

*Government Orders*

It goes on not only to uphold and implement resolution 660, but to restore international peace and security in the area. What is meant by "the area"? How broad is that to be interpreted? Does it mean all of the Middle East? Does it mean just the Arabian Peninsula? Is it just the Persian Gulf?

Does "This resolution is to be presented to the United Nations" mean that we are giving authority to states such as Syria to use all means necessary to restore peace and security to the region? What are the implications of that?

I first of all criticize the resolution to be presented tomorrow for its wording, which I think is very loose and, in many respects, says things that none of us would want to support.

This is the main reason for not supporting it. We think it is premature. It is too soon to authorize member states to use all means necessary, which means military force at this point. It is premature because the economic sanctions were only authorized a little over three months ago. They have not been given enough time to bite.

For years we have been supporting economic sanctions against South Africa, for example. No one suggested after one, two, or three years that we should give up on the economic sanctions and send our troops into South Africa. No. We believed in economic sanctions, and we pushed hard with them. We improved them. We tightened them over the years. We made them more effective.

A little more than three months is not enough to test the efficiency of the economic sanctions against Iraq. In the testimony that has been presented to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and Foreign Trade, all the experts said that we must expect to wait at least six months to a year for those sanctions to bite hard and to have some effect.

Those people who are watching closely feel that they are beginning to take effect, but they will not have the full force of their effectiveness for some time yet.

I point out again that it is premature to suggest that we authorize all means necessary, that is outright war, to accomplish our purposes at this stage.

Economic sanctions are not the only measure that is being used in trying to achieve a peaceful settlement to this dispute. We are also using, and the government has

pointed this out very often, diplomatic initiatives. As a matter of fact, if some of these diplomatic initiatives were taken more seriously, they could lead to a peaceful settlement, because there have been compromises suggested on both sides that could form the basis of discussion that might bring about peace if the two sides were not so inflexible.

Another major difficulty with the use of military force at this time is the double standard in doing so.

If we look at this attempt to use military force against Iraq, in other words to drive Iraq out of Kuwait at this time, and compare this initiative with what we have done in other similar examples around the world in recent years and which still exist today, we will see that there is a great deal of inconsistency and hypocrisy.

There are many examples where today sovereign territories and countries occupied by the armies of other states has been condemned by the United Nations, but where there have been no sanctions and no military action taken against the aggressor. I refer to the U.S. invasion of Panama about a year ago.

If you look at that case, Mr. Speaker, it really gives rise to some of the suspicion of hypocrisy and so on in this case. At that time there was a motion put to the Security Council on December 23, 1989, to condemn the United States for its unilateral military action in Panama, asking it to withdraw and respect international law.

What did the United States do at that time? They vetoed the resolution. The very sort of resolution that they want us to support today, at this early stage before the sanctions have been given a chance to work, they themselves vetoed before the United Nations Security Council on December 23, 1989.

• (1830)

I want to point out, talking about respect for United Nations resolutions, on December 29 the General Assembly did pass a resolution condemning the United States for its unilateral military invasion of Panama and asked them to withdraw and to respect international law. The United States paid no attention to it.

We also have the examples of the Soviet Union invasion into Afghanistan a few years ago—there were no sanctions, no attempt to use chapter 7 of the UN charter—the U.S. invasion of Grenada, the Chinese takeover in Tibet, and the present deplorable Indonesian