

*S.O. 29*

did not share with us any of the unassailable logic that would lead one to the conclusion that there simply was no other way of dealing with the situation of international terrorism, and particularly Libyan-sponsored international terrorism, other than sending in the F-111s and dropping bombs on military targets as well as, as we learned today, civilian targets and populated areas. We have not heard that rationale from the Deputy Prime Minister.

The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Turner) has said that for the moment, we in this Party accept the word of the President of the United States and the Secretary of State of the United States with respect to the military attack which occurred last night because we have no other means of information; not even the most obvious source, that of our own Government. It seems to me to be an unhealthy and frightening precedent that a matter with which Canadians are deeply concerned, and on which the Government on behalf of Canadians should take a position, is something that is discussed only in the context of Question Period and its 45 minutes of gamesmanship and partisanship.

It seems to me to be almost unbelievable that the Deputy Prime Minister and the Prime Minister would not have called the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the New Democratic Party into a private conference, if necessary, to share the information upon which the Government of Canada has taken the decision it has taken. It is unbelievable that they would not have expected, given that kind of co-operation and sharing of information with parliamentary leaders, that that confidential information would be respected.

The Government has invited many Parliamentarians to stand in this Chamber to cast their minds around the subject, to seize upon suspicions about the extent to which we really have been briefed and to vocalize those suspicions because the Government has acted in a very strange manner. I have a personal view about this matter. I find it tragic that tonight we are discussing last night's military attack on Libya in a black-and-white context. We are discussing whether the strike was right or wrong. We are tempted by those who would like to see this matter in only black or white as being either for "Madman" Khadafy or for Uncle Sam. The issue is not that simple; it is far more complex.

We are cast in these roles because the western world has been unable to develop constructive, effective and real sanctions to deal with Libyan-sponsored terrorism until today. I believe there is another alternative other than direct military action. I believe there is another alternative other than terrorizing the terrorists and expanding the cycle of violence. The alternative would not put us in a position of voting either yea or nay to U.S. action when that country finally moves out of frustration. The alternative is to see the western world act in a co-ordinated manner to develop real sanctions that have teeth.

In reality, what have we seen happen? Every time there has been a bombing, every time an innocent life has been taken, every time the cameras have shown us the destruction and

blood on the floors of terminal buildings, we have seen every western nation in chorus condemn Libyan-sponsored terrorism. We have seen every leader proud to put himself in the national spotlight of his respective country to condemn Colonel Khadafy. We have seen an inability to enforce effective sanctions because those same national leaders who have condemned Libyan-sponsored terrorism have continued to do business indirectly through their citizens with the terrorist leadership of that country. Those who condemn that country have continued to provide the means to fuel the machines that produce the dollars required to sponsor terrorism all around the world.

In that regard, it is my view that Canada is equally guilty. That is why we are debating a military alternative, rightly or wrongly, out of frustration or out of genuine belief. It is because we have not been able to get our act together. It is because we wanted on the one hand to be principled people who would oppose terrorism wherever it is found and on the other to share in the dollars being generated by an oil economy in Libya. We have not been able to walk away from the opportunity to compete for those dollars, and that is why there is a massive foreign workforce in Libya. That is why that workforce is composed of Americans, Canadians and citizens of those countries which are today condemning the U.S. action in Libya.

I believe there is another alternative. I do not believe that every other avenue has been tried. I do not believe that there have ever been real effective sanctions developed and applied to Libya in a co-ordinated fashion. I believe we have been talking collectively through our hats for too many years about the renegade and murderous leadership that exists in that country. We cannot have it both ways.

I say to the Government of Canada that if we are to develop alternatives that work, if we are to develop a way beyond sending F-111s in a long and arduous flight path around France to drop bombs, then Canada can play a key role in this. We can begin, not by asking people to make their own decisions, but by asking our citizens to come home. We can begin by saying that Canadians will no longer on the one hand condemn terrorism and state-paid-for and sponsored murder while on the other expect to fill their pockets with the money generated in Libyan oil fields.

● (2130)

We can no longer expect to have it both ways. In taking that kind of decisive action, perhaps we will set an example of the effective leadership which must occur throughout western Europe. The brutal reality is that it is foreign workers, be they Canadians, Americans, West Germans, French or Italians, and foreign technology and know-how which keep the engine running that generates the billions of dollars used to purchase, manage and sponsor the terrorist attacks that occur all over the world.