

# 41st PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

EDITED HANSARD • NUMBER 190

## CONTENTS

Thursday, March 26, 2015

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

*[Government Orders]*

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):**

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Foreign Affairs just misspoke, and I will give him a chance to correct what he said. I just heard him say “We are there to support Syria.”

This is a deeply complex and mutually contradictory position that the administration and the Prime Minister are attempting to put forward. It is the idea that we can violate the sovereign integrity of another nation state, Syria, by conducting bombing missions in that state. We seem to think that international law only applies when we want to criticize Mr. Putin for violating the sovereign integrity of Ukraine. When we play games with international law, we are looking at finding ourselves with nowhere safe to stand.

As this mission is being proposed, we will put Canadian pilots into harm's way and violate the sovereign integrity of a country run by a brutal dictator, Bashar al-Assad, in the hope that he will not retaliate against that violation of his sovereignty because we will be taking aim at his enemies, ISIL. In the west, we used to think that ISIL members were rebels against Bashar al-Assad, so certainly they were better than Bashar al-Assad. We now seem to think that they might not be better than Bashar al-Assad.

Whose side are we on? Do we have any idea how this will play out in international law?

**Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP):**

Mr. Speaker, the issue before this House right now is a serious one, an issue that raises serious questions, and I think it gets to the heart of some of the most important and profound subjects that can be debated in the House of Commons.

We have the spectre of violent movements in the world, and that spectre is real. It is serious. Acts of oppression, of kidnapping, of rape, of ethnic and cultural targeting, of armed conflict and violence are present all over the world.

We have ISIL in Iraq, Boko Haram in Nigeria, events in **Ukraine**, civil war in Syria, recent conflicts in Israel and Gaza, tension in the Caucasus between Armenia and Azerbaijan, and conflicts all over Africa and in the second and third world.

The government today is asking this Parliament and the Canadian people to commit Canada to war in one of these conflicts. The Conservatives assert that the acts of ISIL in Iraq are of such a nature that war is the only reasonable response of Canada, and that ISIL in Iraq represents a threat to Canadians here at home. I respectfully disagree with these assertions.

I have been privileged to represent the good people of Vancouver Kingsway in this House for the last seven years, and we debate many important issues and have done so over that time, but in

my view, no issue is more important or warrants more serious scrutiny and attention than discussion of committing our troops and committing Canada to war.

I would like to start in my remarks with a review of some history. The old adage that those who do not pay attention to history are doomed to repeat it, I think, is time-tested and true. I will review what has been the experience of the west in terms of western military interventions in the Middle East.

Let us just take a brief synopsis of the last 30 years. In Afghanistan in the 1980s, the United States armed the Taliban. At that time the Taliban was the Americans' friend when it was attacking the Soviets. It did not matter to the Americans at that time that the Taliban's orthodoxy, doctrines, or dogma were oppressive, misogynist, sexist, and culturally intolerant and insensitive. At that time the United States armed it because they had a common mutual enemy. Then 9/11 happened. The U.S. demanded the Afghani government deliver up what it believed were the perpetrators of 9/11 who had been, in its view, hiding in Afghanistan. When the Afghani government either could not or would not do so, the United States and a coalition of western countries attacked Afghanistan, including Canada.

Canada was mired in Afghanistan for 10 years. We lost well over 150 brave soldiers. Thousands more Canadian soldiers were injured, traumatized to this day, and Canada spent billions of dollars in Afghanistan.

What is Afghanistan like today? It is not a democracy. Tribal divisions are intact. Opium production is at record levels. It is a country that has been devastated, where western values have failed to take root and in fact are rejected today as strongly as they have ever been.

Let us talk about Libya. Just a few years ago in this House the government stood here and said it had to commit Canadian Forces to enforce a no-fly zone in Libya, and the opposition, despite what the Minister of National Defence has erroneously told the Canadian public, endorsed that mission. We warned, however, at that time that we would not support a mission that morphed into a regime-change one, and that is exactly what happened.

We committed to a mission that eventually resulted in the removal of the Gadhafi regime in Libya, and what happened as a result of that military intervention? The country descended into chaos, with violence on an almost unprecedented level today. There is no democracy, stability, justice, or rule of law in Libya today. I have not heard the Conservatives say a word about the situation in Libya since they urged the Canadian public to go to Libya to remove a despotic government, and they have run away from accountability for those actions.

(1300)

We have the other example of Iraq. I have a feeling of *déjà vu* today, because this is not the first time that a western country has been asked to intervene in Iraq in a military manner. In 2003, the United States led a coalition and attacked Iraq. This was based, as we now know, on fabrications and outright deception. Iraq was accused of importing yellow cake uranium from Africa to fuel its nuclear program. It was accused of developing weapons of mass destruction. American diplomats at the highest levels asserted that this was the case. It turned out that these were outright lies, absolute fabrications.

Massive military force was unleashed on Iraq. Hundreds of thousands of people were killed. Massive infrastructure damage totalling in the billions of dollars was inflicted on Iraq. Regime change occurred. Saddam Hussein was removed and replaced with what the west said was a better government, the government of Mr. Maliki. What happened after we installed him? There was brutal oppression of minorities, corruption on a massive scale, no democracy taking root, and a country shattered, divided, and socially fractured.

As a result of massive bombing in 2003, which we said was going to restore democracy, human rights, and the rule of law to Iraq, where are we today in 2015? We have ISIL in Iraq. One could argue that not only did military intervention not accomplish any of the goals that always are the goals asserted at the beginning of a mission, but they created the opposite situation. There was no ISIS or ISIL back in 2003. There is today.

If bombing and military intervention is a way to make Iraq and countries around that region safer and more conforming to western norms, then that would have been the case after massive bombing and military intervention occurred for eight years and eight months, from 2003 to 2011. Thirty years of a western approach to countries in the Middle East and that region based on violence, based on military intervention, and based on deception, have resulted in only one conclusion for anyone who is viewing the situation objectively: an utter, absolute failure to meet any of the objectives that were stated at the beginning of those missions. Worse, there is a complete absence of accountability on behalf of governments like the Canadian government, like the American government, or the British government, who told the people of these countries that they should be intervening in these countries to make their population safer. It has made the world more dangerous.

What should Canada do? Canadians whom I talk to and represent want a different foreign policy from that characterized by the current government, different from the one characterized by war and military intervention and demonizing and jingoistic exhortations to violence. They want a Canada that resorts to our history, which characterizes our foreign policy for most of our time as a country, where Canada was a peacekeeper, where Canada was a peacemaker, where Canada was regarded as an honest broker on the world stage, where Canada was regarded as a fair dealer, where we practised diplomacy and took a leadership role.

There are other ways that Canada can be addressing this very serious problem. We could shift Canada's warlike approach to one of democracy building. We could help countries like Egypt, Iraq, Syria, and Yemen develop democratic responsible governments that build respectful rights-based societies. We can help these countries build strong civil societies, assist with constitution making, help them build public infrastructure, help them raise the educational levels of their populations, help with poverty alleviation, provide economic aid, and provide humanitarian assistance. These are the roles that stand in contrast to the one being proposed to us here today, which is, "Here is how we can help the people of Iraq: We will go in and add more violence to a violent situation". The biggest myth of all is that this will make Canadians safer.

(1305)

The truth is that we have not had one ISIL-inspired terrorist attack on this soil yet, objectively; not one. However, if Canada commits to force and starts bombing ISIL and ISIS positions in Iraq, it is a matter of logic that it would increase the chances that those people would feel entitled to take retributive action here in Canada.

To keep Canadians safe and to restore Canada to a position on the world stage that Canadians want, I urge all members of this House to reject this ill-conceived motion that is not based in fact and has even less logic and principle behind it than any other motion I have seen in this House.

**Hon. Chris Alexander (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC):**

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present what I hope are some new perspectives on this very important debate. We are talking about Canada's mission against the Islamic State in order to combat terrorism, which we all know is a threat to Canada.

It is a threat not only far from our borders, for civilians living in the Middle East and other regions of the world, but also within our Canadian borders and in our communities, where these networks and individuals who have been radicalized to believe in this harmful ideology are present. Luckily they are very few in number in Canada.

[English]

I would like to begin by reflecting, as we often do in this place, on the historic context. A hundred years ago, in March of 1915, the men of the 1st Canadian Division were already in France, at the front line. They were waiting to move from France into Belgium where they phased into the Ypres salient and faced their first major action at St. Julien later in April. That battle, as we recall, included the first use of chlorine gas. In 1940, it was election day, 75 years ago. Prime Minister Mackenzie King was re-elected with the support, however, of a Conservative leader and Conservative Party under Manion. It called itself a national government because it believed in the importance of what Canada was doing and obviously Canada was already at war. It had declared war, forces were deployed, pilots were in the air and we were facing a major threat. It was one we hoped would remain unprecedented and one that led to the peace of 1945 and the institutions, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It has maintained order on our shores and in much of the world since that time. These were fights against forces of disorder, in the context of world wars, in order to bring about a stronger order. In one case it led to the League of Nations, which lasted barely a couple of decades, and is not seen as a terribly successful exercise in the management of international affairs. Then there was the United Nations and the UN charter, with the support of NATO, the Bretton Woods organizations and all of the trading relationships, the WTO as it is called today. It made the international system much more successful today than it was in 1945 and much more a home for peace, order and good government, for freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law than we ever dared to hope in 1945.

We have only to turn on our television sets or tune in to the Internet media stream to see that this order is under threat in many parts of the world, from Boko Haram in Nigeria, from the Taliban, still, in Afghanistan, from Putin in **Ukraine**. However, the scale of the conflict in Iraq and Syria today is without precedent in the world today. The scale of the threat from terrorists to both regimes in Iraq and Syria is without parallel in the annals of terrorists, which itself is a hideous litany of atrocities and conflicts in which Canada has been involved, on the larger scale in Afghanistan, but elsewhere in the world.

In Syria, of course, a vulnerable population faces a double threat because even before terrorism became the hydra headed monster it is today in both countries, its own president, Bashar al-Assad, was repressing the population and inflicting excruciating casualties, which now number well over 200,000 deaths. Many of the deaths were inflicted by the government of Syria.

(1700)

We have a situation where terrorism and terrorists have been both a threat and part of a larger proxy war involving regional powers, jockeying for position. Iran and Russia obviously want to prop up Syria. Others have unfortunately lent their support in the early stages to groups associated with al Qaeda, to groups that now call themselves the Islamic State. The result is a massive humanitarian crisis, the likes of which this world has not seen since at least Rwanda, the genocide there and the ensuing crisis in the Great Lakes and in eastern Congo, but perhaps a

crisis without parallel since the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, which led to one of the largest exoduses of humanity ever recorded.

In Iraq and Syria, we see Sunni and Shia being victims, especially when they are in minority positions on the territory of the other, on the territory of their armed enemies. We see Alawites and Ismailis suffering, having to protect themselves, vulnerable. We see Kurds and Jews being slaughtered indiscriminately.

These are only the cases where it is documented. There are very few journalists in Syria. It is increasingly difficult for journalists to cover what is happening in Iraq unless the ISIL media make a video and post it on YouTube. We know that the atrocities are on a much larger scale than we have even recorded so far.

Whether it is Assyrian Chaldeans, Chaldeans, Mandeans, Cyrillic Orthodox, Circassians, Turkmen, Armenians, Yazidis or Shabaks, Kizilbashs, humanity and all the populations of these countries are under threat of indiscriminate violence, and hundreds of thousands of them have lost their lives. The diversity of civilization left by all three Abrahamic faiths in these countries over millennia is under threat. That threat—we know from documented sources that no member of the House is going to challenge—includes a threat to those who would help these minorities, like the United States and our European allies, but explicitly including Canada. That threat needs to be addressed.

The opposition response is to sit on the sidelines and watch the slaughter continue. That is what we are hearing, both from the Liberal Party and the NDP, and it is unacceptable to us and unacceptable to most Canadians. Even in the face of this scale of challenge, the other parties in this place choose to do nothing. The NDP is opposed in principle to military. The Liberals are opposed by stealth and ambiguity, ignoring the principles they articulated earlier in the 20th century, the responsibility to protect which they said would protect vulnerable populations. Now they are honouring in the breach more than the observance.

Our response is military. Our response is humanitarian. Our response is generous. However, it also includes the resettlement of refugees. Let us remind ourselves that this response by Canadians, by private sponsors and by our government has been extremely generous and on a large scale, thanks to the great work of my colleague, the Minister of National Defence, when he occupied this portfolio.

Since 2009, Canada has resettled 21,000 Iraqis, more per capita than other country outside of the region, unheralded by the opposition, unacknowledged most of the time by those on the other side. We are well beyond the commitment we made to Syria and are on our way to resettling 10,000 Syrians. That is the largest publicly announced commitment to refugee resettlement, not to accepting asylum seekers or to accepting people across the borders, because we do not have borders with these countries. It is the largest commitment to resettling refugees from a long way away by any country. In addition, we will continue to work to resettle 5,000 refugees from Turkey, Syrians, Iraqis, Iranians who have been there for a long time, and we will accommodate 3,000 more Iraqi refugees this year.

We are defending Canada's values in doing this. We are defending the international order, both by supporting Iraqi forces and by opening our doors and our hearts to those who need and deserve protection.

(1705)

We have no illusions on this side about terrorism. We have no illusions about the kind of protection victims of terrorism need, and that has to include the kind of response the House is

preparing to endorse with this motion: a humanitarian response, a refugee response, and a military response.

**Mr. Costas Menegakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, CPC):**

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate, which addresses the Prime Minister's announcement of a motion to debate an extension and expansion of Canada's military mission against ISIL.

Earlier today, the Minister of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness explained in detail to the House that ISIL has indeed targeted Canada and Canadians by name. Just a few hours ago, we heard from Canada's Minister of National Defence about the devastation ISIL has caused in the Middle East and the magnitude of the problem if we permit ISIL to continue to perpetuate such atrocities not only in the Middle East but around the world. He explained the threat it poses right here at home in Canada to all of us as Canadians.

As the Prime Minister said, we cannot protect Canada and our communities by simply choosing to ignore this threat. I was concerned by the remarks of both the Leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Liberal Party. While the Prime Minister outlined the grave threat ISIL poses to Canada and the international community as a whole, both leaders of the opposition parties refused to even acknowledge it. It is evident that they do not take the threat of jihadist terrorism against Canadians seriously, even when it has already struck us at the very core of our democratic institution, right here in Canada's Parliament.

Both opposition leaders and their parties are woefully unprepared to take the steps necessary to protect Canadians. On this side of the House, we will fight to thwart this threat against us and will help in the protection of millions of innocent lives caught on the front lines of this conflict. It is important to note that while our government is contributing to the military mission against ISIL, Canada is also among the top humanitarian and development assistance donors in both Iraq and Syria.

As we consider Canada's involvement in the international mission against the Islamic extremist jihadist group known as ISIL, the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant, it is important that we take into account its effect on our government's efforts to resettle refugees. Indeed, the ongoing violence in the region has led to a high number of refugees and forcibly displaced persons, not to mention indiscriminate, shocking, and horrific brutality toward civilians. Our government has been, and will continue to be, a world leader in permanently resettling refugees.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Refugee Agency have described the ongoing catastrophe as the largest humanitarian crisis in a generation. Both the violence in the region and its accompanying refugee crisis are utterly tragic situations.

Our country has a long history and a great humanitarian tradition of providing protection for those who have been persecuted on the basis of their religion, their ethnicity, their group identity, or their political beliefs and have had to flee their homelands.

This tradition of refugee protection predates Confederation. Canada was a place of refuge for slaves fleeing the United States in the 18th and 19th centuries, and later for Poles, Jews, and **Ukrainians**, among others, fleeing oppression in eastern Europe in the late 1800s. In the second half of the 20th century, Canada welcomed thousands of Hungarians and Czechs who had escaped Soviet tyranny. More recently, we have brought in refugees from Africa and the Middle East. Now, we have been called upon to help with the ongoing crisis in Syria and Iraq.

It is because of this crisis that the world is now witnessing a level of forced displacement that we have not seen in decades. Canada is answering that call.

(2235)

Earlier this year my colleague, the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, announced that Canada would resettle an additional 10,000 Syrian refugees over the next three years on top of our 2013 commitment of 1,300 resettled spaces for Syrian refugees. This new commitment represents 10% of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' appeal to help resettle 100,000 Syrian refugees, and it is in keeping with Canada's record of resettling one in ten of the world's resettled refugees.

The minister also announced that Canada would resettle an additional 3,000 Iraqi refugees, bringing our total Iraqi resettlement commitment to 23,000 Iraqi refugees resettled in Canada since 2009.

We have met this commitment by already resettling more than 20,000 Iraqi refugees since 2009, the vast majority of these refugees have been resettled out of Syria. We have also committed to resettle 5,000 additional refugees from Turkey, a commitment that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration made in his visit to Turkey a couple of years ago.

This morning I heard the member for Vancouver Quadra speak, and I was troubled to hear her say that we had not provided any new humanitarian aid. As I previously mentioned, on January 7, the Minister of International Development and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration announced increased humanitarian effort and that Canada would accept additional refugees from the region. I have also heard in this debate that we need to give more humanitarian aid, not military intervention.

The military actions our government is proposing today do not preclude humanitarian action. This is not a case of either/or. It is a case, indeed, of both, and Canada, this government, is stepping up to the plate.

These commitments are in keeping with Canada's long-standing and well-respected international reputation for generosity, for humanitarianism and leadership in providing protection to the world's most vulnerable people. Indeed, since the Second World War, Canadians have provided refuge to more than one million people.

Given our relatively small population, we have reason to be proud of Canada's record in resettling displaced and vulnerable people around the world, and we are pleased to be able to continue to do that with the support of the Canadian people.

Today, we maintain one of the world's largest and most generous resettlement programs, welcoming one in ten refugees resettled worldwide, more than almost any other industrialized nation in the world.

I would like to take a moment to talk about my personal experience that occurred last year. I had the opportunity to travel with our Prime Minister to Israel and Jordan. When we arrived in Jordan, a number of colleagues and I had the opportunity to visit a crossing point from Syria into Jordan. As it happened, we were there no more than 20 minutes when the sirens went off. We looked out into the desert. We were right on the line there, and sure enough, about 150 people were walking across the desert after having walked three days through the desert to find Jordan, to find a place of refuge.

I had the opportunity to speak with some of these people, to hug them, to aid them and to see how much humanitarian aid we did provide, through different programs through international aid in Canada and through our partners in Jordan, to those people, and the importance of that assistance to them.

I was moved to know that our government permanently resettles and assists the world's most vulnerable individuals, as the refugees I witnessed crossing into Jordan.

As a Canadian, I am very proud of our compassionate traditions. I am glad I have had the opportunity to discuss Canada's remarkable efforts to resettle in the context of today's important debate. I am proud to stand in support of our government's extended military effort against ISIL, and infinitely proud to stand in support of our brave men and women in our armed forces who serve our country today.

**Mr. Jasbir Sandhu (Surrey North, NDP):**

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of my constituents from Surrey North to speak on the government's Motion No. 17, which seeks to extend Canada's combat mission in Iraq and further extend it into Syria.

I talked to many of my constituents over the last two weeks and I will summarize some of their concerns today.

The issue that we have at hand is deeply concerning and should not be taken lightly. With the motion before us, the government is basically asking the House of Commons, myself as a member of Parliament, and Canadians as a whole to commit to war. The motion, if passed, will require our brave women and men in uniform to risk their lives overseas. A decision like this needs to be carried out with the utmost responsibility and should not by any means have any political motivations.

There is no doubt that the crimes perpetrated by ISIL are appalling and deeply concerning. We are witnessing heinous acts of oppression, kidnapping, rape, ethnic cleansing and cultural targeting.

There also other conflicts around the world. We have ISIL in Iraq, Boko Haram in Nigeria, the conflict in **Ukraine**, civil war in Syria, and there are tensions in the Balkans and other parts of the world with violence happening as we speak.

However, what the Conservatives are asking from us today is to risk the lives of our soldiers for a mission that is not defined. It is not part of an international response, and clearly has not been taken into consideration with the seriousness and responsibility that it deserves.

As a representative from Surrey North, as I said, I have talked to many constituents. I cannot, in good conscience, agree to blindly commit the lives of our women and men in uniform to a mission that has no plan and no exit strategy.

How can we support this mission when the Conservatives have misled Canadians about our role in Iraq since day one?

It was not too long ago when the Prime Minister insisted that we were only sending troops for a month, and it was only to advise and assist deployment. On September 30, we all saw the headlines when the leader of the opposition, the member for Outremont, stood in this House and asked the Prime Minister specifically whether Canadian troops would be involved in directing air strikes in Iraq. The Prime Minister denied it. However, the mission has quickly escalated to a potential year-long conflict where Canadian troops have been on the front lines exchanging fire with ISIL. Now the Prime Minister is openly considering a massive expansion of the mission into Syria.

The Syrian President Assad has committed heinous crimes against civilians. Now the Prime Minister wants to treat him as a friend. Assad is not an ally. He is a war criminal who uses chemical weapons against his own people and bombs schools and hospitals. We have seen this on television stations. Canada should not be allying itself with Assad or strengthening his hand in any way. This is why none of our western allies, except the United States, are conducting air strikes in Syria.

Paul Heinbecker, Canada's last ambassador to the UN Security Council, was quoted in *The Globe and Mail* on March 23. He said:

If out of fear of Islamic State and of a desire to stop them, the Coalition were to ally itself, de facto or de jure, with Bashar al-Assad for fleeting tactical advantage, it would be the ultimate betrayal of the Syrian innocents. And of our own values.

Simply put, our women and men in uniform have no place being in Iraq and they certainly have no place being in Syria. It is very disturbing to see that the Prime Minister is willing to sleepwalk Canadians into a war without accountability.

(2335)

The Conservatives have been very dishonest about our role in Iraq since day one, but for the Prime Minister to still deny Canadian troops are involved in combat is simply disrespectful to our forces. The Conservatives continue to mislead us about our soldiers being involved in ground combat, and now they want to put our troops in danger.

They have not gained our trust for us to commit to this mission. They have not gained the trust of Canadians because they have not put out all the facts for Canadians to judge. They have not done that for parliamentarians to be able to look at the facts and decide whether this mission should be approved. The Parliamentary Budget Officer is having trouble getting some facts and figures from the government with regard to how much this war is going to cost.

The recent death of Sergeant Doiron reminds us of the risk of deploying troops to the front lines. History has shown us the dramatic horrors that war can bring. Let us not repeat history. The Prime Minister does not seem to be at all concerned about the risks or lack of clear objectives. He seems to want his war in Iraq just as he wanted George W. Bush's war in 2003. However, history showed us that Canada was right in not participating at that time.

We also need to remember Canada's involvement in the war in Afghanistan. Just like our current mission in Iraq, the war in Afghanistan started with Canadian Forces participating in a very limited operations. We know what happened in Iraq and in Afghanistan. It was the longest mission, which was 10 years. New Democrats stood in the House and opposed both of those wars. Today, after 10 years, we can see why the NDP made the right decision, because NDP members make their decisions based on principles. We do not base them on fear or political motivations. We stand up for what is right.

There is a lot we can learn from our military intervention in Afghanistan. Only a few days ago, March 5, the Minister of Foreign Affairs actually said in the media, "Being in this for the long term—it's similar to what we did in Afghanistan, for instance". That is what the foreign affairs minister said. I would like to point out for the minister that the deployment in Afghanistan is nothing Canadians want to see repeated. It was the longest mission, 10 years, cost billions of dollars, and resulted in 166 soldiers, brave men and women, being killed, more than 1,000 injured, and thousands of others who suffered and are still suffering today from post-traumatic stress disorder.

We ask our soldiers to go overseas. We ask them to fight for our country, to defend our freedoms, to ensure our right to practise religion, to freely speak in the House, and yet when those soldiers come home, we have seen the record of the government over the last number of years on the treatment they have given our soldiers. That is shameful. It is time we invested in various services that our soldiers require when they serve for this country.

The Conservatives do not like to look after our veterans, but when it comes to war, they seem to be more than willing to blindly spend money to ensure that we go into some sort of war with no plan and no exit strategy. We must learn from history so that we do not repeat it. Another example is the Libya situation, and we know what happened there. There is a lawless society

there. There is no rule of law. We continue to see the same pattern of the Conservatives following in the footsteps of the United States and sleepwalking into military interventions.

(2340)

I want to quote Mrs. Jaisri Margaret Lambert. She is a constituent of mine, and she sent me an email that came to my office.

Canadians are peacemakers, not warmongers. This is a critical time to disallow the government to even seek the right to kill and find a way of making it "legal". Canada is historically wisely governed by a foreign policy of peacekeeping. Let not my taxes be used to bomb. Help! Life and death issue most important. Please make my voice heard in the House of Commons!"