

*External Affairs*

That was relative to Egypt's moving into the Gaza strip. The Prime Minister said:

The Canadian government does not agree with that stand taken by the Egyptian government. As I stated yesterday quite clearly the acquiescence of the Egyptian government was obtained for the stationing in Egyptian territory to do a certain job of an emergency force raised by the United Nations.

Pressed over and over again as to what he meant, the answers were continuously indefinite, and those questions have not been answered today. Those questions were the basis upon which the request was made for the debate that is taking place today.

Then, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) asked a very challenging question. He referred to the statement made by the Prime Minister the day before relating to the use of force, a statement from which the government has been running with hideous abandonment ever since. The hon. member asked this question:

May I direct a question to the Prime Minister supplementary to his exchanges with the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra? In view of some of the press interpretations that have been placed on what the Prime Minister said yesterday with regard to the situation in the Suez, will he make it clear to the house and the country as to what he meant when he referred to the possibility of the use of force to overcome resistance? Was he referring to collective action by the United Nations or to action by individual nations on their own?

The answer was:

No, Mr. Speaker; I was not referring to collective action by the United Nations.

Well, if he was not referring to collective action by the United Nations he was referring to what had been interpreted as the meaning of his words, namely, armed force, action by other nations designed to preserve and maintain the peace in that area. There can be no other meaning or no other interpretation of these words. Then, the Prime Minister went on to say this:

I thought I made it quite clear that the United Nations effort was all directed to preventing the resumption of the use of force in that area. What I was pointing out in answer to the question that had been put was that the only alternative to obtaining the acquiescence of the government of the area where the force was to be placed would be a resumption of the use of force, and I was putting it forward as an indication that the United Nations had no other method but that of trying to prevail upon the governments interested to follow the courses indicated by the views accepted by a majority of the United Nations in the resolutions adopted.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

**AFTER RECESS**

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Mr. Speaker, prior to the luncheon adjournment I was reading quotations from the record to indicate the degree

[M. Diefenbaker.]

to which this house has been carried along the trail of contradiction when information respecting the situation that prevails ought to have been furnished by the government. The most recent example of that was in an answer given on March 12 by the Minister of National Defence as reported at page 2111 of *Hansard* when he was asked the following question by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness):

Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a further question to the Minister of National Defence. Was no definite plan put up to the Canadian government in regard to the employment of this reconnaissance squadron by the United Nations and by General Burns before it was dispatched? In other words, is it not a fact that a definite plan of some kind was put up?

Mr. Campney: Mr. Speaker, the reconnaissance squadron, which is the subject of the hon. member's question, was requested through the United Nations by the commander in chief of the UNEF in Egypt, and the request was acceded to. There was no specific plan involved as to where it would go or when it would go. We are simply complying with the request made by the commander of UNEF through the United Nations.

That answer was incorrect in the light of the statement made today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he stated that the dispatch of Canadian forces had as its destination the Sinai desert. That is another indication of the course of action on the part of this government which seems to believe that parliament is to be denied information or given only such selective information as it may be in the interests of the government to give. That is not a proper attitude to be adopted at any time and in particular with regard to a matter as serious as the international situation.

It was interesting to listen to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) giving appropriate praise to the Prime Minister of France. I intend first to quote what the Prime Minister of France had to say on the occasion of his visit to Canada because he has now been made an authority regarding Nasser. The statement he made respecting Nasser was this:

The Suez canal is also one of the "geographic" causes of tension. Its sabotage by Egypt without any military motive to justify it, and the blackmail exercised since then over the pace of clearing and opening the canal, shows the little confidence merited by the government of Egypt.

That statement was made by Mr. Guy Mollet, President of the Council of Ministers of France, as reported at page 1871 of *Hansard* of March 4, and yet today the Secretary of State for External Affairs still places abiding confidence in the future stands of one who has for many months torn to shreds every suggestion of international responsibility.