

S.O. 30

people who have been subjected to the propaganda of the Progressive Conservative Party in the last months. I know that the Tories took out of context a portion of a previous speech I made two years ago. It was possibly one of the most humane speeches delivered in this assembly for many years, and that Party used it to make the Canadian people believe that the Liberals are Communists and that I myself am a Communist.

I want to tell the Hon. Member for Yukon—and the Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) knows it quite well—that Communist armaments killed over 100,000 people in Lebanon, the country of my ancestors, in the past seven years. Why is he then trying to use a speech in which I was simply saying to the Canadian people that sharing is the future of our country and the future of our world to make the Canadian people believe that here on this side of the House we are Communists when we are not at all?

The Hon. Member and his colleagues, including the Hon. Member for Central Nova (Mr. Mulroney), from what they have shown in the last few days, are those kinds of people who are driving our world into the way of intolerance, which is resulting in actions like the ones which are occurring now in Lebanon, Afghanistan and, for a few days, in Grenada.

I said this in English, Mr. Speaker, because I wanted to make sure—although my English is not as good as I would wish—that people in Provinces and in areas other than mine will understand that Communism and goodwill are not the same thing.

[*Translation*]

To get back to today's debate, Mr. Speaker, Canada's position to date on the events in Grenada is in line with similar positions it has taken in the past, arising from the basic respect any political party and government must show other governments, whatever their allegiance may be.

Mr. Speaker, this last weekend was supposed to be a celebration of disarmament, but instead of showing us brotherly love, it showed us the horror of what happened in Lebanon, where young American and French soldiers who were there in a peace-keeping capacity were brutally murdered. It showed us how a small country called Grenada was ruthlessly invaded.

Mr. Speaker, the past prepares the future, and I remember a similar invasion that took place about seven years ago at the request of the government of the country that was being invaded. Seven years ago, the Syrians marched into Lebanon, at the request of the Lebanese Government. At the time, none of the Western or Eastern countries voiced any objections. Today, seven years later, the Syrians are still there. Syrian cannon and arms have thundered for months over the heads of anything that moved in Lebanon, whether Palestinians, Lebanese or others, and even more forces joined them. All this because countries throughout the world chose to ignore that act of aggression, the massive invasion of a foreign country.

● (2150)

When we refer to disarmament, we generally mean nuclear arms and everyone knows about the nuclear arms race. A lot of people accept it alleging that, strategically, if both sides have nuclear arms, there is no danger of war. However there is another basic aspect to that famous theory which is aimed at deterring a possible enemy, and it is that in addition to having nuclear arms, both sides must show that they fully intend to use them. That is what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, because this is exactly what is going on. Both the Soviets and the Americans are now vying to show up to what length they are ready to go in their military operations. Everything began with Afghanistan. Let us see what occurred afterwards in the Middle East. Look at what happened afterwards in the Middle East. We are now speaking about events occurring very near our own country, in Central America, and the Official Opposition is asking us to endorse such an action, to endorse an aggression which can lead to a nuclear tragedy. We will not, I believe that it is too much to ask, Mr. Speaker. I believe that world leaders have to rise and say: The frontiers of any existing country, whatever it may be, have to be respected. Shall we continue, Mr. Speaker, to accept that the wars of other people be waged in countries which have neither the power, nor the will, nor the capacity to defend themselves, such as Lebanon? Are we going to tolerate such an action, even if we are a free country aligned behind the United States, a country which is proud and which plays a role in NATO, a country which is a member of NORAD, and proudly so, the second largest country in the world, a country located between the two most powerful hostile nations, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, our two neighbors? Even if we live in such a country, shall we accept that the frontiers of the weaker countries not be respected by the stronger countries? Did Canada not protest against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan even if the Afghan government had apparently requested such an intervention?

Mr. Speaker, can anyone give me one good reason which would allow us to justify and condone that kind of action? Unfortunately, on the basis of facts, there is no such reason. As I have said, politicians will have to rise and Canada will have in the years to come to remain in the eyes of the smaller countries the symbol of a nation which has always defended those who needed it, either within its own frontiers or abroad. Let us continue to view individual freedom and freedom of expression as important principles in our lives.

I watched the Members of the Official Opposition take offence yesterday because the Canadian Government had not been consulted. The explanation is simple. Canadians are not a bellicose people, they have never invaded any place, they have always gone where they were asked to keep the peace, they are always where they are needed. They never seek our permission to invade other countries, for they know for a fact that if they did, some 95 per cent of our fellow Canadians would stand up and say "no", for we know that we are not very many to