

S.O. 29

**Ms. Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam):** Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen), speaking on behalf of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney), says the cycle of terrorism and violence must be broken. The act of the United States, as has been pointed out by other speakers tonight, excluding the Deputy Prime Minister, will only exacerbate terrorism and violence just as other acts taken by the United States sorrowfully in the past have exacerbated terrorism and violence.

We who say tonight that we must eradicate international terrorism are, however, being told by the Government that this was an exceptional occasion, that the United States had to take this action against Libya, that it did not really want to have to do it, but Libya was such a mad dog that it had to do it. Only a year ago the United States was looking at Syria and Iran, countries which may indeed be a dangerous source of terrorism, for all we know. We have had a great deal of evidence provided that there were probably more centres of terrorism in other countries than, in fact, Libya. However, the United States has made up its mind that it would be in its best interests, not in the interests of eradicating terrorism, to have a military strike against this particular nation.

I believe we are never going to understand and attack the root problems of terrorism, as the Deputy Prime Minister said at the end of his speech we should be doing, unless we really try to understand the root causes of terrorism, particularly terrorism in the Middle East. I would suggest that all Hon. Members of the House read an excellent presentation made to the Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations less than a month ago by SFU Professor Allan Cunningham, who is an expert on the Middle East. He said, and I quote:

Too often we talk about terrorism and treat it as a phenomenon whose causes we do not actually bother to investigate too carefully and we therefore give our attention to the immediate problem of counteraction to it.

I think that terrorism should be seen as a measure of the prevalence of diplomatic failure on the part of many states.

There is, of course, a mindless degree of terrorism and this is the sort of terrorism which tends to hit the headlines but is actually less often present than people are led to believe if they just read today's paper re the episode and do not inquire, as newspapers usually do not, about what lies behind the episode in question. In fact, more often than not, people who do try to get behind terrorism to explanations and causes find themselves dismissed to the extent that it is sometimes thought to be a disadvantage to know something about.

William Casey, Director of the CIA, himself tells us there is no evidence that the Soviet Union orchestrates international terrorism, a theme which he seems to have not communicated to his President.

**Professor Cunningham continues:**

The President of the United States presents the United States as a country on guard for civilization against barbarian challengers. The barbarian is usually an Arab or a Latin American. . . . But this is playing both sides of the street. One is on the one hand condemning terrorism and on the other practising it, often on a much larger dimension. For Canadians it is important to recognize the associated language, the language which is all symbols rather than substance, and this is all, I think, very dangerous and to be guarded against in our own country because the argument tends to run that if terrorism is generally in our interests then it ceases to be terrorism.

But if it is against our interests, then of course it genuinely is terrorism.

That is the end of the quotation. That is what we should be discussing tonight in this debate. Unfortunately, that is not where the Government has helped to place the debate. Did the Government express any profound concerns about the causes of terrorism to the United States Government? Did it express what, in its view, if it had a view, were some of the causes of terrorism in the Middle East? Did it have any assessment of its own on the degree to which the evidence produced by the President was in fact reliable? Did it have any evidence about other sources of terrorism in the Middle East and did it communicate these to the President or to his advisers? Did the Canadian Government, as we asked earlier today, actually propose alternatives to this military strike which, unhappily, is going to lead only to more terrorism?

Did Canada, a nation which has supported the United Nations from the very beginning present international alternatives? Did the Canadian Government say: "We feel this matter should be brought before the Security Council of the United Nations before any military action is taken"? Did the Canadian Government even mention the United Nations in its discussions with the United States? I see it is not one of those nations which has now put the matter before the Security Council. The Deputy Prime Minister has not even mentioned the Security Council or the United Nations in the context of trying to resolve the conflict about which we are speaking tonight. Apparently we took no initiatives, or they surely would have been mentioned. Did the Prime Minister say to President Reagan before this act was perpetrated: "In light of the Soviet Union's equal concern regarding Khadafy, as has been evidenced over the past months, have you discussed with it what diplomatic initiatives you might take together to isolate Khadafy?". Was that ever done? Did the Government take that type of initiative when it was talking with the President of the United States?

• (2110)

**Mr. Rodriguez:** I don't think so.

**Ms. Jewett:** There were United Nations initiatives. There were diplomatic initiatives. We talk about wanting to see the development of crisis management. However, did the Canadian Government have any suggestion for crisis management in this particular instance? I am sure that if it had, we would have heard about it today or this evening.

Thus one is reluctantly led to the conclusion—and I do mean reluctantly because Canada has a good record on these types of initiatives at the UN and elsewhere—that Canada took no initiatives on this matter. It simply accepted the American decision to follow the military course of action. That country now says, well, it's too bad but this type of thing has to be done from time to time.

It appears that the Government will just follow suit and not take any initiatives when the next action is taken, and the one after that, and the one after that. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, and I think all of us in the House would agree, the cycle of terrorism will not stop. It will be exacerbated by