

*Government Orders*

wagon and support the government and our allies throughout the world.

When the government began its activities, it chose not to recall Parliament. It chose to do this unilaterally. It chose not to make reference to the House, to the committees of the House, or to have a full debate. Canadians, when many are put at risk on ships and in planes in support of an international effort, have a right to a full explanation and a full debate. All international conflicts involve more than one perspective and this one is no different.

The very first step of not recalling the House put this debate in an awkward position for Canadians trying to understand why the government moved arbitrarily and why the government did not invite other Canadians to come forward with their opinions. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the government knew at the time that we had two or three months to get organized while the situation unfolded. We are right now, perhaps, on the edge of a war. It is a very serious situation and this could have been considered by Canadians many months ago.

When the member for Winnipeg South Centre, on behalf of this party, saw this motion, he suggested the following amendment:

That this House censure the government for not recalling Parliament at the earliest opportunity to fulfil its legitimate function of consultation and debate as to what role Canada should play in the resolution of the present crisis;

—and that this be sent to the external affairs committee.

If we had followed that strategy, then the government would have found itself working within a consensus and not working within a divided House.

As the member for Winnipeg—Transcona noted, it is very important for Canadians to understand that when the government enters into an international conflict it is done with the support of the House. It is rather unfortunate that as the original motion stands the government would not be able to get a consensus in the House because it ignored some of those basic steps that have to be taken.

Second, the resolution suggests that we be working through the United Nations more directly.

This is a very fine point, one in which there is a great division in the international community. I think we should address that issue very directly.

The issue is that the United States has taken leadership on behalf of the allies. This is the same way they moved in to the Korean war, in which they were able to use the UN flight that is essentially a U.S.-based operation. When we saw this particular activity, people thought that this was very much like other international activities in that the UN is just blessing the Americans. We think that Canada has had a long tradition of making sure that the United Nations grows in strength. The United Nations of 1990 is different than the United Nations of the early fifties when the Americans made their move and used it as a front in the Korean battlefield.

We should be doing everything within our power through our ambassador at the United Nations to continue our strategy of moving multilaterally in all areas, whether we are talking about trade agreements or talking about humanitarian organizations or war organizations. Our support and our future rest in the use of power, not in absolute ways but in very moderate and measured tones. That can only come through strong international organizations. We run the risk, particularly now at a critical moment, of allowing the circumstances to overtake our position unless we state quite clearly that it is only through the United Nations that we will continue to participate. That is in no way undermining the tremendous effort being made on our behalf, that is on behalf of the House of Commons, Parliament and Canadians by our military people.

I join my colleagues who have spoken before me to issue a thanks to them for being prepared so quickly, for finding the resources quickly in an organization very short of resources, and heading out in support of the United Nations effort. We wish every one of them good health. We wish that a conflict can be avoided. We wish that they are able to return to Canada unscathed by the settlement of this difficult problem.

In this context, as we show support for these people in the field, we also have to make sure that the basic support for the United Nations is not in any way eroded. We are at a critical point in the development of world politics. This was alluded to earlier in the debate by other speakers. We have come from a point where we