

*Government Orders*

In his memoirs, Lester Pearson records one of the saddest episodes of international diplomacy in the 1930s helped sow the seeds of the world war which was to follow. That episode was the consideration by the League of Nations of steps to be taken to counter Italy's unprovoked invasion of Ethiopia, another small country.

Mr. Pearson, who was a Canadian representation at the League of Nations at that time, describes the heady start and the hopeful consensus at the beginning that sanctions should be applied, that Italy's aggression should be reversed. He then catalogues the steady erosion of that consensus, the collapse of resolve as government after government became timid, preoccupied by narrow, self interest. What was to be the salvation of the League of Nations became its downfall and the world lurched toward war. Mr. Pearson concludes his commentary with the following observations, and I quote:

For collective security to have real meaning for peace, all members must be prepared and willing to join in precisely the kind of action, economic and military, which is necessary to prevent or defeat aggression. Otherwise, an aggressor has nothing to fear from the international community but pin-pricks.

That was Lester Pearson on the League of Nations. I say to members of the House of Commons, particularly members of the party that sees itself in that tradition, that we cannot afford a return to pin-pricks that would incapacitate world order now in the way to which unhappily Lester Pearson was a witness decades ago.

Peace, Sir, has a price. Order is not automatic. Security must be secured. Lester Pearson knew that. Canadians should not forget it. I believe there are only two clear choices before us. The first is to defend our principles and in so doing, serve our abiding interest in building an international order which works. The second choice is to avoid conflict at all costs and in so doing, secure a peace which is temporary, a peace which will not endure, a peace purchased at the price of rewarding war. Let this generation, let this United Nations make the right choice, a difficult choice but one which future generations will respect and not ridicule.

• (1600)

I have been involved since the invasion began, intimately, as the Prime Minister and others have, in trying

to find ways in which this can be stopped. The House and the country naturally want to know if there is anything more that the government can do. They deserve our best judgment; a judgment that is confirmed by the pessimism with which Perez de Cuellar came back from Baghdad, a judgment that is shared by world leaders and others who have been involved as intimately as we have in trying to resolve the crisis. That judgment is that we have worked as hard as we can. We have exhausted the realistic options. We have opened door after door which Saddam Hussein has slammed shut. I think that we can, in good conscience now, having done all that we can do to seek a resolution by talk and by diplomacy, be prepared to contemplate giving effect to that other capacity of the United Nations charter, the capacity to use force.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park):** Mr. Speaker, at ten o'clock this morning I received a telephone letter from the students of Parkdale Public School. This is an elementary school. The ages of the students are from four to 15. This is what they are passing on to this House of Commons through their member of Parliament.

The letter reads: "Dear Mr. Flis: Peace is not a word. It is our future. War is a cowardly excuse for people's unwillingness to discuss positively our mutual problems. It is not the only way out. We hope that there is no war because we do not want any brothers, sisters, fathers or mothers to die. No war please. Give peace a chance." It is signed, "Yours truly, students and staff, Parkdale Public School."

I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in his response, what answer he would give these students. I think he partly answered the students concerns in his speech. He said that the United Nations is no longer a talking place. It is a place to act.

Are not sanctions a powerful action? He stated that our leader and our party are not providing any evidence the sanctions are working. I remind him when the three members of Parliament from all three parties returned from Iraq, they gave all kinds of evidence the factories that produced parts were running. Now after the sanctions, these same factories are standing still. Common sense would tell everyone that something is lacking in world leadership today. Common sense would tell you