

*Foreign Policy*

what is happening in the Near East; however, that remains to be seen.

The situation in the Near East is hard to analyse. It seems strange, that, had President Nasser really meant to attack Israel, he would not have gone to war without talking about it so much. Surely he would have invaded Israel and said nothing, had he really meant war, because in these days if you want to go to war, you surprise the enemy. Because there has been much sabre rattling during the last two or three days, gives credence to the belief that President Nasser is working at some sort of negotiating lever. On the other hand his threats may be genuine. Only time will tell.

I can suggest one thing to the minister: Canada is held in a great deal of respect in the United Arab Republic. It is safe to say that Canada is very highly thought of in that part of the world. I know that from experience, having dealt with the U.A.R., and I am sure that the minister has found the same thing.

I remember a little incident that took place a few years ago when Arab students were studying in the Soviet union. President Nasser found that they were receiving more propaganda than technical training, and withdrew them from that country. Canada offered to take these students, thus making a contribution to the United Arab Republic. I could mention numerous other incidents, at the United Nations and elsewhere, to illustrate my point.

In view of the esteem in which Canada is held in the U.A.R.—and we are almost equally well received in Israel—I suggest that Canada might quietly offer the good offices and services of some prominent Canadian, perhaps that might be the minister himself, to try to bring about some settlement in the dispute. I do not know whether that would be successful, but as the minister suggested, Canada should try to do these things. Over the years Canada has taken a leading part in activities such as this, and I think we should attempt something of that sort now. If our efforts do not succeed, nobody will be the loser. Yet there is a reasonable chance that by offering to use our good offices in this situation our offer might be accepted. In any event, I think we should try.

The right hon. Leader of the Opposition spoke at some length about the apparent folly of the government's policy of unifying the armed forces. Many of us sitting on this side warned the government during the debate of the great danger of putting all our eggs in one

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

basket. We said that our forces should not be designed purely for United Nations peace keeping roles. We hope that the United Nations will recover from this present setback, and that it will increase its peace keeping activities in the future; yet the situation demonstrates, as the right hon. Leader of the Opposition said, how unwise the government was in unifying the armed services and in designing them for the undoubted purpose of being useful only as United Nations peace keeping forces. I think the government ought to have been much surer of what would happen in the UN before it unified its forces.

I have one other observation about the Middle East, and this concerns the activities of the Secretary General of the United Nations. He of course is the United Nations senior administrative officer, and it is his duty and job to carry out the resolutions passed by the Security Council and the General Assembly. Granted, many UN resolutions are somewhat vague and subject to certain conditions, but I feel that in this instance, before summarily dismissing the UNEF, the Secretary General ought to have consulted the Security Council. I think what he did went beyond what he has discretion to do. He may have had some colour of right for his actions, but I think he went beyond proper discretion in the use of his office.

• (8:20 p.m.)

It may be said that perhaps it would have been dangerous to call a meeting of the Security Council to discuss this issue before there had been prior consultation. The Secretary General is now in Cairo, I understand, trying to work out some agreement in connection with this matter. But I think he might well have gone to Cairo to see what he could do before he summarily dismissed the peace keeping force. Then, if his efforts proved unsuccessful, he could have referred the question to the Security Council. I have known the Secretary General for many years and I have great respect for him. Nevertheless in this case I think his judgment erred, though I hope of course that his present efforts are successful.

I turn, now, to the problem in Asia, which I call the Chinese problem because Viet Nam is only one facet of it. The Peking government has made its ultimate intentions clear on numerous occasions. It wishes to recover all the land lost to China in the last century—land taken from her by European countries, including Russia. She intends to recover this land, Taiwan, or Formosa, included, and she