

S.O. 30

been able to find any evidence that that Communist takeover threat ever existed.

Speaking of restoring democracy in this hemisphere, have we seen the United States land troops in Chile or Guatemala or Paraguay, that country for which the Hon. Member for York-Peel (Mr. Stevens) has such great admiration? Have we seen those countries invaded to restore democracy? Indeed, ten years ago the Americans did the exact opposite in Chile. They toppled a democratically elected régime and replaced it with one of the worst scoundrels we have ever seen, a scoundrel who as of yet has not held a election in that country and shows no signs of doing so in the near future. Many of us have been astounded for many years when we see the double standard that the country to our south applies in international affairs. It is a "do as I say, not as I do" situation.

● (2330)

I recall from my studies of American history and American foreign policy President Woodrow Wilson's 14 points which were first delivered in a speech to the American Congress in early 1918 as a way of achieving peace in Europe at the end of World War I. Those points grew to some 27, almost all of which were rejected or put aside during the peace negotiations in Versailles at the end of the war. One of those 14 points survived, as I recall, and it was the idea of self-determination of peoples. It is an idea that Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England and Clemenceau, Prime Minister of France, tried to claim originality for at the peace talks, as Wilson tried to claim its originality. But that idea, I believe, is as old as democracy. It is an idea which is included in the United Nations Charter and in the United States Declaration of Independence. But where was that great American principle of self-determination of peoples on Tuesday morning in Grenada?

I think the Americans have forgotten their own history. I believe the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand) pointed out the example of American history when they achieved their independence. I wondered earlier today what would have happened if a superpower of that time, a United States of the late 1700s, had decided to move into the American colonies to forestall chaos and restore the colonial government which was the system considered normal and the approved order at that time. Where would the United States be? Where would those 13 colonies have been in 1776 if someone else had moved in to forestall chaos?

If one claims to walk the high road, one must be careful not to step off. If one wishes to be critical of another person, group or nation, then one cannot commit the same sin and still maintain credibility.

We in the West like to claim a superiority over the Communist bloc and, in many ways, rightly so. We cannot underestimate the value of the freedoms we enjoy. We cannot underestimate the value of the quality of life we enjoy. We also like to claim a moral superiority. But can we do so with justification when the leading power in the so-called western camp, the United States, commits the very sins for which we condemned

the Soviet Union, the leading power of the other side? While there certainly is a difference in scale, is there a difference in kind between the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the U.S. invasion of Grenada?

Mr. Dick: A big difference.

Mr. Sargeant: Tonight we have heard Tory after Tory try to give legitimacy to the American invasion of Grenada because they were invited by the Governor General of Grenada into that country. First, we have no proof of that. Second, let us recall Afghanistan in 1979. At that time the Soviet Union said that it was invited in by the regime to help maintain order.

We condemned the Soviets at that time for that phony excuse, and rightly so. In the four years since the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, we have called upon the Soviet Union time and time again to withdraw their troops, and rightly so. But do we hear our friends over here to my right calling for the United States to withdraw from Grenada? Have we heard them discounting this excuse that they were invited into that country? We have no assurances as to if and when the Americans will leave Grenada. In 1916 the Americans sent troops into the Dominican Republic. They left in 1934. In 1915 they went to Haiti and did not leave until 1924. Today, the United States Congress voted to restrict the American occupation of Grenada to 60 days; but President Reagan has ignored the Congress in the past and it may well happen again.

I took special note today of a cartoon that appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen*. It is a picture of two halves of a face, one half is Andropov with a caption beside it stating "U.S.S.R. occupied Afghanistan" and the other half is Ronald Reagan with a caption stating U.S.A. occupied Grenada. But there is only one voice coming from this person which says: "A clearly justifiable action aimed at protecting a country from the control of a group of thugs". That says a lot, Mr. Speaker.

I also took special note of a column in today's *Ottawa Citizen* written by Anthony Lewis of the *New York Times*. He writes:

As the invasion of Grenada went forward in secret, high Washington officials met to work on a draft of President Reagan's announcement. They had a particular concern: to make sure, as one put it, 'that this does not sound like what Brezhnev said when the Soviet Union went into Afghanistan.'

But however clever the words, the Reagan action speaks louder. And there is no way to avoid what it signifies. It undermines the ability of free people to complain effectively when the Soviet Union uses force for its purposes. It legitimizes Soviet intervention in other countries.

If the United States is justified in using armed force to squash trouble on a tiny island how could we object to Soviet forces marching into Poland... If Ronald Reagan can violate treaties and international law at will, why should anyone listen when we condemn Soviet violations of the Helsinki accords—

He goes on:

For the sake of a tactical military and political victory, Reagan has sacrificed the enormous American advantage of legitimacy. The long-term costs are likely to be extremely heavy.

Consider some of the reasons given by Reagan for the invasion: 'To forestall chaos,' and 'to assist in the restoration of conditions of law and order.' No future aggressor in the world—no tyranny of right or left—will have any trouble meeting those loose standards.