

*External Affairs*

just as well make up our minds to that—and one can never tell if the fighting will be localized.

Then we have the situation in Gaza, which was taken by Egypt in 1948. It is true that Gaza is not a part of Egypt proper. It is a territory; in fact it is a colony. I am surprised that the Arabs who oppose colonialism so much should have supported Egypt in its maintenance of such a colony, where the standards of living are very much lower than those which prevail in colonies of the western countries. The people in the Gaza strip of course are not accorded the rights of Egyptian citizens; they are not helped or provided for in any significant way by the Egyptian government; they are not allowed to partake in the government of the country, and they are not allowed to travel to Egypt. They are virtually prisoners, and that is why I say although the Gaza strip may nominally belong to Egypt, it is nevertheless a colony of that country. Through the years, as this house well knows by now, the Gaza strip has been used as headquarters for the fedayeen in their marauding and murdering raids across the border into Israel.

There was the greatest objection taken when Israel saw fit to stop these raids by destroying the nests of the murderers and the United States, as did other countries, described it as an act of aggression. Let me read a part of the note I hold in my hand. I am not going to read it accurately the first time, but when I read it the second time I shall be most accurate. I think it is quite conceivable that Israel might have sent this note to Egypt had there been diplomatic relations:

It would be tedious to recount instance after instance, outrage after outrage, atrocity after atrocity, to illustrate the true nature and extent of the widespread conditions of lawlessness and violence which have prevailed. During the past nine months in particular the frontier of Israel along the Gaza strip has been thrown into a state of constant apprehension and turmoil because of frequent and sudden incursions into Israeli territory and depredations and murders on Israeli soil by fedayeen bandits, who have taken the lives and destroyed the property of Israeli citizens . . .

In the face of these depredations Israel had no recourse other than to employ force to disperse the bands of fedayeen outlaws who were with increasing boldness systematically raiding across the international boundary.

As I have said, Israel did not send this note. I changed some words in it. This note was sent by the Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Robert Lansing, to the government of Mexico in 1916. I shall now read it accurately and perhaps one can see a most interesting parallel, Mr. Speaker. In its proper form the note reads:

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]

It would be tedious to recount instance after instance, outrage after outrage, atrocity after atrocity, to illustrate the true nature and extent of the widespread conditions of lawlessness and violence which have prevailed. During the past nine months in particular the frontier of the United States along the lower Rio Grande has been thrown into a state of constant apprehension and turmoil because of frequent and sudden incursions into American territory and depredations and murders on American soil by Mexican bandits, who have taken the lives and destroyed the property of American citizens . . .

In the face of these depredations . . . the United States had no recourse other than to employ force to disperse the bands of Mexican outlaws who were with increasing boldness systematically raiding across the international boundary.

American forces were in Mexico, and they were not taken out until the United States was satisfied that a regime of peace would ensue. I think it would be a pity if the United States in its might and power today forgot its own position when it was perhaps not quite as strong, and I would hope that the United States even morally might have a little more mercy in dealing with the transgressor. But what appears to be certain, as far as a great power is concerned, is that there are certain dangers when a great power tries to decide foreign policy with the help of a board of evangelists at the top. I do not think evangelism really has any place in international diplomacy. What I do know is that no nation can allow itself to be continually attacked with impunity. That was what was happening to Israel and what she endeavoured to stop.

It is transparently clear that what Nasser wants is leadership of the Arab people. I disagree with the Leader of the Opposition in this respect, for I do not think Nasser is going to achieve suzerainty over the Middle East, because the Arab people are not as homogeneous as many might perhaps think. They have their own rivalries, their own hatreds, their own aspirations and their own ambitions, and these things keep them more apart than together.

It is also abundantly clear that what Israel wants is the right to live without the constant daily threat of incursions and alarms that were being waged against her, the right to live with some degree of peace and security. In my judgment only the United Nations can provide these things, which are a basic right of any nation, if the United States will play its proper part. As far as we are concerned the UNEF must stay in the Middle East until a permanent settlement has been arrived at; if it leaves, as I said earlier in another respect, that will be another deadly blow to the United Nations.

By and large Israel has obeyed the United Nations, and by and large Egypt has not. In fact Egypt has hindered the United Nations