

## S.O. 30

strengthen the rule and effectiveness of the United Nations." We have not yet succeeded.

It is now time to move from high-sounding generalities, on which we can all agree, to specific measures for strengthening the multilateral system.

I invite my colleagues to read again the speech made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. MacEachen) in September because it is very sound advice. It is almost as if he had a premonition that something serious would happen soon. We all expected something soon in Central America but not in the Caribbean. He recommended that:

—the Council should meet informally to avert potential crises by examining incipient disputes during in-camera sessions with the Secretary-General.

—the Secretary-General requires additional personnel and resources for the more effective use of his "good offices" in the resolution of disputes.

This is the crux of the problem. We have a serious problem in Central America. We have a new one in the Caribbean. But no one turned to the Secretary-General of the UN because I think we do not want him to have the resources he needs to play the role he should be playing. As we all know, he was not involved in the Falklands crisis and he should have been involved in this crisis. Of course with the limited resources he has, it has not been possible. I wish that in the near future members of the United Nations would take this advice seriously and make it possible for the Secretary-General of the UN to have more resources and personnel to assist him to use his good offices in keeping peace and bringing peace to wherever, and whenever it is necessary.

We heard the criticism of the invasion by a wide range of countries, which indicates that criticism is not based on ideology because it comes from all sides. It is based on something more fundamental, a respect for international law and order. The claim is made that the invasion was carried out to save lives when in fact more lives were lost. I feared for the Canadians, not after the assassination of Maurice Bishop, but when I learned that an invasion had taken place led by American troops.

The claim is made that the invasion was carried out to restore order when in fact it consisted of violence and terror. Finally, the claim is made that the invasion is to re-establish democracy in Grenada.

Similarly, when Argentina invaded the Falklands it did so in the name of the holy cause, reunion of the island with the motherland. What was the position of this House at that time? It was, Mr. Speaker, that regardless of Argentina's claims, the invasion was not an acceptable means of achieving the objective. Once invasion is used to achieve one's objective, it will be used to achieve another and another and another. The end result is national chaos in which the strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must.

Great Britain understood all this in the case of the Falklands, and Great Britain understands that in the case of Grenada. The Canadian Government understood that in the case of the Falklands, and the Canadian Government understands that in the case of Grenada, of course.

[Translation]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin):** Order! I am sorry to interrupt the Hon. Member, but his time has expired. However, he may continue if he obtains the unanimous consent of the House.

[English]

Is there unanimous consent to allow the Hon. Member to terminate his remarks?

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Dupras:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One of the most disturbing features of the invasion is the spectacle of a great power, one of the most powerful countries in the world, invading one of the tiniest. This creates tremors of fear for many of the small countries of the world, particularly those located near giant neighbours. I can tell that from conversations of the past few days I have had with members of the Nicaraguan Government. Nicaragua, for example, is fully convinced that the invasion of Grenada is a prelude to what may happen next.

The fear is not only of enemy forces arriving and occupying the country, but economic terrorism which devastates crops, buildings and roads. These are acts which Canada has consistently condemned when committed by terrorist forces and insurgents. They are likewise to be condemned when committed by a great power.

It is now essential to move beyond the debate as to why this invasion occurred and to plan a solution to the problem it has created. I am persuaded myself that Canada, working within the Commonwealth context, has a major contribution to make. Suggestions have been made by various parties that a peace-keeping force possibly composed of Indians and an African State, maybe Zambia, or other nations from Africa and Canada could provide the means for an early withdrawal of the invasion troops. I suggest that all Parties in this House put aside their differences concerning the invasion and get together to support some practical initiative for resolving the problem. This could be done under the auspices of the Commonwealth Secretary.

Finally, the example, as I said earlier, of great powers invading small powers raises the question of whether international law and order has to be found. My own feeling is that middle powers, whether inside or outside the Commonwealth, have a responsibility to play a much more active and creative role in international affairs than they have to this point. In my view, this applies whether one is speaking of North-South relations or East-West relations. It is my hope that Grenada may be one of the first places for such a middle power strategy to be put into effect.

● (2320)

[Translation]

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the recommendations formulated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs