

External Affairs

Apparently now it is being deployed along the border between Israel and Egypt. Dr. Bunche made a statement to that effect as reported in the press yesterday. I quote:

He added that UNEF's principal responsibility is to deploy along Gaza's border with Israel to maintain peace.

In other words, it is to be largely a borderline organization. That seems to be the fate now destined for this force. If this will help to stop the raids, then it will certainly serve a useful purpose. Egypt has made her stand clear on the use of this force. On March 11 Hatem, to whom I referred a few moments ago, said this:

Egypt has agreed to the stay of the UNEF within the limits fixed by the United Nations, that is to enforce the cease-fire and follow the withdrawal of enemy (Israeli) forces to the armistice lines.

Egypt will not accept that the UNEF performs other functions than these.

Of course that was simply carrying out what they had said on February 4, after the resolution of February 2. The foreign minister at that time said that following Israel's withdrawal the United Nations force is to take a position exclusively on both sides of the armistice line. The entry, stationing and deployment of the force must be with the consent of the Egyptian government. The United Nations force is not in Egypt as an occupation force, not as a replacement for the invader, not to resolve any question or to settle any problem, be it in relation to the Suez canal, Palestine, or the freedom of passage in territorial waters.

There is the position in which the United Nations emergency force stands at the present time. I feel that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should have taken some time to clarify just what that force can do. There have been disturbing reports, too, that the Scandinavian troops in the force are to be withdrawn within the next two months. I hope that is not correct. The Prime Minister of Denmark was quoted as saying in New Delhi on March 7 that the force is a financial burden on the smaller countries, and that the United Nations members not contributing to the Middle East unit now should assume a share of the work. He said that the four Scandinavian countries have decided eventually on withdrawal from the United Nations emergency force, perhaps within a few months. This is another question the minister should have faced today. There is also trouble about the Yugoslav portion of the force. A press dispatch indicated that at one stage they were being withdrawn from the Gaza strip. Are they to participate to the full, or what is the position with regard to that force?

[Mr. Green.]

Then the most important question of all is whether the force will have to leave if Egypt so ordered. The minister had very little comfort for us today. He said the United Nations could pass a resolution that the force should remain in the Gaza strip, but then he said that Egypt would not be bound to accept the United Nations resolution. In my opinion that means, in effect, that the troops would have to be withdrawn if Egypt decided she would not comply with the resolution of the United Nations. Did the minister say something?

Mr. Pearson: What would you do in that case?

Mr. Green: It may be that is the only thing that can be done, but I think the government should be frank with us and say that such is the case. In effect Egypt could successfully demand the withdrawal of that force. I do not know how the government can rely so much on the good faith of Nasser. The minister said today that Egypt would be honour bound to comply with the resolutions of the United Nations. Thus far she has not been honour bound to do so. The *New York Times* had an editorial on March 12 entitled "Nasser Challenges U.N." It reads:

The threat of a new crisis hangs over the Middle East today as a result of President Nasser's repudiation of his private assurances to the United Nations and the United States. He is now attempting to restore the status quo ante, which would permit him to resume his war against Israel and to hold the world at ransom by his unrestricted control of the Suez canal.

Today in this house the minister lectured Egypt, but it would be far more effective if the Canadian government were to make formal protests to Egypt when attitudes are taken by that nation which are not in compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations or with what Canada finds should be a proper stand.

As I have said before, Canada is very heavily involved in this question. We have troops there; we are on the advisory committee to the United Nations emergency force, which has a Canadian commander, and we are incurring very heavy expenditures. The bills for what we have done so far are not in yet, but I do not doubt for a minute they will run into millions of dollars.

I think that throughout the Canadian government has made two fundamental errors. One has been in following the United States policy much too closely. The United States policy, it is now so clear, has been to appease the Arab nations. In recent months the United States has been moving in that direction, taking many steps to try to gain the support of the Arab nations, including Egypt, and doing it at the risk of losing her best