

The powers of the Superintendent of Bankruptcy, under the Bankruptcy Act, came into play once Route Canada was declared bankrupt. The Superintendent of Bankruptcy immediately issued an investigation order to the RCMP in view of the allegations surrounding the bankruptcy.

That investigation is ongoing and I believe that it is not appropriate to make any further comment in that light.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Pursuant to order made earlier this day the adjournment motion is deemed withdrawn.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

IRAQ

INVASION OF KUWAIT

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Clark (Yellowhead) (p. 13232), the amendment of Mr. Axworthy (Winnipeg South Centre) (p. 13240), and the subamendment of Ms. McLaughlin (p. 13244).

Mr. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in the debate. First of all I want to make very clear that I really do not support the motion before us, except in so far as that this House condemns the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq. As an individual member representing my constituents I do not need to be encouraged by "unprecedented international consensus demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait". I would take that as a matter of course and I would think most hon. members of the House would think likewise. One cannot tolerate aggression, no matter where it occurs and no matter by whom.

• (1830)

As many hon. members have pointed out in the debate so far, we have very selective memories and very selective applications of a moral high ground that we apply with respect to Iraq and Kuwait. This, by no means, should be taken or misconstrued as any kind of support, indirect or direct, for the actions of Iraq and its leader.

There are two points at issue. The first is what this government did without consulting the House when the

Government Orders

action erupted in the Middle East, without consulting citizens of Canada through their representatives in the House of Commons, without so much as giving this Parliament an indication that it had a right to be involved in actions that could precipitate the world into a conflagration matched only 50 years ago.

I have seen members of the House speak with conviction, almost with rage, on this motion. Why? Because it seems so much like residents of a house of ill-repute discussing the virtues of chastity and abstinence and, perhaps, prevention, all after the fact.

There is an enormous lack of legitimacy behind the government's initial decision to commit the Armed Forces of the country without immediately bringing Parliament back together to discuss what the government's intention should have been.

I point to the fact that this is not a question of the letter of the law being applied, but the intent of the law and a perception among the Canadian public and the global public that Parliament and Canadians had not been consulted before making a commitment that cannot be withdrawn at a later date. We seem to be missing the point that what we are doing is engaging in an academic exercise about whether it was right or wrong to get involved in the first place. Only one member, the hon. member for Trinity—Spadina, made a suggestion that perhaps we ought to consider something along the lines of withdrawal.

I was in Europe at the time of the explosion of this crisis. I anticipated being called back to the House to debate a matter of great urgency. I happened at the time to be a guest of the Commons of one of the main countries in Europe. All members who had gone on holiday were called back to debate what that country should do with respect to the crisis. The same thing happened throughout Europe. Members of Parliament were recalled because in their view a decision that was motivated by American interests in the area would involve all of Europe, maybe all the world, in an issue with which they had to have (a) prior thought and consideration, (b) an assessment of their interests, (c) an assessment of the development of the world interests as a result of their involvement or their abstinence and, finally, (d) the extent to which they wanted to commit the resources available to them in the alteration of the diplomatic, political, economic, and religious realities,