

S.O. 30

Ambassador and "him" being Mr. Dam of the State Department, "that we're a sovereign nation and that the only natural thing for us to do is to go in and look after our own people." This was at a time when a 707 was sitting on the runway in Barbados. Anyone with experience flying 707s would know that it could not have landed given the condition of the runways in Grenada. I would like to know how that plane was ever diverted to Barbados. I feel we ought to be given an explanation of that. I suppose someone on the other side ordered it to go there. When the Government orders, off goes the captain. I would not be surprised if the captain said, "There is no sense in going to the Barbados for me to take off and go to Grenada because I will never be able to land in Grenada". The Government would tell him to do what he was told. Eventually they had to get a Hercules. I gather the Hercules went there, as the Minister indicated. It was warned off and had to return to Barbados. All this time the Canadian Ambassador was saying that we were a sovereign nation, that we would look after our own kind, and that we did not need any help. That is a very strange way to look after one's own nationals.

I was glad to hear the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam mention the Cunard Line's vessel, *The Countess*, which was due to arrive in St. George's on Monday or Tuesday. It offered to take off all the Canadian, British and United States citizens who were there. However, it was warned off because of the inherent dangers in that country.

The conclusions about the operation itself are still very difficult to finalize. Perhaps we will not take that much comfort from the role of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), vaunted by himself and by his Party as being the great mediator and conciliator in the East-West talks and the North-South talks, boxing the compass, if one likes. It has been very seriously eroded in this particular operation. It is very evident that the facts were not reaching Canada as we would normally hope they would. Perhaps one day they will when we re-establish the credibility of our country. When we look over the record of the Prime Minister, it should not really surprise us. He made incredible inroads of destruction in the Department of External Affairs, in which I served, and divided the country by his policies of confrontation. Now he has eroded his own credibility.

To condemn, as this particular motion suggests we ought to do, the operation which has taken place in the eastern Caribbean in response to a request from four members of the area, I think is much too soon. As for the motion the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) presented at the end of his speech, I have yet to see the text of it but, as I listened to it, I found it even more upsetting, more hasty and based on fewer facts than are justified. While he might have been very happy to have it on the record to show, "What a fine boy am I", there is no question in my mind that it was premature. We have no position, and the Government is no help to us in putting us in a position to make judgments on the particular affair.

In conclusion, with the head of state of the country of Grenada unable to communicate with the rest of the world, with its government upset, with the countries surrounding Grenada seeking assistance and fearful of the consequences of a violent revolution in Grenada, and in the absence of more facts, we can do no more than hope that our Canadians will be brought back safely from Grenada shortly.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, it is with some personal sadness that I rise to take part in the debate on the motion brought to our attention by Hon. Members of the New Democratic Party. I welcome it in a sense because it gives me an opportunity to associate myself immediately with people around the world who have condemned, in the most forceful and justifiable terms, the events on the tiny island of Grenada in the Caribbean just two weeks ago. Their revulsion is a revulsion that I share. Prime Minister Bishop was a long and personal friend. I knew him throughout his political years. I had come to understand, in the sense that I understood the pressures under which he served his nation. There were pressures from those within his administration that would have him be less moderate than he was. There were those in his administration who would have him depart from his contact with the private sector. Others would have had him take a much more stringent, pure Marxist approach. They would have had him bind that nation even closer to Havana and Moscow.

● (2240)

I watched him resist those pressures. I watched him maintain his contacts with the western world, with western democracies. I watched him gain the respect of the Prime Ministers not just of the eastern Caribbean nations, but of the Prime Ministers of all Commonwealth countries, indeed countries within the western world outside of the Commonwealth grouping.

The lot of Maurice Bishop was not an easy one. His entry into politics was caused by his absolute frustration with the corruption of the democratically elected government led by Sir Eric Gairy. His continuation in politics was as a result of a frustration about the low standard of living under which the people of his country has to survive.

In absolute frustration some time after the death of his father, whose dedication was equal, and through the continuing legitimate concerns of his people, the Gairy Government was overthrown. That is all a matter of history. Bishop became the leader of that island nation. In the four and one half years that he was its Prime Minister, I watched the progress in medical care, dental care, education, clean water and agriculture. I watched him try and do for that tiny island that which I had come to respect in the man, an absolute desire to do good for people. I never lost an occasion, nor will I, to reaffirm to the people of Grenada the friendship and love that I and all civil and decent people throughout Canada hold for the people of that nation. Maurice Bishop did not die in vain, nor did his father, nor does any man who in fact sacrifices his life for the betterment of his friends.