

*Foreign Policy*

on governments in Washington, in Hanoi, in Cairo and elsewhere does not come from an insistent, loud and determined voice throughout the world. We in this party think Canada is in a position to add to the effectiveness of that voice precisely for the reasons which the Secretary of State for External Affairs mentioned.

This is our major point of difference with regard to Viet Nam and other situations in the world. I am not saying this to be unkind to the Secretary of State for External Affairs—I will be guilty of making many trite statements myself—but it simply is not enough today to repeat unavoidably trite declarations about support for the United Nations and the like. I will illustrate to some extent what I mean as I deal with the situation in the Middle East.

The Prime Minister said yesterday—I had the pleasure of hearing him say this at a luncheon and I believe he has expressed the same sentiment on other occasions—that in his view and in the view of the government, Israel had shown a will to live and, like its neighbours, has a right to live in peace. The fact is that the neighbours of Israel deny Israel the right to live; they refuse to recognize that Israel has any right to continue to exist.

That is not an overstatement; I am sure the Prime Minister will agree that I have stated the position correctly. The difficulties in which we now find ourselves flow from the determination of the neighbours of Israel that Israel shall not continue to live. If the Prime Minister meant what he said—and I am confident he did—I say it is not enough for the Secretary of State for External Affairs to state in his speech, as he did if I heard him correctly, that we intend to maintain our impartiality or our neutrality, whatever the word was. He cannot have it both ways. This is precisely what blunts the influence of this country. If, as the Prime Minister stated it, it is the government's policy that Israel has the right to live and to live in peace, then the Secretary of State for External Affairs cannot be impartial or neutral in the present situation and his attempts to be so belie the statement which was made by the head of his government and help to muddy the waters in the Middle East and throughout the world.

Let me remind this house that the United Nations is responsible for the establishment of the state of Israel and therefore, in my submission, has a duty in the present circumstances of going beyond mere peace keeping

[Mr. Lewis.]

arrangements. It was the United Nations which by resolution toward the end of 1947 established the state of Israel. It is true that the following year there was a war in the Middle East which changed some of the arrangements which the United Nations had set out. None the less, the state of Israel, the idea of the state of Israel, was established by the United Nations. I therefore suggest that if the United Nations as a world institution is to preserve credibility—that is now the popular word—in the minds of people throughout the world, then having established a state it has responsibility for making as sure as it can that the state so established will continue to live.

I was in Israel recently, Mr. Speaker; I came back some four or five weeks ago. I travelled through that little country from north to south, from west to east. I do not want to make any comparison between conditions in Israel and conditions in neighbouring states because I have not been to the other Middle East states. But everyone who has visited Israel has been impressed by the considerable economic and social progress which has been made in that country, progress which is almost miraculous for a small nation of two and a half million people to have achieved. This is particularly so when one realizes that it started with a Jewish population of some six or seven hundred thousand and now has a Jewish population of over two million. In other words, in the course of 17 years the population has trebled or quadrupled. Moreover, it is made up of people from all parts of the world, not only from Europe but from parts of Africa and parts of Asia. The country to which they came was confronted by all the difficulty of integrating hundreds of thousands of immigrants who differed in some cases even in the colour of their skins and who certainly differed in their educational levels, their cultural levels, their social backgrounds, their political attitudes and the extent of their modern industrial know-how. The fact that in spite of these formidable difficulties Israel has achieved a considerable degree of social and economic development has been a cause of admiration among people in many parts of the world. And this development has been achieved despite the fact that a large part of the nation's budget is unfortunately but necessarily spent on defence.

I mention this for the reason I have already given, that it was the United Nations which established the state of Israel, and the Prime Minister having stated in recent days that