

S.O. 29

Government of New Zealand, in response to a murder on the *Rainbow Warrior*, to send the New Zealand bombers raining bombs on Paris, Marseilles, and Lyon? That kind of response to violence with violence inevitably leads to further deaths.

This act of state terrorism is in breach of international law. It is in breach of the fundamental rules of international ethics. As my colleagues have pointed out, there are other alternatives for responding to international terrorism. Tough economic sanctions are an important and effective means, when taken collectively, of responding to international terrorism.

I note as well that it is important for us to recognize the hypocrisy in the approach of the American President. Are the lives of black South African children worth any less than the lives of other innocent people who are victims of terrorism? Black South African children are dying at the hands of their government, yet we hear nothing from "Rambo Reagan" about sanctions or terrorism against the Government of South Africa. That hypocrisy and silence is shameful.

Finally, and most fundamentally, surely we must recognize that the roots and seeds of terrorism are found, in many cases, and particularly in the context of the Middle East, in desperation and a sense of total powerlessness and lashing out against conditions of economic servitude, poverty, and injustice. Two million Palestinians have been uprooted from their land. A generation has grown up as strangers without any sense of roots in their own land on the West Bank and elsewhere.

Until we come to grips with the reality that the treatment of the Palestinians has been profoundly unjust by the Israeli occupying authorities on the West Bank, that it has discriminated against them, and has resulted in a denial of justice, we will not fully come to grips with the realities of the Middle East. My colleagues have spoken about the fundamental importance of a homeland on the West Bank for the Palestinian people living in an independent state in peaceful coexistence and mutual respect with the State of Israel.

All Members of the House condemn, without equivocation, terrorist attacks against innocent civilians in other countries. However, let us not be deluded into believing that we will reduce the level of intensity of such violence by responding in kind. Indeed, as I pointed out earlier, the opposite will be the case. Ronald Reagan has argued that the Libyan attacks are state-sponsored terrorism. I say that a Government and a president which engages deliberately in bombing attacks on civilian targets is itself guilty of the terrorism which it proclaims to be attacking.

I expect my Government to speak out on that. I would have hoped that, during the consultations which we were told took place, my Government would have had the courage to tell President Reagan to stand back and examine the alternatives, as the European Community did. Instead of our Government taking that responsible approach, it was ready-aye-ready, full steam ahead. That is cause for sadness and shame today.

My colleagues have spoken of the importance of assuring the safety of the 1,300 Canadians in Libya. Indeed, that is a

concern which all of us share. I hope that the Government has taken the steps necessary to ensure, if necessary, the evacuation of those Canadians who want to leave Libya.

In conclusion, I want to again emphasize my concern that Canada's voice has not spoken out against this act of international state terrorism. I sense that the support of the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) and the Government of this country will be seen in the future as one of the gravest and most profound black marks in the history of the country. I feel a sense of sadness, shame, and anger that we have allowed this act to go by and that, indeed, we have approved it.

**Mr. David Berger (Laurier):** Mr. Speaker, terrorism is a threat to all of us. Most visibly, terrorism has killed and maimed thousands of innocent civilians around the world. Because terrorism has blurred the distinction between ends and means and led many in the world to accept violence as a means of settling disputes, it threatens world stability.

I believe that the American attack on Libya was wrong. It is not the way to deal with terrorism. First, it is stupid. Chances are that this attack will trigger a wave of terrorist attacks which will go far beyond what we have seen to date. People who engage in terrorism will not be restrained by the American action of yesterday. Libya was a convenient target for the United States, given some of the outrageous statements of Colonel Khadafy. It was easy for the United States to attack Libya under these circumstances. Why not Syria? Why not Iran? Those countries could just as easily, and probably have, been behind some of the recent terrorist attacks which have occurred in the Middle East and Europe.

Second, I have it on good authority that the attack is a violation of international law. During this debate in the House this evening, no one has quoted from the United Nations Charter. I would like to do so, but without any sense of superior authority. I just had a good teacher a number of years ago. I would like to read from Article 2(4) of the UN Charter which was referred to in one or two interventions.

● (2330)

It states:

All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

Yes, we have heard President Reagan state that the American action was in self-defence. However, I again quote from the UN Charter, this time from Article 51 which describes the right of self-defence:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, . . .

I am not aware of any armed attack against a member state of the UN which would lead to the American response. Therefore, quite clearly, the American response was a violation of international law and the UN Charter. It was not justified under Article 2 and it is not deemed to be an act of self-defence under Article 51.