

Would it have been tolerated in principle by the Americans that there would have been intervention by, let us say, the monarchies of Europe at that time? Not at all, Mr. Speaker. That is not a legitimate excuse.

The United States action in Grenada must be condemned not only because it is a violation of international law, but also because it sets an example. It allows that a large powerful nation can invade a smaller, weaker nation, if it does not approve of its system or structure of Government, or even if it does not approve of political developments in that country. How was this any different than the reasoning given by the Soviets for intervening in Poland and Afghanistan or the actions of Libya in Chad or the Cubans in Angola?

If we do not condemn the United States in this case, Mr. Speaker, how can we ever with any sincerity, with a straight face, condemn others who would do likewise again? What hypocrisy. If the United States can flout the principle of national sovereignty when it thinks it is appropriate to do so, then so can anyone else. Some will say those others have already done so, so why not the United States? Well, we expect more from the United States. In the U.S. there is freedom to criticize, there are freely elected governments, and there is a constitution based on very high principles. We do not expect the United States to act like the Soviet Union. We expect much more than that from the United States. We expect the United States to respect principle in international relations. Once we dispense with that principle, then we accept that might is right in international relations and that smaller nations must submit to the large powerful nations. World law and world institutions then become meaningless.

● (2040)

It is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, that many countries see this situation in much the same way. Many NATO countries and allies of the United States have criticized and objected to the action taken by the United States. The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) has mentioned some of those countries which include Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Denmark and Sweden.

Another very sad commentary on this whole incident is the lack of consultation by the United States with its allies. It told some of its allies almost at the last minute what it was about to do, and it told others a few days before, but in such terms that what it was about to do could not really be understood. The United States certainly had no clear and straightforward consultations with the allies it relies upon in so many other ways in international relations.

The House and the people of Canada must certainly reject the puppet policy statement which was made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) in the House the day this incident occurred. The Leader of the Opposition was urging the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to jump on the bandwagon of the United States immediately, even before the facts were established. In responding to the Leader of the Opposition, the Prime Minister said at the time that he was not ready to condemn or condone the American action because he did not

yet have the facts. The next day, which I believe was yesterday, the chief spokesman for the Conservative Party criticized the Prime Minister for taking the whole matter a step forward and delivering a note to the United States. He said that the Government was acting too quickly because it needed more facts and more information before it could make any statement. One wonders who really speaks for the Conservative Party on these matters.

An Hon. Member: Do you speak for the Government?

Mr. Allmand: I am touching upon sensitive nerves now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: You're being silly.

Mr. Allmand: Canadians are asking the same question. As a matter of fact, I have received many calls today which have put that very point to me. It is very evident, Mr. Speaker, that there is a fuzzy approach on that side with respect to this whole matter. Their position would be amusing if it was not so lamentable and if the issue was not so important.

This invasion, Mr. Speaker, must be condemned. That type of action repeats all of the errors found throughout history which have led to all-out war. A small invasion here or a small incursion there are the kinds of sparks that set aflame the tinderbox of war on a worldwide scale. Countries like the United States and the Soviet Union should realize that fact, especially in an age when there are enough atomic and nuclear weapons in the hands of both sides to wipe out mankind entirely. One might call this incident in the Caribbean small, but it can be the sort of incident which can lead to much more horrible catastrophes.

After the terrible conflicts of World War II, the United Nations was established and it was established on great principles. As was mentioned, we celebrated its anniversary on Monday of this week. Although it has had its faults, and we admit that it has, it offers a much better way of resolving disputes than unilateral military action. As Churchill once said, better jaw-jaw than war-war.

Peace requires patience and wisdom, not a hasty military action like that which took place in Grenada by the United States. In particular, peace does not require actions taken by the powerful against the weak.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, a moment or two ago, the Government Whip asked me if I would defer my speech until after the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent) had spoken in order to allow the Minister to speak second. That apparently will not happen, otherwise I would be following the Minister.

Mr. Turner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister was invited outside by the CBC to do a television show at 9.45 p.m.

An Hon. Member: The CBC is more important. Where are his priorities?