

## S.O. 30

aggressive behaviour which has been undertaken against the nation of Grenada, because if the United States—and again I stress, the present administration of the United States—succeeds with this, and that is why President Reagan is on television again tonight, then I ask, can Nicaragua be far behind? And after Nicaragua, will it be Cuba? After Cuba will it be the Dominican Republic? And after the Dominican Republic, who knows?

We have a very basic obligation, Mr. Speaker, to send a message to the Government of the United States that it is morally wrong. I also want to stress, Mr. Speaker, that, as is very often the case in politics, morality counts for practical events. They are not disconnected aspects of human existence. Morality in politics frequently counts in the way states behave. If we do not make the proper decision in this instance as a parliamentary democracy on the northern borders of the United States, not only will we be doing a disservice to moral principles, we will not be sending the kind of practical, moral message which must be sent to the Government of the United States. That is what is involved in this debate.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliament of Canada tonight must now join France, Britain, Sweden, Venezuela, Mexico, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic and many other States in making it unequivocally clear that we condemn this invasion.

● (2030)

On the opening day of this session of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, an extremely serious debate took place in this House. On that occasion, as was the case today, I moved a motion under the provisions of our Standing Orders calling for an emergency debate. I did so because the Government of the Soviet Union, through whatever series of events, and in one sense it matters not, got involved in a decision that took the lives of 259 civilians. All of us in this House representing all Parties condemned that action, and correctly so. We did not hesitate when we thought through all of the important intricacies involved, and there were many, and in the final analysis said that was a morally wrong thing to do.

As I said the other day, most actions in politics, whether domestic or international, cannot be reduced to the simplicities of black and white. Most political issues are complex and involve very weighty and practical moral judgments. Occasionally you get clear-cut issues when you look honestly at the evidence. We did that, Mr. Speaker, on the opening day when it came to the shooting down of a Korean civilian aircraft. I suggest we are in exactly the same situation today regarding the clarity of the issues involved. We do not have an issue which is clouded by ambiguity. Anyone who wants to see the facts and see them honestly, I suggest, can only reach one conclusion.

In this sense, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a test for Parliament, a test of the integrity of the Members of Parliament of all Parties, to see if they can apply the same moral standard to that great democracy to the south of us when it acts wrongly,

as we did in applying standards and judgments to the Soviet Union when it acted wrongly.

Therefore I would like to propose we resolve this debate by coming together on a motion today, as we did on the opening day of this session. I would like to propose that motion, and I would hope that after consideration it could obtain the support of all three of Canada's political Parties in this House. It is:

This House supports the judgment of the Secretary of the Commonwealth—

That is our Commonwealth, Mr. Speaker:

—who just recently described the invasion of Grenada as:

“A deplorable act of blatant aggression.”

In the name of decency, Mr. Speaker, in the name of a fundamental commitment to democracy, in the name of a commitment to the principles of non-violence in relations amongst the nations of the world, I urge all Members of the House to support that motion.

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

**Hon. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East):** Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was able to make a short statement on this matter yesterday, but considering the short amount of time allowed for that type of statement I was not able to complete my remarks. Therefore, I would like to very briefly make those same points again tonight.

I pointed out how deeply shocked I and many other Canadians were two weeks ago when the bloody *coup d'état* took place in Grenada, and how many of us would have supported reasonable international solutions to the problem which had arisen there. But we could in no way approve of the U.S. invasion of that small island which took place earlier this week. There is no doubt in my mind that that invasion, as was said by the previous speaker, is a clear violation of international law, the United Nations Charter, and in effect constituted an act of war against Grenada by the United States. If that action was merely to protect and evacuate United States citizens after other less severe alternatives had been examined, then there could be some justification for the attack. But there has been absolutely no evidence thus far that that was the case.

The other reason given by the United States Government for its action was to restore democracy or protect democratic institutions. I said that was a noble intention but very difficult to believe, Mr. Speaker, since many of the governments supported by the United States in Central America, the Caribbean and Latin America are military dictatorships. I referred to the example of Chile where there was a democratically elected government which was undermined by the United States Government and replaced by military dictatorship, and we see no signs of an invasion by the U.S. against that Government. Many other examples could be given as well.

Nor is it enough to argue that this action was necessary because of the bloody *coup d'état* which occurred a few weeks before. Do we forget, or do Americans forget that their very beginnings were born in bloody military revolution in 1776 when Americans took up arms in rebellion against the British?