

*Special Debate*

to the people who now perpetrate this violence against the innocent of Somalia.

We are now going to have to pay the cost for what we have profited from in the past. Hopefully, through this action, as we pay the cost, I sincerely hope that cost will not be in human lives. As we pay the cost of this operation, I hope we will come to recognize that our profiting from arms sales world-wide is not worth the cost and that we will be more committed than we ever have been in the past to an arms control convention in the world, not just control of large weapons but conventional weapons as well. We will need to put a lot more work and effort into the conversion of our military industrial base and help other nations of the world to make that conversion as well.

Before I continue, I would like to express my dissatisfaction with what is happening in the House this evening. On Friday morning in Question Period I raised the question as to what recommendations the minister would give to this House for prior debate before a decision was made on what we would do in Somalia.

I personally felt that I was treated with contempt by that minister. It was not just that I felt that I was treated with contempt. I felt the people of Canada were treated contemptuously by this minister and worst of all, I feel that this House was treated with contempt by our minister.

She refused to answer the question in the House. She refused to answer to the people of Canada directly where there could be some debate and some discussion and she arrogantly dismissed us and went to hold a press conference to announce the government's decision.

The process cannot continue this way. The people of this country want to be involved. They do care about what is going on in Somalia and what our relationship is to that situation.

To give highlight to some of their concerns so that it is not thought it is just the opposition raising these arguments, I would like to quote from some recent articles on this issue.

I will begin by a quote from an article by Geoffrey York in *The Globe and Mail* this week. He said: "Some relief agencies are worried that the U.S. troops will cause more problems than they will solve. They expect that the Somalis will simply hide their guns until the U.S. troops

have departed. Then the same problems of violence and lawlessness could resume".

We have tried to raise this issue this evening, and our action in Somalia which the minister has said will be for a period of up to 12 months with no peacekeeping role after that causes a lot of concern not only to us on the opposition side of this House but also to Canadians. There has to be a long-term view of what we are doing in Somalia. Perhaps it would be appropriate for Canadian forces to be involved in peacekeeping as well as peace-making.

In quoting Mr. Fennell the article goes on to say: "There are two fears: if the military involvement is too short, things will just go back to the way they are now. And if it's too heavy-handed and neo-colonial, it would just alienate the population".

There is another quote out of *The Washington Post* that says that things could unravel. We have heard from representatives, both in the U.S. and here in Canada, that we can expect casualties in this operation. That means we could have some Canadian casualties.

I would like to reiterate what my colleague from Labrador was saying. I have grave concerns about the cuts which have been made to national defence.

Rather indiscriminately they appear to be on focus. I had forces personnel speak to me after the gulf war project. They said that before they went to the gulf, they had to beg and borrow equipment and clothing from their colleagues before they could head out to the gulf because they were poorly equipped.

We will risk casualties and we will make higher risks than are necessary if our government is not committed to equipping and looking after our peacemakers appropriately.

We want to know if we are going to provide humanitarian assistance through enforcement action in Somalia whether this is a new principle of government policy. Where else might we expect to see similar actions taken?

I will quote from a *New York Times* article that says: "The problem is that if halting starvation or upholding human rights are now legitimate criteria for U.S. intervention abroad, as compelling as protecting traditional strategic interests, where does Mr. Clinton draw the new red line? How much starvation is necessary, or how woefully must human rights deteriorate, to justify U.S."—or we can say Canadian—"action? If Somalia,