

*Oral Questions*

ships. The U.S. may contribute commandos to the conflict. The UN contact group has also endorsed a plan that would give UN soldiers the power to aggressively attack warring factions.

Does the government support shifting the UN mandate in this direction, shifts which will escalate military activity in the former Yugoslavia?

**Right Hon. Jean Chrétien (Prime Minister, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there is no question at this moment of shifting the mandate of peacekeeping to enforcing peace in the way described by the hon. member. They are sending more troops there to protect their own troops.

I explained the Canadian situation. We are not in exactly the same position. Our troops are not as spread out as others. It is not a question at this moment of Canada's sending more troops.

The mandate is not to start a war with anybody but to protect the troops there, which is exactly what we are supporting.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, to many observers it appears the UN mandate is shifting. If the government simply passively accepts those shifts, the public will want to know what that means for Canada.

In March the government sent our peacekeepers back to Bosnia without a clear mandate, without firm criteria for staying or withdrawing and without a voice in the decision making contact group.

If the government insists on staying under conditions of military escalation will it now insist on being given a place at the table with the United Nations contact group? In other words, will that be a condition which must be met if Canadian peacekeepers are to remain?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, there have been concerns on the part of a number of countries about the contact group and membership.

As a result we are now looking at perhaps shifting some of the focus to NATO nations contributing troops. There may be a meeting on Saturday or a few days later in Brussels to deal with that.

Canada is certainly a member of that group. We had one meeting last December—

**Mr. Hermanson:** It is almost June.

**Mr. Collenette:** If the hon. member would listen, I will explain.

We have had continual contact back and forth, personal, one on one and bilateral and other multilateral meetings since last December between the Minister of Foreign Affairs, myself and other ministers of defence of NATO contributing nations.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, who is in Europe, has been fully apprised of what has been happening and has given input into the deliberations that went on yesterday.

**Mr. Preston Manning (Calgary Southwest, Ref.):** Mr. Speaker, what continually disturbs us about this discussion is the fuzziness of the government's criteria for remaining and the fuzziness of its strategy in this troubled part of the world.

I will ask the minister again a very straight question, one Canadians want answered. If the government has decided Canadian peacekeepers are to remain in the former Yugoslavia, with their lives even more at risk because of the escalating dangers, will it be conditional on the government's being given a place in the UN contact group, yes or no?

**Hon. David M. Collenette (Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I do not know why the hon. leader of the Reform Party is so preoccupied at this late date with the forum for discussion.

Discussions are ongoing. There is nothing fuzzy about the government's position. I do not know how the hon. leader of the Reform Party can make that statement having sat here last night and listened to my speech in which I outlined the number of criteria for our continued participation in a redefined UN mandate. That was outlined again today by our Minister of Foreign Affairs in The Hague.

\* \* \*

• (1430)

[Translation]

### EXPORTS OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT

**Mr. Jean H. Leroux (Shefford, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence.

A study conducted by Project Ploughshares, a research institute in Waterloo, Ontario, shows that in 1993-94, more than US\$200 million in military equipment manufactured in Canada was exported to at least 11 of the 39 countries ravaged by civil war last year, in contravention of the arms exports controls.

How can the Minister of National Defence explain the fact that the government authorized the sale of Canadian-made arms and military equipment to countries like Peru, Turkey and Burma, where human rights are systematically violated?

[English]

**Hon. Christine Stewart (Secretary of State (Latin America and Africa), Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is very clear in the countries that it supports with the delivery of arms and parts for munitions.

Most of our trade is with the United States, with NATO countries or with other countries with which we have a production agreement. We do not send and sell arms to third world