

sanctions, before we consider sacrificing the lives of thousands and thousands of individuals.

I point out to the House that, in the other examples that have happened over the last number of years, we used economic sanctions. Such was the case in South Africa, where we have used economic sanctions for years and have been hoping that they will work. We did not think of a war when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. We condemned them in the United Nations, but we did not suggest a war.

In this case, it suggests that we are moving into a new order because the cold war is over. Good, Mr. Speaker, I want to see this new order, but I do not want it to apply selectively. If it is going to apply here, let us make it universal, and let us make sure that all nations, including the superpowers—the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Britain, and China—will accept for themselves the same sort of regime that they are suggesting to others.

**Mr. Jack Shields (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend suggested that this is no time for war. No time is a time for war, and I think we all accept that in the House.

There were accusations of a double-standard when comparing actions that we have taken as a government against Iraq's occupation of Kuwait, and the American invasion of Grenada and Panama, and things like that.

There has been the accusation, in the media and obviously by my friend across the way who just finished speaking, that we are applying a double-standard in the approach to the present crisis in Iraq. That has become a recurring theme in the debate today, this double standard.

Canada has been forthright in its attitude in the Iraqi occupation. The opposition is saying that we did not show the same firmness when faced with other similar breaches. Well, it would be wrong to consider this act of aggression of Iraq against Kuwait in the same way, regardless of their context. Is the hon. member suggesting that all kinds of supposedly similar historical incidents can be brought up to argue that the world is behaving differently toward Iraq? The Canadian position on other issues is very clear, well known, and well justified.

### *Government Orders*

For example, I would if ask Canada's policy with regard to the occupied territories is a matter of record. We have opposed consistently the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza by Israel. That is clearly on the record. But to compare the situation of a more powerful nation such as Iraq, heavily armed, unilaterally moving in and taking over another country, to fully occupy that country—not to occupy, restore order, and then move out, but to fully occupy that country—with the atrocities that are going on, to rape and pillage that country, and to announce clearly to the western world that it is going to annex that portion of Kuwait to the country is entirely different.

Does the hon. member not see a difference in the invasion of Grenada to restore order, peace, and government and then move out. It is entirely different. The United States at no point in time ever said that it was going to occupy permanently Grenada. The same thing happened in Panama. To use these, to me, just does not make sense when we hear Hussein in Iraq saying that it is going to occupy Kuwait, period. It is going to happen. It is going to keep the territory and it is going to annex it. It is entirely different.

**Mr. Allmand:** Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that. I do see similarities. In the cases of Grenada and Panama, the United States had certain grievances with respect to those governments. Instead of proceeding through the United Nations, it proceeded unilaterally with the use of its own armed forces and violated the principle of international law that every country is a sovereign state.

I am not saying that those countries, such as Panama, should not have been dealt with, but they should have been dealt with by the United Nations and that was not done. The Americans flaunted the resolutions of the United Nations which were similar to the ones that are now directed against Iraq.

If the member wants an example with respect to double standards, I will refer again to the still-existing occupation of East Timor by the Indonesians. We trade and have diplomatic relations with Indonesia. Why are we tolerating this occupation? The reason we tolerate that occupation, overlook it, and bury our heads in the sand, despite the human rights violations, is that there are no energy interests in that country. There are no interests to the United States, such as I pointed out