

*External Affairs*

not been informed about it because censorship is very strict, and so the thrashing he took in the Gaza strip and in the Sinai desert at the hands of Israel is not widely known. On the other hand, he is held out as being the victor over western imperialism. We have to realize that there is more dislike for what is called western imperialism in the minds of the Arab peoples than there is fear of soviet aggression or soviet imperialism. The Arabs simply do not see the soviet threat as we do.

We in the C.C.F. have no illusions whatever about Russian policy. We believe that this era of coexistence in which we are living has really given the soviet the opportunity for even more aggressive policies in many ways. We are not deceived by them. But at this precise time, we are convinced that an intransigent and ambitious Nasser is more of a threat to world peace than are the soviets. Mr. Nasser has played his hand very skilfully.

He has played on the fears of the western world about the threats and promises of Russian help—call them what you will—whether it be economic or military. And, of course, he has substantial allies in his campaign, the allies being particularly the great oil companies in the Middle East who are very, very rich, and who would have no objection to the obliteration of Israel. And so the belief is spread about that if the west shows favouritism to Israel, then we shall automatically throw the Arabs into the arms of Russia. We do not ask that favouritism be shown to Israel. I know of nobody who asks that favouritism be shown to Israel. Certainly I am convinced that the Jewish community in this country does not ask for that. All we are asking for is that there should be justice to Israel, neither more nor less.

Let me quote here part of an article by Monsieur Paul-Henri Spaak in *Foreign Affairs* of January of this year where, at page 185, the Belgian foreign minister says:

In the present United Nations set-up, which is not what its founders wished and hoped it would be, everything short of war is allowed. Treaties may be violated, promises can be broken, a nation is licensed to menace its neighbour or to perpetrate any sort of trick on it, just as long as there is no actual war. The attitude of Egypt during the last few months is a case in point. While Egypt denied transit through the Suez canal to Israeli ships, sent death commandos onto Israeli soil, violated the treaty of Constantinople, sent arms to be used against the French in Algeria and made preparations to attack its neighbour, the United Nations was powerless to intervene. Such intervention would not come within the scope of the charter as at present interpreted. But let Israel in desperation send troops into the Sinai peninsula and let Anglo-French forces land at Port Said, and they are sure to be condemned. Meanwhile, those who

were looking on impassively at the brutal repression of the revolt in Hungary could not find words harsh enough to damn them.

This brand of justice, I repeat, is nothing but a caricature.

We do not want to see a caricature of justice in the Middle East. Israel has got the right to live and has got the right to exist in as much peace and security as is shared by other countries, and we are going to insist that that be a cardinal point of this country's policies. And so I say, while we have no illusions about Russian policy, neither have we any illusions about the policy which has been carried out so consistently through the years by the oil companies which have been making such fantastic profits in the Middle East.

Aramco, through its publicity agents has its tens of millions of dollars which it can spend sedulously to foster fear of Russia. It tries to persuade us that Russia is the immediate enemy when, in fact, what it really means is that the Shell Oil is the enemy in that part of the country. Why Aramco should be so concerned about Shell Oil I do not know, for it is winning. It is interesting to realize that there has been a vast change in the ratio of oil production in the Middle East as between the United Kingdom and the United States. Whereas in 1945 the United Kingdom produced roughly 80 per cent of oil to the American 15, now that has been changed, and in no small measure with the assistance of the state department, to a British production of 30 per cent as against the United States 55. It is obvious that the United Kingdom is being forced out. Aramco is paramount, and this is being done under the guise of fighting the menace of the infiltration of communism.

We know the high profits which are made in oil. I wonder how much Aramco had to do with the recent visit of the King of Saudi Arabia to the United States. Few potentates, certainly few kings or few leaders of any country, have received such a royal welcome, at least in Washington, if not in New York, as the king received from the President of the United States, who went to the airport to meet him.

Perhaps the President of the United States had seen the statement the king was going to make in the United Nations and concurred in it, for before the United Nations the King of Saudi Arabia said:

We believe in human and spiritual values. We stand on moral principles, on the freedom and dignity of human beings.

Well, let us consider that, in view of the facts of the situation. His Majesty states that we believe in human values. That being so, why does he throw workers who

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]