

Oral Questions

for External Relations, who said that we would consult neighbours before deciding whether to extend recognition or not. That is a different matter from an invasion.

The second point is that the Leader of the Opposition quotes President Reagan as having said that they intended to ensure the safety of the Americans there. That is not enough for me to justify or to condemn the action. Were there other ways of ensuring the safety of the Americans there than by proceeding by invasion?

In the case of Canada, as I have said, we had authority from Grenada to take our citizens out. I do not know if the United States was refused that authority or not. If they had the authority to do that, I cannot see any reason for invading to protect their nationals when you can protect them by getting them out. I am in hypothesis here, Madam Speaker. I do not know. Perhaps Secretary Shultz will tell us. If the Leader of the Opposition is satisfied with the bland explanation that invasion was necessary to protect nationals, then he obviously knows more than I do.

I do not know why invasion was necessary. The Leader of the Opposition goes on to quote President Reagan as saying that the invasion was also intended to maintain the democratic system. The Leader of the Opposition said that should suffice for me. Obviously it is sufficient for him. I would ask him what would happen if the United States gave itself authority to invade any country where the democratic system did not exist?

NATURE OF UNITED STATES NOTIFICATION

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question is also directed to the Prime Minister who has indicated that they were notified at 1900 hours yesterday. Would the Prime Minister indicate what specifically they were notified of? Was it to be an American rescue operation, or was it in fact the multi-nation entry into Grenada that actually occurred?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, at about seven o'clock last evening Mr. Motley met with Mr. Roy, Minister at the Canadian Embassy in Washington, and outlined a number of options that the American authorities were thinking of in relation to protecting the safety of American nationals in Grenada. Those options largely could be characterized as being of the rescue operation type. There was no indication at that time that an invasion would take place within a matter of hours.

SELECTION OF AIRCRAFT TO FLY CANADIANS TO SAFETY

Hon. Sinclair Stevens (York-Peel): Madam Speaker, my question again is for the Prime Minister who will recall that yesterday the Minister of State for External Relations described the preparations that had been made with respect to taking the Canadians that wanted to leave off of the island. In view of that answer yesterday, would the Prime Minister confirm to the House that in fact the aircraft that was secured was a LIAT aircraft and, as matters developed, it turned out it

needed the consent of each of the Caribbean Governments that own a piece of that company? When that consent was forthcoming this morning it was too late to take the Canadians off as the invasion was then under way. Would he explain to the House why Canada did not secure a Canadian aircraft, or charter an aircraft to take the Canadians off the island, so that they would be secure and safe, if that was their wish?

Hon. Gerald Regan (Minister of State (International Trade)): Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member ignores the fact that there were no problems in relation to the utilization of the LIAT aircraft which was already in the area and, therefore, able to be used on relatively short notice, until we were very close to the time scheduled for the flight to Grenada to pick up the Canadians yesterday.

I believe that flight had been scheduled for 2.30. Earlier approval had been received from the office of Prime Minister Tom Adams of Barbados and it was only shortly before the departure time that two or three other countries that share in the ownership of the airline objected to having an airliner, in which they had part ownership, being seen flying into Grenada. By the time it was cleared up with those countries it was too late in the day for the flight to occur. Indeed the crew had dispersed. Obviously this morning was too late. I do not think there were any reasonable grounds to anticipate that that aeroplane would not have been able to be used.

* * *

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

CANADIAN CONTENT PROPOSAL—JAPANESE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry. On Friday last the Minister of Industry, in answering a question asked by me, indicated:

The Canadian way is the negotiation route, Madam Speaker. We will continue in this direction, but if we are not successful then we might have to take other action.

This was in response to a question with regard to the Government's intention in terms of the implementation of the recommendations of the task force on automotive parts. The Ambassador from Japan has indicated that they do not favour the Government of Canada taking this route, and they have indicated that they will retaliate if Canada moves in that direction. Is the Government presently involved in negotiations with the Government of Japan? Is there a deadline for those negotiations? If that deadline is met without the negotiations having been successfully concluded, will the Government of Canada implement those recommendations?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, as I have indicated on several occasions in this House and other public fora, we are trying to negotiate with the Japanese automobile companies to make a major investment here in Canada as they have in many other indus-