

Government Orders

by this Prime Minister. He will use the Canadian Armed Forces in Iraq and he will use them without any further consent from this House of Commons. Fourteen per cent of the people in this country support this government. Everyone else holds them in nothing but contempt. It is earned contempt.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I don't know whether there is a question there. That was a comment.

I think I will allow the hon. member a short rebuttal.

Mr. Reimer: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief response. I am amazed at how our socialist friends can always find the right statistic to quote and all the right ones to ignore. When it comes to this issue, he uses the one statistic that is in his favour. What about looking at another that we saw on the CBC news last night, if we watched the CBC national news. It said that if we were working in concert with the United Nations, as we have from day one, then 67 per cent of Canadians support that decision. Why did he not quote that 67 per cent instead of selectively looking at one other statistic that has nothing to do with the issue before us tonight?

Mr. Fred J. Mifflin (Bonavista—Trinity—Conception): Mr. Speaker, I have sat in the Chamber all day and listened to the various comments made, and I trust the public is being instructed in precisely what is happening here. It may be difficult because I must confess to a certain amount of confusion myself as to what the points are that have been made without belittling or denigrating any of my colleagues. There are a number of issues that are under consideration here.

What I would like to do in the next 20 minutes or so is to just look at where we are now, what we have all approved in this Parliament of Canada, what it is we are debating here today, my position, some of the reasons I take that position, the position that my party has taken, and then I would like to cast ahead a little bit to the future.

Without reading the motion to which we agreed and was passed in the House, this is the point at which we are now, that this House condemn the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, that it demand the immediate unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait and that it affirm unequivocally its support for Canada's action in the Security Council and its support for all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions adopted since Au-

gust 2. This was at a point in time when that automatically included resolutions 660, 661, 663, and 664. I want to talk a little later about those resolutions.

• (2030)

We went on to say: "and for the sending of members, vessels and aircraft of the Canadian Forces to participate in the multinational military effort in and around the Arabian Peninsula, and in recognition of the seriousness of this matter, accept the undertaking of the government to present a further resolution to this House in the event of the outbreak of hostilities involving Canadian forces in and around the Arabian Peninsula."

I am not sure right now whether that is the debate that is going on. I do not believe it is. I believe there has been a disclaimer that that is the debate that is going on.

Let me move on now to what I believe we are discussing. I think there are three things before us today. There is the motion that has been put forward by the government, as amended by the Liberal Party and as further amended by the NDP. There is the United Nations resolution to which that motion refers, and that has been discussed here today. Then there is an unspoken thing that we are really thinking about, but we do not really know how to describe it because we are predicting the future. The only thing right about predicting the future is that you will probably be wrong.

We are looking at what happens after. After what? The way I see things with the positioning of forces that we have in the Persian Gulf now, with 26 nations, we are looking at 500,000 men and women, 115 ships and 1,600 aircraft. It is a large force, and it is there for what reason? I think the objective is Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait, to begin with, but I think the follow-on is important: with enough effective constraints being placed upon it so that it will not menace its neighbours again. I think that is the ultimate objective.

I am sure the government has asked itself questions about where we go from here, if indeed through the numbers that the government has this resolution is approved and is subsequently approved by the Security Council. I would like to have some indication of how our force is going to be used. Is it going to continue in the interdiction blockade role? Are we going to take more participatory action? Are we going to stay longer when Hussein gets out of Kuwait? Surely it has to end either