

Supply—External Affairs

security council will not only be able to enforce a cease fire, to bring about a cessation of fighting and movement of troops after the fighting, but it will also be able at least to begin the process which we have failed miserably to do in 20 years, the process of bringing peace and political settlement to the area.

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the Prime Minister review the historical past I asked myself one question—what of 1956? The other day in the United Kingdom this matter came before the House of Lords and Lord Avon, the former Anthony Eden, without actually saying so was able to leave the impression that the mistakes of 1956 have proven to be the nursery of the troubles of 1967. I am reminded by the Prime Minister's quotations of the debates that took place in this house in 1956. At the conclusion of his remarks the Prime Minister dealt with the need for action in the United Nations or by the four major powers.

It is interesting to recall the words of 1956 that caused difficulties within this nation. At that time the right hon. gentleman was secretary of state for external affairs. The then prime minister, right hon. Mr. St. Laurent, dealt with superpowers, supermen, and had this to say:

I have been scandalized more than once by the attitude of the larger powers, the big powers as we call them, who have all too frequently treated the charter of the United Nations as an instrument with which to regiment smaller nations and as an instrument which did not have to be considered when their own so-called vital interests were at stake.

These words brought solace to Nasser and others connected with him. I said at that time:

The only reference in the preceding paragraph is to Britain and to France. I am scandalized, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister saw fit to condemn Britain and France to the same bag in which the U.S.S.R. was placed.

I say today that the views members of the opposition expressed in 1956 could be read and reread and they would reflect to an unusual degree events that have happened since.

I want to say at once that I asked for this debate. I also asked, in the event that there was information that should be available to members of the house, for a secret session of parliament. I can understand a difference of opinion on that. However, I am going to refer to one newspaper, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* which, ever since the cancellation of the Avro Arrow and since they failed to secure a television licence in Toronto, has adopted an

attitude of bitter criticism of the Conservative party. Yesterday, in an editorial, vicious as it was vacuous, they denied the right of a member of parliament to advance in this chamber views that are not acceptable to that newspaper. I am going to say more about that licence later. I am going to say more about the television licence that was awarded in Toronto because from that day there have been regularly in that newspaper, more so since it has been under F.P. Publications, attacks not in keeping with the responsibility of the press to place the true facts before the country.

I asked for a secret session. I think it may still be necessary to continue to press for one because what we secured today from the Prime Minister, with the exception of certain general views that were expressed in the last 20 minutes of his address, were historical quotations and apologies, in the tradition of Right Hon. Mackenzie King who at all times found solace and satisfaction in being able to quote what he himself had said.

There are certain general principles that we must affirm. One is that Israel has a right to live. Mention was made of the attitude taken by the U.A.R. and other Arab nations to Israel. I visited Israel on two occasions and at length. I was also, for a period of time, the guest of Colonel Abdel Nasser. I was asked subsequently what he had said about Israel. He never mentioned Israel. He discussed Yemen. He discussed the oil situation in the Middle East. He never made a reference to Israel in our conversation. I concluded it was because so far as the Arab nations are concerned Israel does not exist. It has never been accepted. It has never received any consideration as a national entity.

In recent days Israel's right to live has been hammered out anew in blood and arms. Today in old Jerusalem, for the first time in many years, that portion of the city occupied by Jordan, is under Jewish control once more. The Garden of Gethsemane, scene of warfare in the last few days, the Wailing Wall, embodiment of Jewish resistance through all generations, King Solomon's Temple, today a Moslem mosque—these areas are now in possession of the Israelis. They should never have been outside of Israel in my opinion.

So far as the Arab nations are concerned, we believe that their attitude during the last 20 years has been dangerous and detrimental not only to the peace of the Middle East but also to world peace. Nasser made the statement that never again would there be recognition of Israel's right to use the gulf of