

1947. It was demonstrated again by Lester B. Pearson's concern in the early years of the fledgling state. It helps to explain our active participation in the drafting of Security Council Resolution 242 of November 1967. It inspires us today to contribute to diplomatic efforts to encourage the parties to initiate early negotiations towards a settlement. We fully subscribe to President Carter's statement of March 16, 1977, at the Town Hall of Clinton, Massachusetts, when he said: "The first prerequisite of a lasting peace is the recognition of Israel by her neighbours; Israel's right to exist; Israel's right to exist permanently; Israel's right to exist in peace". Certainly a lasting peace can do no less, as it can do no less than to find a negotiated solution to the plight of the Arab Palestinian people, over one million of whom remain today in United Nations refugee camps. This dual concern lies at the heart of our policy, and we fully support President Carter's current efforts to address the principal issues of this conflict in a manner at once comprehensive, humane and realistic.

Security Council Resolution 242 remains the only framework for a Middle East peace conference agreed to by all the states immediately concerned: establishment of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East; termination of the state of belligerency; sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area; secure and recognized boundaries; a just solution for the Palestinian refugees; non-acquisition of territory by war. We fully support Resolution 242 in all its parts, one of which is the call for a just settlement of the Palestinian refugee problem. For Canada, this means a just political as well as humanitarian solution, to be negotiated at future peace talks. While we fully support 242, we also recognize that there are other elements necessary to a settlement that are not fully defined in that resolution — the nature of the peace, what should constitute a just settlement to the refugee problem. There may also be a place in a settlement for factors that are not mentioned in Resolution 242 at all as long as they are consistent with its goals and principles and can be agreed to between the parties concerned.

Canada's approach towards the Arab-Israeli dispute is neither one-sided, as some believe, nor indifferent or detached. Our attitude fully recognizes the tragedy recognized by Israel's founder and first President, Chaim Weizman, who described the dispute as one between two peoples, each with right on its side. It is this humanitarian perspective of the great Jewish statesman, scientist and political philosopher in which, it seems to me, lie the seeds of a just and permanent peace for the region. For each side, it implies the imperative for compromise so that these two rights may be accommodated within a peace settlement that will stand the test of time and, incidentally, will provide Israel with security beyond that offered by mere geographical advantages in a climate of hostility.

Some critics have recently regretted the trend in Canada's voting record at the UN on resolutions concerning Israel and the Middle East. According to these views, Canada, from 1973 onwards, drifted away from voting in support of Israel in favour of joining the West European countries in abstaining on controversial resolutions concerning Israel and the Middle East. In so doing, it was argued, Canada was becoming part of a process that, whatever its guise and motive, is consciously aimed at the delegitimization of Israel and has already led to the erosion of Israel's inter-

---