

better than we have done, that the future will be as the past, scarred by sacrifice, wedded to war?

If we as Canadians say these things, we are contemplating the destruction of the United Nations and the international order it now has the chance to build. If we as Canadians say these things, we are betraying the efforts of Louis Saint-Laurent, of Lester Pearson, men who had seen war, leaders and statesmen in times when 100,000 Canadians had died fighting wars which were undeterred, wars whose origins lay in the unwillingness of the world to enforce the rules which all claimed universal.

Perhaps some Canadians are more comfortable with a United Nations that talks, not a United Nations that acts. Perhaps some see it as a place for soapboxes and UNICEF (United Nations Children's Fund) boxes, not a place where the world comes together to take the hard decisions which peace requires.

It is said we have not waited long enough, that perhaps the message has not gotten through. Saddam Hussein has had 166 days to contemplate the consequences of his actions. Saddam Hussein knows what he is up against. Mr. Aziz said that in Geneva last week.

If we were to make January 15 a mobile date and extend it to February 15 this year or perhaps February 15 next year, by what form of logic could it be argued that Saddam would treat our resolve more seriously than he does now?

What about sanctions and giving them more time to work? That is an issue this Government has given serious consideration. There is no doubt that if the international consensus held, the Iraqi economy might be in ruins if we waited six months or a year. But that is not the end of the argument. There is every indication from the words and deeds of Saddam Hussein that thousands of Iraqis -- men and women and children -- and thousands of those Kuwaitis we seek to liberate, would be made to starve before Saddam would allow his army to suffer. In that regime of terror, we cannot rely on popular discontent to dissuade a dictator. And during a period of further delay, the plunder of Kuwait would continue, and we could find ourselves trying to free a society which has ceased to exist. Finally, in the tinderbox that is the Gulf and the Middle East, crisis and miscalculation and terror would threaten every day as the world waited for an outcome which was by no means assured.

Rather than delay, some say deal. Give Saddam what he wants now to get him out. Let him claim other victories to justify his aggression. But that would be a reward for aggression, an invitation to other conflicts, other tyrants. It would be absurd to give a bank robber the money he has stolen or