

External Affairs

friends, the United Kingdom and France. She has been brushing those two nations aside.

Certainly one is entitled to wonder to what extent the oil interests are involved in this policy adopted by the United States. Whatever policy she adopts is her own business, not ours; but the Canadian government should recognize United States policy for what it is, and I think should be far more careful about supporting the United States so fully in her moves in the Near East, as this government has been doing in these recent months. Certainly I do not believe the United States and Canada have been facing reality in the Near East. They are about the only two nations in the world which have not been looking squarely at what is going on in that area, and it is about time that the Canadian government, at least, opened its eyes.

The other error has been for Canada to allow Nasser to humiliate her. Whether or not the government admits that we have been humiliated, the fact is that the Canadian people believe that has been the result. We know about the Queen's Own Rifles. I do not need to repeat that. The government has not yet admitted that the Queen's Own Rifles were sent home because Nasser would not have them in Egypt. The government alone apparently does not think that is what happened, but the actual fact is the government simply will not admit it for fear of the criticism that would result. Indeed, they are only now getting reinforcements into Egypt after the Egyptians have held up that movement for some days, and after there have been great parleys going on between the two countries in order to get Egypt's consent. I can well imagine how feverishly the Canadian ambassador and the officials of the United Nations in Cairo have been trying to persuade Nasser to allow those 120 troops to go into the Gaza strip. This amazing softness toward Nasser, which has continued right through the piece, will never get this country anywhere, and it is entirely out of line with the character of the Canadian people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we make no apologies for having these questions debated on the floor of the house. The whole British parliamentary system depends on robust debate. Our parliamentary system does not consist of having the government make all the decisions and all the announcements, with everybody else accepting them and keeping still. That is the Russian system, and this government has moved too far in the direction of this system of a one-party government and a one big "yes" vote.

We make no apologies for raising these questions. We believe parliament can only function properly in that way, and we believe

the Canadian press and the Canadian people are entitled to the benefit of a debate on this question and on all other questions, as a result of which all sides of the story can be brought out. Then it will be much more likely that policies will be adopted which will be in the best interests of our nation.

Mr. Colin Cameron (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to talk for very long, because I wish to give an opportunity to the Secretary of State for External Affairs to answer; but there are one or two things that I think need to be said.

Perhaps, like most hon. members, I have listened with great interest to the speeches from the official opposition, and I was particularly interested in them in view of something which took place last year when, as you may recall, Mr. Speaker, the official opposition presented a motion amending the original motion in the external affairs debate on January 31. At that time the C.C.F. group, through the hon. member for Rose-town-Biggan, produced a subamendment. The Conservative amendment at that time deplored the approval of the government's policy of authorizing the shipment of munitions of war to countries in that area not within the NATO alliance; and also condemned the government for the lack of candour with which the matter had been dealt in the house. The C.C.F. subamendment, sir, read as follows:

That the amendment be amended by inserting therein immediately after the word "alliance" the following words:

"without at the same time making sure that peace in that area would be guaranteed either by the United Nations or by the powers that signed the tripartite agreement of 1950, namely the United States, the United Kingdom and France."

Now, sir, I find this particularly interesting because on February 1 a vote was taken on the subamendment, and I find in the list of hon. members who voted against having the United Nations or the tripartite powers, guarantee peace in that area, the names of the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green).

I think most of us realize, sir, that there is no simple solution to this problem. In fact I think that is the explanation of what I have considered in the last few weeks to be the rather regrettable irascible answers the Prime Minister has given to questions asked on the floor of the house. That is one point on which I do agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra. I think it was regrettable that the Prime Minister was so extremely irascible when he answered those questions. I can understand that the cause was the uneasy consciousness of the