

S.O. 30

Those are the three important matters that I want to say that the debate is not about, Mr. Speaker.

I now want to turn to the essence of the matter. What we are talking about is an act of aggression, as open, as calculated, as inhuman as any other act of murder. I use my words with care because I think it is important for us as politicians to keep in mind what acts of unjust war, in particular are all about. Wars in general are about killing people. Today, as we are debating in Canada, in a fellow member country of the Commonwealth young men and probably young women also are being killed. This means, and we should think of these things,—that when their lives are snuffed out they will never see a cloudless sky with stars again. They will not have the pleasures and the friendships we will have, and they will not experience the joys of parenthood. They will not do all the mundane or blissful things that are part of the human existence.

These people who are being killed, whether young Grenadians defending their land, whether Cubans who happen to be in their land, or whether a young soldier from Iowa who happens to be a U.S. marine and who has been instructed by his Government to act in this way, and, like young soldiers in any nation, is inclined to accept what he is told to do as being the right thing, are lives being lost today. War is not some abstract entity that is a collection of mere statistics. War means that men and women, particularly young men and women, are going to disappear from the planet in a violent and cruel way. We must keep that in mind in this debate.

In my view what we are involved in, in this debate, in this Parliament, is an act that was deliberately and coolly calculated to create violence. It was an act coolly and carefully calculated by a great democracy in the world, the United States of America. I will come back to that in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

Although fellow members of the Commonwealth were involved in this decision to invade Grenada, anyone who understands the political reality of war in this hemisphere or anywhere else on the planet, knows that the United States of America, as the great power involved in this instance, is really behind the activity. For anyone who has any doubt, I ask them to consider whether it is conceivable if the other states involved in this so-called joint action would be taking this action were it not for the United States Marines. Would they, on their own, be combining to invade Grenada? My own judgment, and I suspect that of anyone who thinks about it seriously, would be that they would not be involved.

This is an act to invasion, an act of aggression initiated and led by the United States of America. We in this Parliament have an obligation to state the truth, to accept the truth and, in unpalatable cases, to try to change the reality. That is what we are involved in tonight.

If, as I say, this act of aggression was something initiated in its fundamental causality by the United States, I want, with care, to say why I think that. In so doing I want to deal with the reasons offered by the United States, its President, its

Secretary of State, and other spokespersons, for the action and I want Members of the House to consider them.

No doubt as we are here tonight the President is on television and is readdressing these questions and reasserting the arguments and dressing them up with so-called fact. But just consider the arguments and consider whether anyone would believe them if they were offered, for example, by the head of another super power in another part of the world to justify acts of aggression in another part of the world.

First of all, the President has suggested that the United States has been involved in this act to protect its own citizens. That was one reason that was given. Surely we have to see this as a bogus argument. We now know, not through our own sources but through the *New York Times* as well as other American media, that the United States sent envoys, special representatives of the State Department, a number of days ago, shortly before the invasion, to ascertain whether there was necessity for involvement by the United States of America and its armed forces, presumably, and the answer they got was no.

We also know that the spokesperson for the largest single group of Americans there, namely, the university students, had openly expressed the wish that their President and the United States not take any violent action that could create problems for them.

It takes someone with a rather fanciful imagination to believe that the reason for the action of the United States was to protect its own citizens in Grenada.

Second, the United States has had the audacity, I say, in that region of the world to claim that it was acting to lay the foundations of democracy. I just mention some other countries in that region and ask Members of the House to try to place themselves in those countries and hear the words of the American President. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to think of Haiti, Guatemala, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic. All those countries in our lifetime have had violence inflicted upon them by the United States again, I regret to say, as a democrat. These countries have been attacked, have experienced the violence of the United States marines and invariably the argument given was that the purpose was to create conditions for democracy. Quite the opposite occurred. After each of these actions of violence by the use of the military, democracy did not grow. Vicious, inhumane dictatorships were what emerged from these invasions—dictatorships that lasted not for a year or two but for a number of decades.

As Senator Moynihan of the U.S. said a couple of days ago, you do not create democracies by using violence, and particularly you do not create democracies in one state by inflicting upon it the organized violence of another. Senator Moynihan said in criticism of his own government: "I don't know how you restore democracy on the point of a bayonet". That sums it up very well.

The third reason given for this action by the United States, Mr. Speaker, was that the American Government was asked by the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States to participate in this intervention—again, not to mince words, "to participate