

*Government Orders*

maple leaf on our lapel, that we would be seen as boy scouts and that we would have open access. All of a sudden, we would have the scales drop from our eyes and we would now see ourselves in a world where there can be ruthless dictators detaining internationals.

I do not need anyone in the House to lecture me or tell me about how bad Saddam Hussein is, because I see it with my own eyes. My argument is not because I have any illusions about the regime in Iraq, or the nature of what they are doing in Kuwait, or in any way the kind of genteel society which he tries to run. It is none of those.

At the same time, the reality, that loss of innocence, has to bring about wisdom and it has to bring about judgment. It has to mean that you do not fall into old traps, that you use your brains and your mind to understand what is going on. You do not simply listen to the bell and respond in a Pavlovian fashion. You have to sit back and take a hard look at what you are facing.

I have here about 700 letters which I have received in the last three or four days from Canadians who are asking this government, and this Parliament to stop and take care, to watch carefully because they do not believe that the right role and direction for Canada at this time is to engage in hostilities against Saddam Hussein. They say very clearly that that does not represent Canadian values. When we talk about this new international order that has been bandied about in the House today they say: "Remember what it means to Canadians."

We are not a great power. We do not equate greatness with military might. We do not say that it is the right of our country to command respect by the force of arms, but more by the nature of our contributions for peaceful resolution. We are not a formal Imperial power. We are not a colonial power. We do not dictate, as the French and British did, the false boundaries of the Middle East.

If one wants to be a historian and go back to the problems of the Middle East, go back to the First World War when the Arab countries were induced to fight on the side of the Allies because they said they would get their independence. Then, they were treated with treachery by the colonial powers and were not given their independence at that time.

We do not reflect those values. In fact, we reflect the opposite. If there is anything contained in every single one of these pages, it is a plea for new thinking and a new approach. We do not see it in the debate that we have had so far from the government. It is falling into the traditional trap of preparing for peace by preparing for war. It does not believe in the philosophy that in this new world order one can prepare for peace actually by preparing for peace.

Members of the government cite Lester Pearson with great frequency. There is one phrase I think they should remember from Lester Pearson in his Nobel Prize speech. He said that nations prepare for war like precocious giants, but for peace like retarded pygmies. I can tell you that that phrase has run through my mind as I listened to the speech of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State this afternoon.

They have been so anxious and so concerned about knocking down, destroying, and eliminating the idea that there is another way to deal with Iraq, that there is another UN way of dealing with it, and that, if the only answer today is force, they have forgotten that they are trying to build up some kind of equation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, they have not been honest enough to say that they prefer force, but that those who have a different way and who also believe in the United Nations and collective security but do not happen to agree that military instruments are the only way of having the UN work or having collective security exercised.

Let us talk about the Pearsonian tradition for just one moment. In 1935, when Lester Pearson was a member of the League of Nations, what did he object to? The fact that they should abandon economic sanctions. Not that they went to war, but that they abandon economic sanctions. He also writes in his memoirs how economic sanctions could have worked, should have worked, and would have been an effective international tool to stop aggression, but the country let them alone.

• (1620)

Are we not in a similar case today? Are we not in a similar case when, in those halcyon days of August 2 and August 6, the world community said: "There is an act of aggression and we are going to stop it." Then we