

*Government Orders*

last one adopted in November, and we are told that the Canadian Parliament should support this resolution, congratulate the UN and make it known that the UN is right when it wants this resolution to be implemented.

But this is not the meaning of today's debate. This debate is misleading in two ways, Mr. President, because the resolution presented to us is not the one which was passed. The UN resolution did not ask member states to make war. It said that after a given date, if Iraq had not completely withdrawn from Kuwait, these countries could take all necessary measures to ensure the Iraqi withdrawal. But, the government takes care to tell us that all necessary measures does not mean exclusively war measures and that they include the whole range of enforcement measures. Within that range, before war breaks out, there is room for diplomacy, for dialogue, all the initiatives that a peace-loving nation can imagine and Canada is such a nation.

Canada made its mark in the world. It illustrated its diplomacy with great men, such as Lester B. Pearson in particular. Many references were made to him today. It is true that Mr. Pearson enhanced Canada's stature in the world. It is true that Mr. Pearson, if he were with us today, would tell us: "Let us make a last effort for peace, and let us do it in the name of the United Nations."

The debate has been distorted in two ways, and I said that first because the meaning of the United Nations resolution has been altered. Second, the debate is not what it appears to be. The government is putting a virtuous resolution: Will you vote, yes or no, for virtue? We know very well that it is only appearance. What the government is telling us essentially or what it will want to be able to say after the resolution has been adopted is that the Parliament of Canada authorized the Government of Canada to make war. That is what it will say the day following a yes vote for the resolution.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister made a speech that looked a lot more like a declaration of war or a speech made before entering the war than a speech by a Prime Minister or a head of government who must first seek the support of the citizens to try an ultimate attempt to save peace. I am sorry to say that I heard nothing in that speech which led us to believe that this government was seeking other alternatives to war and that, unfortunately, this government has resigned itself to war. And I think a government should never resign itself to war until war is declared.

In the debate today, reference was made, especially from the government side, and my colleague from the NDP also just made reference to the World War II, to those horrible years preceding World War II. During which the European democracies submitted themselves, in an appeasement policy, to the fierce appetites of a dictator who was bad—it is difficult to compare dictators as they are all terrible—but a very successful, Hitler. From one demand to another he swallowed whatever was given to him and then asked for more the next day. Today, we judge very severely the statesmen, and political leaders who agreed to deal with Hitler in order to maintain peace.

Indeed, we can make this reference to World War II, but we can also go back to World War I and other wars before that. One wrong after another. In the days preceding the declaration of World War, everybody said in retrospect: The political leaders knew nothing. They acted hastily, feverishly, in the turmoil. They agreed to a war psychosis. They missed opportunities to resolve the small emerging conflict. They did not foresee the enormous proportions that the relatively small episodes would take and they are now seen as warmongers. That is why, during the period after World War I, people were reluctant to be hurried into a war and why those same people are now being accused of having been too pacifist and of being less than brave. We must not forget, that the generation in power in European democracies at the time had seen an entire generation of young people, the best and brightest of countries such as Germany, France and Great Britain, mowed down in muddy trenches. They did not want those millions who perished to be followed by more victims in the forties.

Imagine how lucky we are to be able to look back, although I suppose it is rather ironic. In any case, these are things we must consider. We cannot afford to let ourselves be influenced solely by comparisons with the acts of aggression committed during the Second World War, while ignoring what happened before then.

We are perhaps only a few hours away from a war whose duration we do not know and whose negative impact, the loss of lives, we cannot estimate— As I was saying, we are only hours away from the threat of war, and I am sure we would all have liked to be able to rally around the government and support the Canadian position. At a time when Canada is going through a very difficult period and Quebec is trying to find its way with a great deal of difficulty, at a time when Canada's and Quebec's children are about to meet their destiny in the defence of peace, we would have liked to be able to stand