

*Arab-Israeli War*

Speaker, is something that no Canadian and no Canadian government could ever tolerate.

**Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood):** Mr. Speaker, we join with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) and the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Wagner) in deeply regretting the breaking out of a new and bloody chapter in the tragic history of the Middle-East conflict and we express our most sincere sympathy for the people who are suffering on both sides of the line.

The renewal of war by the forces of Egypt and Syria on October 6, the Day of Atonement, marks the refusal to use the only means possible to bring about a just and durable peace. I refer to the process of negotiation on the basis of the formula set out in Security Council resolution 242, to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has already referred. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that is the only formula for peace that has found universal acceptance and that it is the only formula on which peace in the future in the Middle-East can be based.

The essence of that resolution was that it emphasized two aspects necessary to the peace. In the recital it spoke firstly of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war, and secondly it spoke of the necessity to work for a just and lasting peace in which every state in the area can live in security. Section 1, the main operative section of the resolution, provided also for two things, the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, the termination of all claims or states of belligerency, and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force. Mr. Speaker, you will note that I stressed the words "within secure and recognized boundaries" because they are essential to an understanding of this matter.

It will be noted that both the preamble and the resolution are balanced. They do not speak of the withdrawal of armed forces alone, but they balance that against the right of every state in the area to its independence and territorial integrity and sovereignty with the right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries. The one is made conditional upon the other. The tendency has been for the Arab states and those who favour them to put all their emphasis on the first part, on the withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces, and they refuse to give adequate attention to the second part, namely, the right of all states in the area to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries.

The problem, unfortunately, is and was that the resolution was ambiguous and incomplete. It did, as I have said, refer to secure and recognized boundaries, but it really constituted a series of guidelines and not an agreement. It lacked a definition of what the secure and recognized boundaries should be, and they remain in dispute. That dispute can only be properly resolved by bona fide negotiations. There is no other way to determine what those boundaries should be. But the Arab nations have refused negotiations, insisting on prior withdrawal by the Israeli forces. They have now taken steps to secure withdrawal by force.

That the present phase of the conflict was initiated by Egypt and Syria, later joined by other Arab states in various degrees, is abundantly clear. Let there be no pretence to the contrary. We recognize, as most people must, that the Arab states, particularly those bordering on Israel, may have legitimate cause for grievance. But what we cannot accept is that they should have resorted to force before efforts to negotiate had been tried and failed. This failure and unwillingness to negotiate, and the present resort to force, cannot, therefore, be condoned.

The modern State of Israel was the creation of immense determination and commendable industry and ingenuity on the part of the people of Israel. These efforts were contributed to by Israelis from many parts of the world who had ancient and traditional, and indeed continuing ties with Palestine, as indeed had the Arabs who resided in that area under the Ottoman empire. The creation of the modern State of Israel was also the creation of the world community acting through the United Nations. It followed the agony of the holocaust which gave an impelling motive to establish an independent state. The United Nations, by resolution 242 on November 22, 1967, clearly recognized the right of Israel to independence and security as well as the rights of neighbouring states in the Middle-East.

That resolution was adopted unanimously by the Security Council and accepted by all those concerned. As I have said, it failed to provide the adequate machinery for bringing about a just and durable peace, but it did at least clearly recognize the right to political independence and sovereignty of the State of Israel. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the survival of Israel is a moral and political necessity and a priority for those who believe in democracy and international order. Until it is accepted, and accepted both formally and sincerely by all the nations concerned, no lasting peace can be secured.

We do not want to pretend that mistakes have not been made by the Israelis and that statements made by some of the leaders in that country have not been harsh and intransigent, however much justification they may have had, but we do say that the independence and security of Israel is an international concern. It cannot be abandoned without shame to the world which accepted it, and indeed created it.

It may be that the present attack by Egypt and Syria and their associated states was indeed, as they proclaimed, for limited objectives. But I for one cannot blame the Israelis for being sceptical about these limited objectives. After all, history is replete with the words of Arab leaders speaking to their own people in particular of the liquidation of the State of Israel and of driving the Israelis into the sea. Indeed, even today when the Egyptian president, Colonel Sadat, spoke of ending the war he set out two conditions, one being the total, immediate and unconditional Israeli withdrawal from all the Arab territories lost in 1967, and then he added this phrase, "as well as the return of the rights of the Palestinian people." What does this vague phrase imply? Israelis, naturally enough, interpret it as just another formula for the liquidation of Israel as a sovereign Jewish state.