that there was some confusion between Daniel Johnson and the members of the federal government regarding the recognition of Quebec as a distinct society and the right of veto.

• (1135)

Yesterday, some confusion emerged within the federal Cabinet when, unlike the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Minister of Foreign Affairs expressed his support for a right of veto. As for the Prime Minister, sometimes he is in favour, sometimes he is opposed, depending on what day it is and to whom he is addressing.

Given the confusion prevailing in Cabinet with regard to the right of veto and the Prime Minister's occasional hints that he supports the notion of distinct society and giving Quebec a right of veto, why did the Prime Minister vigorously oppose the Meech Lake accord, which he played a large part in killing? On the night this agreement was rejected, he said to Premier Wells: "Thank you, Clyde, for a job well done".

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, the number of unfounded statements in that question is unbelievable. First of all, yesterday, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs did not discuss the right of veto issue with anyone. So much for that. There was no mention of a right of veto in the Meech Lake proposal. It was not an issue because the amending formula had been accepted by René Lévesque several years earlier. Another faulty interpretation by the hon. member.

Third, he said that on the night I became leader—I explained this but they do not want to tell the truth. I simply said—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Chrétien (Saint-Maurice):** No, you may be reluctant to admit it but, on the night of the convention, the vast majority of Newfoundland delegates supported my candidacy. So I thanked the people of Newfoundland for voting for me at the convention. However, that is not what they want to say. It was during the celebration following my election as leader of the Liberal Party, and I was saying thanks to Mr. Wells and all my other supporters. I also expressed my thanks to those who had run against me. I said that, for the sake of the party; to have a good convention, one needs opponents, and after it is all over, one should thank everyone and help the Liberal Party move forward. That is why I am Prime Minister today.