

S.O. 30

We believe that the Canadians are in the hotel. We do know that the United States has refused permission for the Hercules to land. One could suspect that the Americans want to return them on their planes in order to give some additional justification to their presence in Grenada.

The American invasion of Grenada brings to mind a scenario that was written at least two years ago. An article was written by Gail Lem in *This Magazine* in March of this year. The article is entitled "The Elephant and the Mouse: What's the US Doing in Grenada?" It is very much worth reading in full, but I will quote only the three first paragraphs. She is talking about something called "Ocean Venture '81". The article states:

Like all such displays of military might, Ocean Venture '81 was weighted with code words, jargon and in-speak, but authorities did not waste undue language skills or political sophistication to disguise the real-life target of the exercise. In the eight-week flaunting of sea power by the United States and its allies in late 1981—their largest peacetime naval manoeuvres since World War Two—

As many will remember—

Grenada became 'Amber and the Amberdeens'—

That was the code:

And 'our enemy in the Eastern Caribbean'—

This is a tiny three-island state which, according to Ocean Venture '81, was:

—busy exporting terrorism, subversion and anti-democratic revolutionary activity' throughout the region under the influence of a menacing 'Country Red.' Citizens of Grenada and its sister island dependencies . . . were understandably horrified at finding themselves the object of the US effort in the Caribbean and they were doubly shocked with the scenario's denouement: an invasion of the country by the US after Amber's radicals seize American hostages and 'negotiations with the Amber government breakdown.'

The United States carried out a full dress rehearsal of this mock invasion at Vieques Island, the US base off Puerto Rico. Under the direction of Rear Admiral Robert P. McKenzie, commander of the Florida-based Caribbean Task Force created by former President Jimmy Carter to counter a perceived 'Soviet threat' to US interests in the region, US paratroopers staged a dawn parachute drop into Vieques. Combat troops trained for mountainous terrain provided support, followed by 1,000 amphibious marine units and air assaults.

The US State Department insisted that the operation was intended only to 'develop a quick reaction capacity for a hypothetical hostage rescue mission.' Why then did the battle plan also call for US troops to remain on the island after rescuing the hostages and to seize power from the 'unfriendly' Amber government in order 'to instal a regime favourable to the way of life we espouse?'

That is the direct quote, "To instal a regime favourable to the way of life we espouse."

That was the scenario in 1981. Apart from the fact that it was not a question of hostages, almost everything else that has happened in the last few days is identical. I fear that it will escalate rather than de-escalate.

American administrations have yet not learned that it is not in the best interest of the United States, their strategic interest or otherwise, to engage in military interventions of this kind. It was not successful in Viet Nam and it will not be now. I am afraid that it will lead to tremendous escalation.

The Cubans have nationals whom they will want to protect as well. They have lost 100 already. They did not start the invasion, and this will just lead, I am afraid, to a tremendous escalation of the situation.

I agree entirely to participating in a peacekeeping effort but I really fear for what will happen before we have an opportunity to do that.

For one per cent of the cost of this massive military invasion, massive in the context of Grenada, that country could have been given an enormous contribution toward economic development, prosperity and political stability. Prime Minister Bishop had sought international development assistance and financial support for the development of the economy and particularly for building its tourist industry base. Such support was not given by the United States, just the opposite. To think that only one per cent of the cost of this invasion could have brought some prosperity and democracy to Grenada!

Mr. Donald W. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) has been making a great issue of the fact that the Minister has not come clean with Canadians. I think we are all prepared to admit that the Government has not come clean with Canadians. I suggest that the fact of the matter is that the Minister has not come clean because he obviously does not have all of the facts himself. They have not been given to him. His diffidence about imparting them to us, even those that he has, is very definitely related to the fact that he has so few to impart. That is obvious. The Minister, while he was out appearing on CBC this evening, obviously did not hear the President of the United States who was talking at that time and revealing that only two hours before speaking—and that was about four hours ago—there had been discovered on the island of Grenada three large warehouses stacked to the roof with arms and ammunition. That fact the Minister obviously did not know. I think none of us have the facts that we need on which to form a judgment.

● (2220)

There are some very disturbing news reports that I understand are now on the news wires. I will not give currency to them because I have no means of testing them, but they are very disturbing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, when you consider that in all sanctimoniousness today the New Democratic Party decided, and tried yesterday, to have a debate on this matter, it can be explained if we look at the chronology of events. On October 12 we learned that the Prime Minister of Grenada had been arrested. That was a Wednesday, if I remember correctly. Over the weekend we heard more disturbing events, and on Monday morning in the House the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) asked the first question about this matter as a result of information which had reached him. That was Monday of last week. There were no questions whatsoever from the New Democratic Party. On Tuesday there was no Question Period because of a procedural problem. On Wednesday the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East asked another pair of questions. On Thursday, a week ago today, the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition led on the matters relating to Grenada, and was followed again by the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East in probing and