

Supply—External Affairs

Aqaba. His threat to destroy the people of Israel was reinforced in the last few days by a statement made by King Faisal of Saudi Arabia. He said the aim was to exterminate Israel.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The United Arab Republic is a member of the United Nations. Yet Nasser pledged himself in these words: "It will be total war and the objective will be to destroy Israel". Canada cannot afford to allow those words to go unchallenged, Mr. Chairman, because they embody the principle of genocide which has been specifically rejected under a resolution of the United Nations.

The wording of article I of that resolution reads as follows:

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, when committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Then genocide is defined in these terms:

Killing members of the group;—
Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction—

It also includes imposing measures intended to destroy.

We owe much to the Arab nations, but there can be no neutrality by Canada with regard to those who have the specific objective and purpose of destroying the Hebrew race.

I was surprised on May 30 when I listened to the Prime Minister being interviewed on the C.B.C. by Charles Lynch, Claude Ryan and Joseph Kraft. The Prime Minister was asked whether he was in favour of one side or the other, Israel or the Arab nations. One of the questions asked by Mr. Lynch was as follows:

You mentioned earlier the strength of world Zionist opinion as one of the things that Israel has going for in this situation.

There is obviously a mistake there in the reprint of this C.B.C. interview. The question goes on:

The Arabs, of course, suspect I think that your policy—Canada—and the U.S. policy is influenced by the political strength of the Jewish people inside our own countries, which has no counterpart on the Arab side. Now, is this valid or not?

The Prime Minister replied as follows:

The proof that it does not apply to this country, surely is in our action in 1956 when we were very active at the United Nations in interposing a UN force between the Israelis and their friends, and the fighting—

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Then Mr. Lynch asked:

Are we acting in the same way this time?

The Prime Minister replied:

Absolutely. So far as I am concerned I have no feeling of any kind in favour of one side or the other. We have a strong Jewish Zionist movement in Canada, of course. We also have not so many Arabs here. I would not like to admit that this influences me in the slightest. It does not.

As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, in view of the words of Nasser, not only in the book he published prior to 1956 but in the statements he made recently, I cannot be neutral on the position he has taken. Then the interview dealt with the gulf of Aqaba, to which I may make reference later.

We have all been encouraged by the events of the last few days. I agree with the Prime Minister when he says that if only the United Nations security council had acted a week or ten days ago it would have been better for all concerned. It was good tidings today to learn that the U.A.R. is prepared to accept the direction to cease fire. That they could do anything else is, of course, quite impossible to contemplate because their forces have been swept away on every part of the front on which they have taken a stand.

In the event, Mr. Chairman, that the cease fire is accepted and is established by all the nations, we come to the serious question of what we are going to do next. No longer can we allow ourselves the luxury of permitting the problems to which the Prime Minister made reference to remain unsolved. Political settlements must now be achieved. Up to the present the objective has been to bring the fighting to an end. We now have to deal with those matters which in 1956 were unfinished business and have remained so.

What course shall we take? I listened to the observations of the Prime Minister and in general I agreed with the views that he placed before the committee. However, I would ask that there be more definiteness and clarity than has been the case in the past with regard to Canada's stand.

I recall speaking in this house on November 29, 1956 and saying that the government of Canada was not taking a definite stand, that its attitude had been one of "Oh, let things calm down and all will be well". The Prime Minister quoted some words of mine which I uttered in 1956, and I should like to put on the record some words of mine, which are to be found at page 141 of *Hansard* for November 29, 1956. These words are as true today as they were then. I had just referred