

S. O. 29

terrorism. In 1975, Senator Frank Church chaired a committee which studied U.S. intelligence activity around the world. That committee detailed CIA involvement in assassination attempts on such diverse world leaders as Fidel Castro of Cuba, Patrice Lumumba of Zaire, Rafael Trujillo of the Dominican Republic and Diem of South Vietnam. These were people on all sides of the political spectrum, just people who happened to be in the way of the CIA at that particular time. These particular attempts at assassination did not succeed. We still have Fidel Castro very much with us. But other attempts did succeed. Right now President Reagan is attempting to link the situation in Libya with the situation in Nicaragua and at the same time he is again coming before the House of Representatives for \$100 million worth of support for the Contras, the people whom President Reagan calls freedom fighters.

I would like to give some details of those so-called freedom fighters. On February 16 a Swiss development worker in Nicaragua was driving a truck home when he saw a group of 16 women who asked for a ride. He picked them up, and as they drove along they hit a land mine. The truck was forced to stop, and as it stopped the Contras stepped out of a ditch and gunned down the development worker and four of the women. The Washington office on Latin America has sponsored a report on violations of the laws of war by both sides in Nicaragua. It was prepared by Mary Dutcher, a former Assistant Attorney General for the State of Missouri. I would like to read the following dominant conclusions of this report:

The preponderance of the evidence indicates the continuation of a systematic pattern of gross violations committed by Contra forces . . . The presence of Contra troops in a given locale seemed to give rise to a pattern of indiscriminate attacks against civilian targets, kidnappings, rapes, assassinations, mutilations and other forms of violence—

On the other hand, the violations that were committed by members of the Nicaraguan armed forces appear to be relatively isolated cases of abuses of authority and breaches of military discipline. There was no evidence that violations were condoned by superiors.

The report also shows that in a number of cases Nicaraguan soldiers or militia who were guilty of abuses were punished with long jail terms. The preponderance of evidence indicates that the great majority of abuses in Nicaragua have been committed by the Contras, the very people for whose support President Reagan is asking for \$100 million.

A few months ago it came to the attention of the American public that the CIA had published a manual, quite contrary to American legislation, on psychological operations in guerrilla warfare for the Contras operating in Nicaragua. This manual calls for a selective neutralizing, or assassination—that is what the word “neutralizing” means—of targets such as judges, police, security officers and local militia heads. It calls for that kind of selective assassination as a way of inducing terror among the Sandinista people, those people who would want to support their Government. These are the Contras for whom President Reagan wants to provide \$100 million in support. Yesterday morning I heard a report on the CBC that I can scarcely credit. I would be interested in having this chased down because it seems to have disappeared from the news. However, I heard it twice yesterday on early morning news

reports. They indicated that the Contras had considered a plan to assassinate the United States Ambassador in Costa Rica, with the idea that this assassination would later be blamed on the Sandinistas, giving a pretext for an invasion of Nicaragua. These were reports I heard on the CBC.

● (2240)

We are talking about Americans concerned about terrorism in Libya. I want to emphasize the fact that the Americans do not come to this situation with clean hands. We want to see an end to terrorism. We want to see an end to terrorism in the Middle East. We want to see an end to American-sponsored terrorism in Central America. I think the answer has to be a greater reliance on world law and world opinion. Unfortunately, the United States turned its back on world law by withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the World Court in its dispute with Nicaragua last year. Today, world law is needed more than ever. Today, reliance on the United Nations and the offices of the United Nations is needed more than ever.

In the face of the threat of international terrorism what we need is not hasty, ill-considered vigilante action. Rather, what we need is a degree of patience, self-control, a co-ordinated attempt to work with all nations to eradicate this evil. Terrorism will not be defeated by vigilante action. It has to be defeated by the rule of law, and the rule of law has to be based on justice. We have to make sure that we provide justice for the people of our world, otherwise we will continue to face the threat of terrorism.

There have been alternatives suggested. Unfortunately, those alternatives were not suggested by our Government when it was in touch with the United States. I think we should be pushing for tough economic sanctions when we have conclusive evidence that one country is harbouring terrorism. We should be pushing for an international anti-terrorist police force which can act effectively in this area. Given the historical origins of terrorism, we need more than a mad dog view of human history which feels that by hitting at someone such as Khadafy we will solve the problem.

In conclusion, I would like to quote again the words of our Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) from January 13 when he said:

—we, as leaders, are not powerless to do something about this. We can encourage support for more effective enforcement of international law—

I only wish that our Prime Minister had done this during this past week when he was aware of the threat of the American invasion.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Hon. Chas. L. Caccia (Davenport):** Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that it is impossible to remain silent and indifferent in this debate. I admire the cool and the indifference of Tory back-benchers who so far have chosen not to participate in it. I look forward to hearing some voices of Members from across the way taking a stand on this very important resolution before us.