

S. O. 29

I am astounded by the response of the Government of Canada as we have heard it in the House over the last few days and from the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) earlier this evening. He stated that the U.S. had no alternative. This demonstrates a lack of understanding of international law and of the UN Charter, and the basic principles which should govern the conduct of nations.

As well, I believe the American action will add to anti-Americanism and diminish any influence the U.S. has in that part and other parts of the world. I believe the moral position of the U.S. would have been much stronger if it had made greater attempts to deal with terrorism within the bounds of international law. I am not aware of any resolution submitted at the UN in recent weeks as a response to the bombing in Berlin. I believe that, given the right circumstances, it would be possible to get the Soviet Union to agree to a tough proposal before the Security Council. Over the last few nights I saw Mr. Arbatov on television. He has special responsibilities in the Soviet Union for western relations. He took great pains to distance the Soviet Union from Libya. I saw no understanding of that in the response of the U.S. and its spokespersons in recent days.

This attack is a tragedy because we are seeing a breakdown of international order. It demonstrates the extent to which international legal systems and the UN have been unable to cope with terrorism. It demonstrates the extent to which a policy of appeasement of terrorists has undermined the trust and confidence between western democracies. Many countries have accommodated or accepted terrorism. They have not imposed sanctions or used the UN or other international agencies to deal with terrorism and its causes. I have to question whether the U.S. did all that is humanly possible within international law. I ask any Member in this House: Why is it that the U.S., with all its power, was not able to get the Europeans to agree to adequate sanctions? What does that tell us about American foreign policy? What does that tell us about our position and our ability to influence other countries in this world?

We have to develop methods of dealing with terrorism. I suggest that public opinion will play a vital role in dealing with terrorism. However, a vital element in mobilizing public opinion is evidence. You have to present people with evidence which will allow them to come to the necessary conclusions and adopt sanctions. Yesterday Mr. Reagan said that he had irrefutable evidence, but none of us have seen it. He has said he cannot produce it because that would damage the U.S. intelligence system. That is not the first time he has said that. I would like to quote an article from *The New York Times* of January 9, 1986, which dealt with this problem of evidence. It said:

Claiming "irrefutable evidence" of Colonel Khadafy's role in the airport killings, Mr. Reagan was unwilling to produce it. He said the location of 15 terrorist training camps was known but wouldn't say where "because there are things that should not be revealed."

Such diffidence leaves Mr. Reagan looking like a chronic blusterer. Where are the photographs of those camps? Why aren't they included in the State

Department's white paper on Libya's offenses? If they cannot be published, why not at least circulate them among allied leaders, as President Kennedy did when he sent emissaries to document the presence of Soviet missiles in Cuba in 1962?

*The New York Times* conceded that the President's options were limited but said:

The way to enlarge them is to share the evidence of Libya's complicity.

That was on January 9 and we have yet to see the evidence.

I also feel a sense of shame because the Government of Canada has been a party to an attack which destroys international order. It has been reported in the media that the United Kingdom and Canada are the only two countries in the world which approved this action. The Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) in recent days has proudly said that he was consulted. He was made fully aware of American actions. What does that mean?

Did the Government approve the general idea of an attack? The Deputy Prime Minister said that the U.S. had no alternative. I must believe that the Government came to that conclusion too readily. Did the Government even attempt to convince the U.S. that alternatives were available? Did the Government say that we have imposed sanctions on Libya but we are prepared to upgrade those sanctions? We are prepared to take more increased sanctions. Let us try that before we resort to an armed attack. Was the Government given a list of targets? Did it approve such a list? Were they military targets? Did the Canadian Government tell the U.S. that civilian targets should not be hit? The Deputy Prime Minister earlier this evening said that Canada expressed concern for Canadians. Canada gave the U.S. a list of the locations where Canadians are located in Libya. What does that indicate? Does it indicate that we are only concerned about Canadian lives? Is that the sole responsibility of the Government of Canada?

• (2340)

In trying to come to grips with terrorism perhaps we, who are in Government, might take some advice from younger people. They seem to have more cogent, rational, reasonable answers than we in Government have sometimes. Recently a group of Jewish students lobbied Parliament Hill to encourage the Government to take action against terrorism. These students represented the group, North American Jewish Students Network Canada. They urged three things of the Government and of parliamentarians. They urged the establishment of a joint Senate parliamentary committee on terrorism. They urged the implementation of effective legislation to seek out, investigate, prosecute and punish terrorists and their supporters. They urged that known terrorists and representatives of terrorist organizations be barred from entry into Canada for any purpose. Did they suggest that we should strike at Libya? No. I would suggest again that young people perhaps provide wiser counsel than we get sometimes in the area of Government.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to quote a letter that appeared in *Le Devoir* on January 18 of this year, signed by a