

*Supply—External Affairs*

therefore, do we still hesitate? What diplomatic niceties are permitting the exposure of our own position to such dangerous risks?

Rumours were afloat very recently in our country that Canada would sell to Israel a number of defensive planes. The impatience of the people of Israel and of many people in many quarters in Canada and the other western countries should be understandable, and I know is fully recognized by our government. Though I am not unmindful that the government of Canada must exercise great caution in view of the recent complicated developments, I must nevertheless point out, Mr. Chairman, that these complications result from the unilateral actions of a dictator who truly follows the diabolic pattern of dictators. We have learned from painful experience in this very century that dictators understand nothing better than a show of courageous strength and grim determination to stop them. The very actions of the Egyptian dictator, by themselves, should have promptly precipitated strengthening our position in the Middle East rather than retarding it. I appeal to our government to be in the vanguard in urging our allies to strengthen western defences in the Middle East post-haste, and the first move should be the shipment to Israel of the defensive planes for which this dependable ally of ours so passionately pleads.

I commend, Mr. Chairman, the position taken by the United States government not to permit itself to be duped into financing the construction of the Aswan dam. This is a courageous demonstration of policy and is a declaration that it recognizes the complete duplicity of Colonel Nasser and his military clique in Egypt.

This, Mr. Chairman, is only a step in the right direction in a negative way. Such acts by themselves are not sufficient. There must be affirmative action equally as courageous. I admire too, and commend, the speedy action of the United Kingdom in freezing Egyptian assets and in sending warships to the vicinity; that is a positive and very significant move. But I respectfully suggest that the western powers should go much further. I can think of no better or more positive act to demonstrate to the Egyptian people our repugnance of this behaviour than by sending an abundance of defence equipment to Israel. Why should we hesitate to tell Colonel Nasser we are apprehensive of his further aggressive actions? Sending the planes to Israel would be an effective warning to him that the western powers will not tolerate further aggressive behaviour. At the present stage all sense of logic dictates the strengthening of Israel's defences, which could in no way

[Mr. Crestohl.]

adversely affect the western position even though it might displease Mr. Nasser.

It is my respectful submission that at this point the western powers would be turning the other cheek too readily if they showed any concern about displeasing Mr. Nasser. Not strengthening Israel's defences is to be virtually delinquent in strengthening our own defences in the Middle East. Let us therefore not, by an act of omission, place ourselves in a position that may cause painful results. I do not want to pour salt on anyone's wounds, but deep down in the hearts of many diplomats in Washington and in London there must be intense soul searching and genuine remorse for having sent Egypt such an abundance of planes, tanks, warships and other aggressive weapons. They must now bitterly realize that they have built a Frankenstein. I am fearful that the statement I made on the floor of this house some months ago may yet, heaven forbid, materialize; that is, that our men may yet be facing weapons which we have ourselves supplied to an irresponsible and over-ambitious dictator.

When I said six months ago, Mr. Chairman, that the massing by Egypt of vast armaments near Alexandria was for greater game than Israel, it now becomes obvious that it was the Suez canal that was one of those greater objectives. Mr. Nasser would not have dared to do what he did last week if he had not had the vast armaments to defend by force, as he recently declared he is prepared to do, any position he has taken. He would not have dared to make that move were he not aware of the fact that he had a vast collection of armaments in his country which we ourselves helped to build up.

What he has done is what contemporary history shows that all dictators do. They follow the same pattern. They first do something aggressive, and immediately set up a smokescreen with honeyed language declaring peaceful intentions, promising readjustments and subduing the troubled waters by these false manoeuvres. This was the pattern of Hitler following every move he made into neighbouring countries. This was the style of Mussolini and is also the pattern Russia followed in Korea, China, and only in recent days again is attempting in Burma. This is precisely the course that Nasser has set for himself.

He must be stopped and stopped at once. Caressing him will be useless. Negotiating with him will be meaningless and worthless. A barrier must be set up beyond which he dare not go. Sanctions should be imposed. He should be completely isolated for disregarding unilaterally a sacred agreement