

S.O. 29

this very act. I take it that we will not now take any diplomatic or political initiatives *vis-à-vis* the United States, or the Soviet Union, in terms of dealing with the problems of terrorism in the Middle East.

Not only do we not attempt to understand the causes of terrorism, we make no attempt to at least present some alternatives to military solutions. In this connection, one of the most frightening aspects of all is that there now appears to be an attempt to link the provision of aid to the Contras, who are terrorists in Central America—

**Mr. Stevens:** You are now getting ridiculous.

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

**Ms. Jewett:** — to some Libyan action taken in Nicaragua against the Contras. It was distressing to hear live today over television the President of the United States addressing a business luncheon bringing out what I am told is total misinformation with respect to \$400 million having gone from Libya to Nicaragua, as well as an arsenal of weapons and advisors. There is no evidence whatsoever from any reliable source in Washington that this is the case. Even the Department of the Secretary of State in Washington says that there are only a small number of advisors and that there have been no weapons since a report in 1982. The report to which I refer proved to be erroneous since the planes in question were carrying non-military aid. This is an absolute nightmare coming to us once again. Is it only coincidence that this happened today when the vote is tomorrow or the next day and the attack on Libya took place yesterday?

It is somehow being suggested that Libya, which is not a democracy and in which there is no freely-elected Government, is pushing to develop a support system for Nicaragua which will in turn justify the Americans sending more aid to the terrorists in Central America. To all of us—and I hope it is to all of us—this is frightening as it makes one wonder if the timing of this particular raid on Khadafy was deliberate because of the coming vote this week in the United States Congress.

We are all terrified by the possibility of the use of force becoming a pattern in our lives, be it the force of the Libyans, the force of Khadafy, the force of the Americans, the force of the Contras, all the violence and the repression. As Canadians, surely it is incumbent upon us, and upon our Government, to try to persuade the Americans, the Soviets, whoever is exercising this pattern of violence, that to try to end violence with violence will not end it.

It is a great disappointment that the Canadian Government, rather than propose strong, valuable and constructive alternatives to the United States, simply said when it was informed of what it planned to do: "Ready, aye, ready". Surely we could have asked more, and must ask more, now, today and tomorrow, of the Government of Canada.

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

**Mr. Brian Tobin (Humber—Port au Port—St. Barbe):** Mr. Speaker, I came to this Chamber tonight with all other Members in the hope that it would be the first real opportunity for Members of Parliament to gather the information necessary to make an informed judgment, to draw conclusions and to comment intelligently on the events which have unfolded over the last number of weeks with respect to Libya and the United States Government.

We have heard some interesting speeches this evening. The most important speech, the one which Members waited for with bated breath, was that speech delivered by the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen). It was to be beyond the opportunity in Question Period today, which I do not believe elicited too much real information. It was to be the speech which would say to Members of Parliament, and through Parliament to Canadians, exactly what information the Government of Canada had in the days, weeks, perhaps even the months, preceding this military action. More than that, it would indicate to Canadians in a more tangible way than we have seen thus far what the position of the Government of Canada is with respect to the military action which occurred last night.

In my judgment, two things came out of the speech of the Deputy Prime Minister. First, he began his speech by saying that the United States had no alternative in this matter. That is a radical departure from the position which has been taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), even as late as this afternoon. This afternoon the Prime Minister said that Canada supported the objective of the United States Government in combating terrorism. However, under questioning by both the press and by Members in the House, he refused to take a position on the military action by which the United States tried to meet its objective last night. He refused to say whether he condemned it, condoned it, or what he felt with respect to it.

• (2120)

This evening, the Deputy Prime Minister, who, as the Prime Minister himself has said, has been charged with Canada's response in this matter, said that the United States had no alternative whatsoever other than the military action that took place last night. That is new information. For the first time, the Prime Minister, if he will not be contradicted or has not spoken out of turn, has indicated Canada's position on that military action. That is useful when one is trying to find a road map of the position of the Government of Canada on this very serious affair.

What the Deputy Prime Minister did not do is share with Members of this House, and through them the public, or with the leaders of the various Parties in private, any of the information that was communicated to the Deputy Prime Minister by the American administration official who came to Canada to provide the Government with a briefing and with the so-called unassailable information which indicated that Libya was involved in the terrorism of recent weeks and furthermore that Libya has planned for additional attacks. He