

occupation of East Timor. Where is all the self-righteousness in the world with respect to that? Here we have a country like Indonesia invading and occupying East Timor, with some pretty terrible human rights violations. Where is the consistency in principle? We also have the invasion of Lebanon by both Syria and Israel at different times in 1982. The same approach was not applied at that time.

To give other examples, we have the attempt by Morocco to occupy the western Sahara. We have the example years ago of Turkey occupying the northern part of Cyprus, and it still occupies the northern part of Cyprus. We have the examples of the U.S. complicity with respect to the overthrow of the Government of Nicaragua, the funding of the Contras, and the mining of Nicaraguan harbours contrary to UN resolutions and contrary to a decision of the World Court.

Today we hear the brave statements from the President of the United States about respect for international law, respect for the United Nations, and respect for the World Court. Where were they a few years ago when confronted with these decisions of the World Court and the resolutions of the United Nations?

When we are considering what is being attempted tomorrow in the United Nations, one must also understand the suspicion with which many nations of the world look on this attempt by the major powers at this time to do things that they did not accept themselves, whether the Soviet Union, the United States, or other countries, when they were in similar positions, when they unilaterally occupied and invaded territories which were not their own.

We are totally in favour of a new order at the United Nations where there would be no acceptance of unilateral offensive military action, where all grievances against other states would be dealt with through the United Nations, the World Court and other international bodies, and the use of UN military action against aggressors as suggested in the resolution with respect to Iraq to be presented tomorrow. We would accept that as a new world order if it was to be consistent and universal.

Government Orders

Would the countries that are putting forward the resolution tomorrow at the UN be willing to amend that draft resolution to adopt a universal policy against all aggression, and not simply this aggression of Iraq against Kuwait? Would they be willing to apply the principles that they are putting forward with respect to Iraq? Would they be willing to put those into operation against all cases of occupation of foreign territory which are presently existing in the world today? Would they make it apply to cases which might come up in the near future? In other words, would the major powers renounce all unilateral aggression on their own part and accept the same sanctions that they want to impose against Iraq?

If we were to cast ourselves back to a year ago, would the United States agree now with respect to Panama to the same sort of regime that it is suggesting with respect to Iraq? I might say that Noriega is just as serious an international outlaw as Saddam Hussein. Both of them are not people to be congratulated. They are people to be condemned for their actions internationally.

The question is: Do you deal with the Noriegas and the Husseins of the world by unilateral military action, or do you deal with them through the United Nations? Do you pick and choose according to your own national self-interest when you do that? In other words, you suggest one plan of action through the UN when your oil and energy interests are at stake, but when there are some other interests at stake, you do it another way.

One might ask: Why this double standard? Why this lack of consistency? There is no doubt that it has something to do with energy resources. If we look at statements of the American government over the years, we see that it has always considered the energy resources in the Middle East to be of utmost importance.

In the 1940s the State Department issued a statement that the Arabian Peninsula constituted a stupendous source of strategic power and one of the greatest material prizes in world history. Later President Eisenhower described the Middle East as the most strategically important area in the world. As a result, a driving concern of the United States over the years has been to protect its energy resources in that area.