

External Affairs

time goes on, although we must keep in the back of our minds this question: how long will the emergency force be an emergency force and how long will it stay there?

I am sure hon. members will agree that the action of the secretary general was dictated by wisdom. It would be unfortunate indeed if the experience gained during the past two years should be lost.

I do not know how much time remains at my disposal.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may continue for approximately five minutes.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): I did not realize the time was going so fast. Another matter that we considered was the question of UNRRA—a most interesting subject—the United Nations relief and works agency in Palestine. Hon. members may recall that in 1948 the United Nations set up the state of Israel and as a result of the division of Palestine to provide for the establishment of that state there are now one million refugees in the four neighbouring countries of Egypt, Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. The number of refugees in Jordan constitutes approximately 33 per cent of the population and they have been living in misery at the expense of some of the members of the United Nations. At this point it comes to my mind that the soviet bloc has not contributed one cent to the cost of the United Nations emergency force or to the cost of UNRRA. It costs \$36 million a year to operate UNRRA and that must come from voluntary gifts from different members of United Nations.

This subject was particularly interesting because the Arabs felt that this was a United Nations problem. They seemed to be against any solution but one and that was that the refugees should be re-established in their homelands. They felt they should be sent back to Palestine and given their land back again. Israel, of course, does not want that. In the thirteenth session, for the first time, Israel made the offer to pay compensation to the dispossessed refugees. They did impose certain conditions under which compensation should be made but it was important to note that the offer was forthcoming. They also offered to take a certain number of the refugees who had relatives in the state of Israel. The chief spokesman for the refugees was Mr. Shukairy the representative of Saudi Arabia at the present time. I do not know if my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition knows him, but in very dramatic appeals—

Mr. Pearson: He used to represent Syria in my day.

Mr. Browne (St. John's West): Yes. He himself is a Palestine refugee. He made [Mr. Browne (St. John's West).]

some very pathetic speeches in support of the refugees. The permanent representative for Israel and the ambassador to Canada were also present and spoke on behalf of Israel. It seems to me that the Israeli government having made the offer of paying compensation provided a basis on which to work. I feel that the governments of the countries where the refugees are now stationed should discuss with the government of Israel how this question could be resolved because each year the number of refugees is growing and the cost is \$36 million annually. The acting director of the agency, Mr. Leslie J. Carver, said there were some bright spots. People who had been living winter and summer in tents, numbering hundreds of thousands, were now willing to accept permanent buildings which he thought was a good sign. Also, through a system of loans he was able to establish some people in business which was also helpful but he did not have enough money to carry this on on any grand scale. In any case, it was decided that the agency would carry on for this year but as the mandate of the agency will be up in 1960 it will be extremely important in the session that will take place next fall to try and find a solution to this very serious problem.

There was one subject discussed at the United Nations which seems to me merits some attention. The delegate from Czechoslovakia sponsored a resolution dealing with the question of peaceful coexistence between states but in the general committee which was appointed to consider the items this was amended to read, "Measures aimed at implementation and promotion of peaceful and neighbourly relations among states." I feel that most people prefer that language because "peaceful coexistence" is a mysterious expression which members of the soviet bloc are continually using. They have some meaning of their own which they apparently attach to those words. They appear to have a certain understanding of that expression. Members of the soviet bloc attached great importance to the debate on this subject in its original form. They attended with their speeches all prepared and delivered them despite the fact that there had been an amendment.

But it seems to me that is a subject on which we should be well instructed. It seems to me also that hon. members should remember that the aim of the communist countries is world domination. Communism was established by Lenin in 1917 with one object in mind, controlling the whole world. Even at that time he thought there were going to be revolutions in neighbouring countries such as Germany and offered assistance to them.