

debate. In fact, on June 8, 1967, we had a similar debate during the so called six-day war. At the beginning of the current conflict I heard people say that we did not have to worry and that this war would not last long.

We see that the conflict is to last since both parties involved are much better armed and the soldiers much better trained. During the debate of June 8, 1967, I said—and I would like to repeat it tonight—that in my humble opinion the reasons for this war which had been lasting for so long still existed and that the fire which broke out so suddenly these last few days had been smouldering for twenty years. The fact that the belligerents have laid down their arms does not mean that the fire is completely extinguished but rather that it is under control and that if the United Nations which are representing the world community do not take the necessary steps, this fire is liable to break out any day. Unfortunately this happened, the fire broke out again because the diplomacy mentioned tonight was not efficient. They have tried to convince the Jews on one side and the Arabs on the other that it was no good for them to fight and kill each other and I am almost convinced they agreed but had to answer: We can stop fighting but what are we going to do with the weapons you compel us to buy? This is the answer, this is the reason. If diplomacy is to be efficient we should rather convince those who are benefiting from this situation, the arms manufacturers and traders who are making money through the destruction of others. At the beginning of his remarks, if I did not misunderstand him, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) stated that Canada should take measures to ensure peace in the Middle East. But what measures can we take? Should we take up arms and kill them so that they will stop fighting. It is ridiculous! There is another means, persuasion. But should we try to convince those who fan that fire? Not very long ago, that is at the end of last spring, more specifically on May 30, was held in Ottawa the second annual conference of the Canada-Israel committee and I have in hand a policy statement which I would like to quote. It reads as follows:

Canada has always distinguished itself at the international level thanks to its diplomacy, especially in the Middle East with its firm support for the establishment of the Israel State as well as with its contribution to the creation of a mechanism required for the application of a truce ordered by the United Nations. On the other hand, our country has always co-operated in the organization of special forces of the UN during the period covering the years 1949 to 1967. In addition, Canada enjoys at the present time a unique position which enables it to maintain friendly and neighbourly relations for our economic development with the United States as well as with the Soviet Union.

Thanks to those relations as well as successful diplomatic efforts associated with the international assistance plan, the Canadian people are in a position to voice their opinion on all problems connected with the Middle East in the international forum as well as before the United Nations.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this policy statement of the Canada-Israel committee recognizes the value of the Canadian diplomacy and it is at that level, I think, that Canada can more effectively intervene. But it must make representations to great industrial nations that take advantage of those wars, not only in the Middle East but also in Viet Nam, Korea, the Congo as well as all other conflicts that have taken place since the World War II. And these four great international powers take advantage of these conflicts. On November 24, 1971, *Le Droit* of Ottawa, com-

### Arab-Israeli War

menting on a report published by Stockholm's International Peace Research Institute, said that 90 per cent of the Third World's armaments were provided by four countries: The United States, the U.S.S.R., Great-Britain and France. And for 25 years, according to the report, all wars have been carried out in poor countries, and the weaponry used was provided in large part by industrialized nations of the northern hemisphere. It is obvious that these countries are not in a position to produce the armaments they use to kill one another. In return, they are practically obliged to give away especially oil and mostly, the objective of these wars is oil control. France provided Mirage aircraft to Libya. The U.S.S.R. provides 99 per cent of military equipment to Egypt, 100 per cent to Syria and 75 per cent to Irak. Great Britain sent 50 Phantom tanks and two war vessels to Libya, 40 per cent of the military hardware to Lebanon and 225 Centurion tanks to Israel. Both countries are provided with arms so they can fight together. If at least we gave armament to one side only. But we sell arms to both so they can kill each other. According to *Perspectives* dated June 13, 1970, the United States delivered about 12 helicopters and Phantom tanks to Syria as well as 10 F-104 jets to Jordan and 36 M-24 light tanks to Iraq. In *La Presse* of June 10, 1970, one can read the following:

Military forces of Syria amount to 75,000 men, including 60,000 for land forces with 450 tanks and 500 armoured vehicles, all Russian made. Air forces have 55 Mig-21 and 75 Mig 15 and 17 as well as a number of transport training aircraft.

● (2110)

The Navy has about twenty ships, six of which are patrol vessels armed with missiles. The whole equipment, as we can see, is from the U.S.S.R. and has been delivered in the last few years. I recall, Mr. Speaker, the utterances from a former mayor of Montreal, Mr. Camilien Houde, who said that weapons are not made to decorate Christmas trees. It is quite obvious. Weapons are made to destroy and care has been taken to train the Israelis as well as the Arabs in order that they can use these modern weapons.

As I observe the way in which events develop, I have the impression that strangely enough, it looks like a chess competition where the champions use Jewish and Arab pawns, three million Jews on one side against 100 million Arabs on the other, and they are provided with the necessary weapons to balance forces. When weapons are in short supply, arrangements are made to have more delivered in sufficient quantity for the forces to always keep the balance.

According to the most recent statement by United States President Nixon concerning what he calls a massive shipment of Russian armament to the Arab states, he feels that he himself has to establish an airlift between the United States and Israel in order to balance forces and according to the very words of a spokesman for the American State Department, Robert McCloskey, the American decision was also dictated by the level of Israeli losses in equipment. Not men, equipment!

That is the concern of armament producing nations. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State should on behalf of the Canadian government, intervene with these nations, use all his influence to convince industrialized