

*Government Orders*

resumed debate on the report stage of Bill C-40, an act respecting broadcasting and to amend certain acts in relation thereto and in relation to radiocommunication, shall be called and continue until 5 o'clock p.m., when such debate shall be adjourned and Private Members' Business and proceedings on the adjournment shall be called in the usual manner.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Members have heard the terms of the motion. Is it agreed?

Motion agreed to

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** I believe the hon. member for Victoria is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. John Brewin (Victoria):** Mr. Speaker, in the same vein, I believe I have unanimous consent to put a further amendment to the motion that is on the floor at this point. The motion would read as follows:

That the motion be further amending by adding the following words:

"and further, that this House oppose the use of force against Iraq until sanctions and other UN measures have had time to succeed and urges the government to seek amendments to the currently proposed Security Council resolution to that effect".

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** On the same point, I must say that this is an exception to the rule. There will be two amendments to the main motion, not a subamendment. It is two amendments to the main motion.

**Mr. John Nunziata (York South—Weston):** Mr. Speaker, this particular motion was put earlier and unanimous consent was denied. Now, there ought to be some fair play around here. I understand what is happening, the members of Parliament that did not give their consent to this particular resolution are absent from the House at this point in time. So I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to determine whether it is appropriate to bring forward a motion that it was already dealt with by the House.

I would like to also ask you, sir, whether this would, if adopted by the House unanimously, set a precedent. The NDP are asking that the rules be changed in order to accommodate them. The rules quite clearly state that they would not be in a position today to put an amendment.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Albert Cooper (Parliamentary Secretary to Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to the hon. member who raises a concern. First, yes, the motion had been put previously but the House can do again by consent whatever it chooses to do. Second, because it is done by consent, it is very clear that it does not establish a precedent or a change in our procedures. They are legitimate questions and I just wanted to speak to those.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The consent is to have two amendments to the main motion.

Questions or comments. I will ask the hon. member for North Island—Powell River for the first question and then go to the hon. member for York South—Weston for the second question or comment.

**Mr. Ray Skelly (North Island—Powell River):** Mr. Speaker, in the member's speech, he alluded to something that agrees with my point of view on this and I wonder if he could confirm it.

This motion before the House will be construed by the government as the authority to deploy the Canadian Armed Forces in the Persian Gulf and engage the Iraqis in active warfare if the United Nations declares that that is going to happen. What we are in fact debating today, in the minds of the Prime Minister and the government, is actually a declaration of war, or the equivalent of a declaration of war.

If the United Nations subsequently authorizes force, Canada has already had its debate on that issue in the mind of the government. The House will go forward. There is much talk about adjournment and we will not come back until March. In all probability, we could have become involved in a major war with Iraq in the Middle East by that time.

Consider the vagueness of the United Nations motion. It is a fact that any member nation can use whatever measures it requires. The scale of this war could be enormous and any measure could mean even the use of nuclear weapons, or theatre nuclear weapons, if the costs on the United Nations or United States side were thought too great. The hon. member's point about the vagueness of the government's position and the vagueness of the United Nations motion were well taken.