

ing and religious fighting. Because of the nature of the general change in conflict it requires we change our approach to solving these kinds of problems. I would not dare presume to speak for Mr. Pearson, but I would suggest that if he were here he would say we have to reinvent our approach to peacekeeping given the situation we face.

I would recommend to my colleagues a report published in February 1993 by the other place. It was a report of the standing Senate committee on foreign affairs entitled "Meeting New Challenges: Canada's response to a new generation of peacekeeping". It is excellent reading and contains some very forward thinking ideas. I make a suggestion to the House. We recognize that in April there is a decision point for our country in terms of whether we stay or not stay. The rotation involved in Srebrenica is really not directly involved in our decision with respect to April.

● (1715)

We also have a decision to make or delay until November. Our commitment in the former Yugoslavia is in six-month increments. This is the negotiated arrangement that all member nations have with the UN.

I suggest that because the government has made a commitment to review our foreign affairs policies and our defence policies, which will likely come to a conclusion by this fall, and because we want to involve Canadians in those consultations, as we are doing with the budget and the efforts by the finance minister to involve Canadians, I believe we will see public consultations.

We need to have a partial moratorium on Canada's involvement in the former Yugoslavia. I am not suggesting a withdrawal from the region. I am only suggesting that a decision be made by our minister to withdraw our troops from Bosnia to Croatia from this spring until this fall.

Our commitment to the NATO forces there is in six-month increments. I believe we need to give Canadians a little bit of breathing room when it comes to our involvement not only in Bosnia but in peacekeeping in general.

It is my recommendation to the House that even though there are four options, one being to withdraw entirely from the region, another to simply withdraw from Bosnia but stay in Croatia, we could keep the status quo stable at our base in Bosnia and in Croatia, or we could augment our forces.

I believe that only the second and third are options for us right now and that the second is the one we should opt for which is to withdraw our troops into Croatia.

The review we will be holding in Canada over this next six to eight months is very important for the long term. I would not

### *Government Orders*

want to see our troops in a situation that could blow up when we do not have a thoughtfully considered place in the peacekeeping or peacemaking efforts of the world. When you consider that we are the third largest contingent over there, I really have to question how much say we have in what is going on.

I recognize that there is a serious humanitarian element to this if we remove troops from Bosnia. There is a lot of important work that needs to be done in Croatia in support of the humanitarian effort and there are other nations that need to take their turn at this very important task.

By withdrawing our troops from Bosnia and moving them to Croatia we can send a subtle but important message to our allies and to the UN that our own role as a peacekeeping nation is under review. It recognizes there is very little effort being made by the protagonists to come to a peaceful compromise. Canada can show its leadership by sending a strong message that we are looking seriously at our role as peacemakers in this world.

We want to give Canadians through this next six to eight months an honest opportunity to see how our troops are deployed, how we commit our Canadian tax dollars to peacemaking around the world because Canada has never shirked its responsibility. However, maybe it is time for others to come forward. We are all grateful to our troops for their efforts in all peacekeeping theatres, especially in the former Yugoslavia, but we do not want to see them in a situation that may blow up and soon be out of control.

● (1720)

I remind the House that we had great leadership with Mr. Pearson back in the late fifties. If Canada wishes to maintain that role—and I am sure our new Minister of Foreign Affairs is up to the task as is our entire government—it does not mean that we have to endanger our troops in a very volatile situation while we review our place as peacekeepers in the world.

**Mr. Peter Adams (Peterborough):** Madam Speaker, I really enjoyed what the member had to say. I wonder if any member of the Reform Party has any comments on it.

**An hon. member:** Where are they? They are not here.

**An hon. member:** Was that a question or a comment?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Maheu):** It is a comment. Are there any further questions or comments? Resuming debate.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Madeleine Dalphond-Guiral (Laval Centre):** Madam Speaker, since this is the first time I rise in the House as the member for Laval Centre, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election to the Chair. I would also like to emphasize the efficiency, professionalism and exceptional work being done by the entire staff of the House of Commons.