

S.O. 29

behind such acts. Instances of terrorism would then be both much reduced and more amenable to prior detection and appropriate policing action by the international community as a whole.

In conclusion, let me mention a wider point that affects this debate tonight. Not long ago I sent to my colleagues in the House a book sent to me by a constituent entitled *How Democracies Perish* outlining the vulnerability of democracies to all sorts of forms, but primarily terrorism. We do not have many democracies in this world, and they are vulnerable. They are vulnerable to acts of terrorism. This the United States has had to recognize. This, I think, all civilized people will recognize. Peaceful political settlement, especially with the long term objective of democratization of more and more countries, is both the process and objective of our policy. It is our hope this will soon penetrate the Middle East. Let us not give up on this, Mr. Speaker. Let us remember that regional conflicts have been resolved in the past. Regional conflicts can seem intractable but nothing is intractable. Let us resolve again tonight to do what we can to stop the spiral of violence and help bring that region to a new and genuine security.

[Translation]

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) was referring a few minutes ago to an 11-year old boy who asked his father whether there was going to be a World War, when he heard the news about Libya. Mr. Speaker, I remember clearly that as a boy of nine, in 1961 I asked my mother and father the same question: Mom, Dad, is there going to be a World War? They answered: We don't know. We don't know.

[English]

It is with a sense of anger, shame and pain that I participate this evening in the debate on the events in Libya. I believe that all of us in this House should share the sense of shame that Canada's voice, which historically has spoken out for peace and against the use of violence to resolve international disputes, has been silenced. Not only has that voice which has been respected in international fora been silenced, but that voice has been joined in unison with the voice of the perpetrator of murder of innocent civilians.

I believe the response of the U.S. Government and of the President of the United States in this instance was fundamentally immoral. I say immoral because surely it cannot be right to suggest that by taking the lives of innocent Libyans, who had no dealings whatever with people in other countries, certainly no dealings with terrorism, that somehow we are reducing the risk of terrorism in other countries. It cannot be right to suggest that by paralyzing a 14 year-old Libyan boy for the rest of his life by breaking his spinal cord that we will in some way be reducing the likelihood that Colonel Khadafy may engage in acts of violence himself.

It cannot be seriously suggested that by murdering the 15 month-old adopted daughter of Colonel Khadafy that we will

in any way reduce the possibility that that man, who has certainly been an instrument of hatred, of intolerance, of anti-Semitism and of violence will suddenly become a man of peace. No, Mr. Speaker, by adopting the approach that President Reagan has adopted, far from reducing the likelihood of violence, of the loss of life of innocent civilians, he is increasing the possibility of further death and further violence.

The message which he is giving to the people of this world is that we respond to terrorism with terrorism. I say terrorism, and I say state terrorism, because if we examine the definition of terrorism, I understand that to be the taking of innocent human life for political motives. Innocent human lives have been taken to send a political message by the President of the United States.

What is that message, Mr. Speaker?

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, the message is clear: Violence is being met with violence, murder with murder and terrorism with terrorism.

[English]

An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, on an international scale. That cannot be right.

I am ashamed that my Government has sided with the instruments of violence and death in Libya. I am concerned that this decision, this strike by President Reagan is merely a foreshadowing of something else that he has wanted to do for some time. Remember, it was Ronald Reagan who proudly proclaimed "I am a Contra. I am a Contra".

My colleague, the Hon. Member for Cowichan—Malahat—The Islands (Mr. Manly) has very eloquently demonstrated the record of murder, violence and torture of the Contras in Nicaragua. "I am a Contra" the President said. Today he went on and suggested that Libya is involved in the funding of the Sandinistas in Nicaragua. He says that \$400 million is going to the Government in Nicaragua.

There is a profound danger that "Rambo Reagan" as the new super cop of the globe will see his next mission to destroy the revolution of the people of Nicaragua using the pretext of a link with Libya.

• (2320)

I remind you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that it was that same Government which mined the harbours in Managua, an act which surely could have resulted in loss of innocent human lives. Let us examine the rationale of the American Government. It has suggested, and the international community waits for the evidence, that the Libyans are responsible for the death of an American serviceman in West Germany. If that is true, the international community condemns that terrorism. The Americans say that they will respond to that death by bombing in Libya.

What if that logic had been applied by the Government of New Zealand? Would it really have been appropriate for the