

on September 27 of this year will be given very serious consideration, so that the Secretary General of the United Nations will have the resources, tools and staff to intervene personally in a peace-keeping capacity when necessary and to prevent the worst, whenever possible. I am sure that all Members would agree to providing the Secretary General of the United Nations with additional funding and resources, thus enabling him to play a peace-keeping role.

[English]

**Mr. Terry Sargeant (Selkirk-Interlake):** Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this very important debate. When I woke up on Tuesday morning and heard the news on the radio and learned that the United States was invading Grenada, I was stunned. I cannot really say that I was surprised. I think that over the last few years I have become numb to what any of the superpowers might do and particularly to what the United States has a history of doing in Latin America and the Caribbean. However, I was stunned that the United States would do something that was so patently stupid. I really wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Americans will ever learn. However, I will return to that point in a moment.

I was saddened, as I am sure were many other Canadians, the week before when I heard about the events that went on in Grenada. I, like many other Canadians, was saddened particularly by the death of Maurice Bishop, the late Prime Minister of that country. The Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) who spoke earlier pointed out that many Canadians had a certain degree of admiration for Maurice Bishop and for the type of government that he brought to the country of Grenada. Certainly we all admit that that government was far from perfect. We would have liked to see a move toward a more democratic, pluralistic society. However, there is no doubt that it was a government that was vastly superior to the one that had been run by Eric Gairy, the former Prime Minister of that country.

One wonders what might have happened if the United States had not rebuffed Bishop's persistent attempts over the last year or so to achieve some sort of a rapprochement with the United States. Events may well have been very different. However, what kind of response did Bishop get from the United States for all of his attempts at friendship? As my friend the Hon. Member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett) pointed out earlier, the United States continued to run its annual Caribbean amphibious exercise featuring mock battles or invasions of Grenada as usual and it pursued its habitual attempts to isolate Grenada within the Caribbean community.

As the Leader of the New Democratic Party said in his opening speech on this debate, the Grenada invasion was simply an event that was waiting for an excuse to happen. I think many of us recognize the fact that over the last few years since the Reagan administration has been in office, President Reagan has been itching for some kind of an excuse to involve himself in the politics of that area. Indeed, he has been itching for some excuse to go to war in that area and to put down the

type of government about which he is so paranoid, any government which is slightly to the left of what he considers centre.

What happened in Grenada on Tuesday morning was very clearly a violation of international law. It was a violation of the United Nations Charter in a number of different ways, but notably it was a violation of Article II which calls upon all nations to refrain from threat or violence against the political integrity or independence of any other nation. It was a violation of the treaty and it was a violation of any and all standards of international morality. Ironically, Mr. Speaker, it was also a violation of United States law. It did not comply with the war powers resolution of that country.

I would like to deal briefly with President Reagan's rationale for the invasion. One of his reasons was that the invasion was mounted to protect the lives of American citizens. First, as has been pointed out in debate tonight and as has also been pointed out by the press, there is absolutely no evidence that the lives of the Americans resident in Grenada at the time were in any way in danger. Indeed, American students in that country sent messages through their families to the President the night before the invasion saying that they were in no way threatened and calling upon him not to take any kind of precipitous action. As the Leader of the NDP said in his speech, American envoys were in Grenada a few days before the invasion and saw no threat to the lives of Americans in that country.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Americans did not seem to make any attempts to remove their citizens peacefully from Grenada. The Canadian example was simply to ask and receive permission for a Canadian plane to go into Grenada and remove the Canadian citizens that were in that country. Ironically, it was the American invasion of Grenada that prevented that from happening. The lives of Canadians in Grenada were not threatened until the Americans invaded that country.

On the second point, Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has said that he invaded Grenada in order to restore democracy. When one looks at the American record of restoring democracy in Latin America, one does not hold much hope. During the greater part of the last century, we have seen American troops invade a number of countries in Latin and Central America. In the two most notable situations, what kind of a democratic system has been left behind? Take a look at Haiti, for instance. Papa Doc Duvalier was left as a shining example of democracy in that country. Take a look at Nicaragua where the Somoza family was left in power for some 50 years, I believe. Those men are some of the more oppressive and non-democratic despots that the western hemisphere has ever known.

I remember well that in 1965 I was a university student studying American foreign policy. At that time I watched as the Americans invaded the Dominican Republic under the pretext of saving that country or saving American lives and American interests from a Communist takeover. To this date, Mr. Speaker, some 18 years later, no objective observer has