

I had thought, Mr. Speaker, that I might read into the record the terms of Resolution 242, but in order to save time I wonder whether it might be agreed that the text be included in Hansard at this point in my speech. (Text attached)

Canada has supported Resolution 242 since its adoption in 1967. Our adherence has been total but strictly limited to the terms of the resolution itself and we have always refused to add anything to it or subtract anything from it or even to interpret it or draw implications from it that were not immediately apparent from the very wording. Since it is the only text in the whole 25 years of recent Middle Eastern history that has met with wide acceptance, we still believe that it constitutes the only suitable and available framework for peace.

This peace must come from a settlement negotiated by all the parties involved in the conflict. There is no other way to devise a just and lasting settlement. One implication that can be drawn from the recent resumption of hostilities is that even the greatest powers cannot impose a settlement but, on the contrary, may be drawn into the conflict on opposing sides and thereby endanger their own attempts at opening a dialogue and developing a better climate for the peaceful resolution of other world problems.

When I say that a negotiated settlement on the basis of Resolution 242 is the only way finally to resolve the conflict, I am fully aware that since 1967 the two sides have never come together on the means of getting down to negotiations or the discussion of a settlement. While the numerous efforts of intermediaries such as Ambassador Jarring on behalf of the United Nations went on, the positions of the two sides never came quite close enough to open the avenue to negotiations and to the implementation of Resolution 242. Therefore, the ceasefire which was to open these avenues finally broke down.

A ceasefire, while undoubtedly necessary at the earliest possible moment, as I said in my statements of October 6 and October 8, will not be enough. A ceasefire should provide the opportunity for the belligerents to discuss such questions as the drawing of border lines or the resettlement of civilian populations displaced by warfare, or indeed any of the other points mentioned in the resolution. Unfortunately, the past 25 years of conflict in the Middle East prove that without the will to make peace on both sides a ceasefire is only a temporary expedient between bouts of war and a period in which the two sides re-arm and prepare for the next round of fighting.

Canadian policy, as I repeated in the House yesterday, begins from the premise that the State of Israel has a right to exist, just like any other state in the world, and the right to exist behind secure and recognized boundaries.

Some of us, Mr. Speaker, have had the privilege of visiting Israel. We had the experience of flying from south to north in a few minutes, seeing the whole of Israel spread out below us. I think we understand the concern for recognized and secure boundaries.