

Government Orders

If I may permitted an aside. Kuwait just sent a guy to jail for 15 years for wearing a T-shirt. I can imagine what is going to happen if this government goes down further in the polls and some bad youth comes out with a terrible picture of the Prime Minister on a T-shirt. Is he going to get 15 years?

"Kuwait is not a democracy. It is possible that Canadians would not choose the Kuwaiti system". It is impossible, but that is his definition. That is not the point. "Peace is not the province of the privileged who are lucky enough to be in democracies, the universal right. Aggression is a universal wrong". Piety number one.

Piety number two is on page 4: "That is why we are in the gulf. Not for oil, not for democracy, not for others, but for the principle that Canadians have always defended, a principle Canadians need if this country requires its security and prosperity to prevail. We are there based on the universal principles of international law".

I am going to get to more claptrap, but at this point I am just reading little excerpts.

This is a government that says, as a justification for going to war against Kuwait, and this is Mr. Clark in Calgary—

Mr. Hockin: Why are we talking about war. This is a different bill.

Mr. Barrett: We are going to get to his quotes on arms control. Just do not get nervous. He has even said things about arms control that are attached to this. He spoke to the Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Volpe: Are you going to table those, Dave?

Mr. Barrett: Table this? I will give you 1,000 copies. He goes on to say: "This government does not necessarily defend democracies". We saw that. This policy shifts day to day. When it says: "this is just defensive weapons," one begins to wonder about further hypocrisies.

This is the one that will grab your attention, Sir, and perhaps the attention of the Liberals. The former minister gave four reasons why we have to take the position we have.

Third, he said: "A durable peace will require addressing the full spectrum of problems that have plagued that region. That means dealing with other conflicts, includ-

ing the Arab—Israeli conflict. That means addressing the symptoms of conflict, the proliferation of weapons and destruction and the arms trade, the constant chase for spheres of influence". How in the world is selling these arms to Saudi Arabia, a consistent violator of human rights—which my friend referred to as a policy matter—going to be consistent with the policies of that minister, the ones which say we have got to stop selling arms?

You cannot say one thing in Calgary and do something else when you are a government here in Ottawa, because someone will accuse the government of being hypocritical. If no one else does, for want of such an accusation, I will make it myself. The government is being hypocritical.

It says one thing in one part of the country. It says one thing in other speeches, but does something else by this bill here today. I am shocked, disappointed and, frankly, hurt. In my tender years I do not like to experience those emotions.

The government was fibbing. The minister in that speech could be accused of fibbing, and guess who did the accusation? No one other than Douglas Roche. I was not serving in this House when Douglas Roche was a member here, but he was a Conservative. He would never reach the low of being a Liberal; he was a Conservative. He sat in this House and he was appointed by this government as the ambassador for disarmament. He has an article in today's edition of *The Toronto Star* saying that the arms sale must be killed and gives all the reasons, as a former ambassador and a former Conservative, and this government is bringing in this bill.

Mr. Brewin: And supported by the Liberals.

Mr. Barrett: Is it supported by the Liberals?

Mr. Brewin: We don't know.

Mr. Barrett: We do not know what the Liberals do. This is the best in Liberal tradition. Maybe yes, maybe no; it is the old tango. The Liberals play the game any way they want. They can run out of here and say: "We are not for arms sales, but not necessarily for stopping the sale of arms". The Liberals invented Orwellian doublespeak. They are the experts at it. When they cannot even dance on the fence they do not dance at all. They do not even participate in the debate. Where are those great spokespersons from the Liberal Party?