

government which supported the Duvalier regime for years.

Now there is a beacon of light. There is an opportunity.

[*Translation*]

Maybe Mr. Clinton and his new administration would hold a gala in Washington. The Canadian government certainly has the opportunity to propose solutions, to make recommendations and to present some new initiatives for Western countries.

[*English*]

I think we must undertake a far more significant and serious effort first as our resolution puts forward. If the embargo is going to be taken seriously we must ask others to enforce it. We cannot allow Europe and other countries of Latin America to cast a blind eye toward their responsibilities as members of the international community. We cannot continue to allow a double standard to exist.

I think it is almost immoral to initiate one set of actions for a devastated country in one part of the world and not at least show an equal initiative or effort in the other.

It goes back to the point I was trying to make in the debate last evening when we were talking about the government's actions in Somalia. If we are proposing to become involved as part of a multinational force in Somalia based on the violation of human rights, extreme suffering and a breakdown of government, does not the same criteria not apply to Haiti?

Why do we choose one and not the other? What is the difference? That is one of the reasons why these issues must become part of our parliamentary debate. It is one reason why we are using the measures under the special economic act to open this debate and ask the government what is the difference?

We want an explanation. We want to fully understand why it is taking multilateral, military action in one area where there is violation of human rights, deep human suffering and the overthrow of constitutional government and not in the other.

I think it is fair to ask what judgment is being applied to make a difference. There may be perfectly reasonable propositions, but we have not had them explained. I have gone through the statements the Secretary of State made at the Bahamas meeting. I read carefully the

statement of our ambassador to the United Nations last week at the debate of the UN resolution and nothing was said.

Our ambassador at the United Nations addressed the Haitian resolution at the very same moment the debate was going on in Somalia, and yet it was as if there were two different worlds. It was not even mentioned. There was no attempt to even pose the problem that if the UN is going to be initiating a set of standards for one country, it should at least be considering one for the other.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has said she thinks this matter should be considered by the Security Council. I accept that at full value. Certainly, it should be accepted at full value, but the issue really is, what are we proposing to the Security Council? Are we undertaking diplomatic initiatives among other countries of the western hemisphere to build some kind of consensus as to what action should be taken? Should embargoes be strengthened? Should there be more aid? Should we be talking to the Americans to get them on side or are we prepared to discuss in realistic terms whether some form of military action might be required?

The US landed in Panama to get rid of Noriega, a drug smuggling ruler of that country. There is pretty good evidence the rulers of Haiti are also engaged in the drug business. I think it is up to Canada to raise these questions. There is no reason why we should not. There is no reason why we should not act to try to bring these very difficult matters into perspective.

I think it is also incumbent upon members of Parliament to raise these issues because in some ways they go to the very heart of what we are as a country. If we are going to be asked to assume and accept a new definition of international security, which requires and accepts the involvement and intervention of various countries of the international community and various countries which have broken down for reasons of enormous human rights violations, then surely it is a responsibility of this Parliament to come to grips with those issues.

It should not do it in an *ad hoc* responsive way and should not be subject to the vagaries of the U.S. presidential elections or whatever. Surely it is time we had some degree of consistency or coherence in those measures we think are important. I would say the kind of opportunity the special economic act offers for this kind of debate should be part and parcel of a standard procedure used when we are initiating major international commitments, whether through the UN, the OAS,