

*Supply—External Affairs*

going to Israeli ports—there is only one—to use the gulf of Aqaba.

I have mentioned these two points, though they do go back into history, because we will be facing them both very shortly and it is well to know about the experience of the past in order to avoid the same mistakes in the future, if that can be done.

Perhaps I should say a word or two about the more general issue we face, I am not going to attempt to establish responsibility for today's tragedy. Undoubtedly that will be done in due course. However, I think in looking at the question of responsibility we must make a distinction between the occasion of the war and the causes of the war. I have already said that the causes of the conflict go very deep indeed. That is why, as I said a few moments ago, a cease fire and an armistice, if that follows, can only be considered as a means to an end. Nothing was done about this after 1956. Some of us gave warning at the United Nations at that time that if nothing was done to bring about peace and a lasting settlement there would be trouble. This has happened. Are we to repeat these failures as we again approach this problem, diplomatically, through the United Nations, this time through the security council? I think I am misquoting a famous quotation when I say, those who ignore the lessons of history are doomed to repeat its tragedies.

That is why our ambassador at the security council made a very short intervention after the cease fire resolution, although a very impressive one, in which he said:

We note that the resolution is only a first step. We believe that the council must take advantage of the opportunity which this unanimously agreed resolution represents, to deal effectively and in an equitable manner, with fundamental problems which underlie maintenance of peace and security in the area. We cannot and we must not wait for another ten years with another crisis which will result again in fighting and bloodletting and bring us all once more to the edge of catastrophe.

It is perfectly clear from the experience of 20 years, since the state of Israel was founded, that only a fair and enduring peace, and it will not endure if it is not fair, and a political settlement can avoid another round in this dangerous game of brinkmanship on the edge of the abyss, indulged in not only by the states of that area but by the great powers as well.

As we have said in this house, on both sides, the frightening danger of this situation is not merely that Israel is in conflict with the Arab states, which is dangerous enough, but

that behind the Arab states stands the U.S.S.R. and behind the state of Israel stands the United States and other countries. The two great superpowers are on different sides of an issue which could convulse the Middle East and in convulsing the Middle East could convulse the world.

I was talking about this the other night on a television program. I ventured to say this:

It is a wonderful thing to have a peace preservation corps sent to an area of disturbance where there has been military conflict. It can patrol and police an armistice and a cease fire, but unless there is a political settlement it cannot stay there indefinitely. This applies not only to the Middle East, it applies also to Cyprus. So the United Nations operations in the field of peace preservation have to be related to United Nations operations in this field of political settlement.

I said the same thing ten years ago in New York when I was addressing a Jewish audience there. I said that the work of establishing the state of Israel remains unfinished as long as Israel's Arab neighbours resent and reject her. There is no peace on her boundaries, despite the healing presence of UN forces, and hence there is not that security for the future to which her gallant and hard-working people are entitled.

That must be the next objective to be achieved, a creative peace and security for Israel based on freedom and justice, something which I believe is as much in the interests of Israel's neighbours as it is of Israel herself. This must be a peace which is not only fair to Israel but fair to her neighbours. We accept the Israeli point of view in respect of some matters, when we believe they are in the right. But we are not unfair to the neighbouring Arab states. There have been times in the past when we have fought their case at the United Nations when we thought Israel was wrong. In any event a political settlement must be one that is acceptable to all the countries in the area, and that is not going to be a very easy thing to achieve.

● (3:50 p.m.)

What is the basis for such a political settlement and a more enduring peace than an armistice along with a state of war? We must not forget that in the almost 20 years since 1948 there has been an armistice but there has also been a state of war. I think I can only outline what I think is a possible basis, and there is nothing original in it.

There will have to be certain military withdrawals, after a cease fire, by negotiation and agreement. If the military status quo, or something approaching it, is to be restored