

will not stimulate and encourage an arms race in the Middle East which can have no good result, except for the political machinations of the stimulators. I agree, of course, with the hon. member for Winnipeg North that the way to blunt the machinations of those who seek to gain advantage from inflaming the troubles of the Middle East is to bring about peace there. I am sure any Canadian Government, any government, would wish to do what it could, along with other similarly disposed governments, to assist in bringing about such a peace.

With all respect, however, I do not think that the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North made much of a contribution to that end. Among other things he complained of the "passionate admiration" of officials in the London foreign office for the Arabs. His own attitude seemed to me to be one of passionate hostility to the Arab governments. Passion on either side of this issue is not likely to help; indeed, it already has hindered and bedevilled the chances of a settlement. The hon. member implored this Government to pay a "more significant part" in bringing about such a settlement. The attitude he took in the House, however, would make it more difficult, not less difficult, for any Canadian representative, if he were charged with any responsibility in this matter, to be considered as an impartial and objective conciliator and to pay effectively what he referred to as an "honourable part".

It is easy enough to criticize indiscriminately those powers and those persons who have had to cope directly with this complex issue. It is easy enough to put forward proposals which fortunately no one is expected to put into practice. If our response to recent Soviet moves in the Middle East were to abandon friendly relations with the Arab States and support Israel, completely and exclusively, with our diplomacy and our arms, then we should indeed be playing the communist game. The moral position of the Western powers in that area is based on the fact that they have, though not without mistakes and contradictions, tried to preserve peace on a basis of mutual accommodation rather than on the triumph of one side over the other. I suggest we must not abandon that position because the Russians have done so for their own purposes.

Compromise is Needed

The important question is, however, how can an honourable and satisfactory solution be brought about? The main issues are now commonly known. It seems clear that both sides, if they recognize the desirability of a settlement, must give something to achieve it, must make some compromise. There can never be a negotiated settlement where one side or the other remains adamant. Each must enter into negotiations prepared for some sort of give and take although, of course, no one would expect one of the sides to make prior or unilateral concessions.

It seems to me that an essential, indeed, a first requirement, is that the Arab states should recognize the legitimate and permanent existence of the State of Israel. That, as I see it, necessitates abandonment by them of the impractical stipulation that we must return to the United Nations resolutions of 1947 which provided for a divided Palestine. The Arab states took up arms to prevent these resolutions becoming effective and I do not see how they can claim the right to have them accepted now as the price of peace in that area. The people of Israel have the right to know that their national existence is not at stake. That seems to me to be fundamental. Efforts to bring peace and all