

*Supply—External Affairs*

absolute necessity of a world organization to try to keep peace and order in the world. If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, the taking of the attitude adopted by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the previous speaker, that the United Nations, right or wrong, should never be subjected to any constructive criticism on the many problems and faults the United Nations has is, I think, a rather unrealistic way of looking at things. It is not my intention to make a speech concerning the difficulties of the United Nations, but I believe many people realize the United Nations has a great many faults. There are many things that could be done to improve that organization. If I heard the two hon. gentlemen correctly, they said that the United Nations was perfect and should not be subjected to any constructive criticism.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I do not think either of us said that.

**Mr. Olson:** Neither do I.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I certainly heard what both hon. members said, but perhaps I interpreted their remarks differently from the way they intended. I am basing my remarks on what was said.

The other thing which the Secretary of State for External Affairs said, and with which the hon. member for Medicine Hat agreed, at least by implication, was that the United Nations came through in this emergency. Well, they did. I think we should be realistic about this. If the Arabs had been winning the war rather than the Israeli, I am not so sure things would have gone so smoothly at the United Nations. There may have been a quite different picture altogether if the Arabs had been successful in the war.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Will my hon. friend enlighten the house on exactly what he means by that statement?

**Mr. Nesbitt:** It seems to me that perhaps the Soviet union might have exercised its veto on the cease fire resolution had things been going in the other direction, shall we say. Since the Arabs, whom the Russians were supporting, were not too successful, perhaps there was not any alternative. Regardless of the reason, things have worked out better than I think most people hoped they would.

There are just two or three points with which I should like to deal. I have no desire

to deal with matters that have already been dealt with by other speakers. First of all, as I understand it, the minister told us a few moments ago that the Canadian resolution has not yet been voted upon by the United Nations.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Perhaps my hon. friend would like to be told that the Canadian resolution is now one of the operative parts of the United States resolution.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** Can the minister perhaps tell us if it is included as a paragraph of the United States resolution? Has the minister a copy of the United States resolution?

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** Yes, I have, but it is quite a long resolution.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** If it is lengthy perhaps the minister could give us the general purport of the resolution.

**Mr. Martin (Essex East):** I have already given it to the hon. member who just spoke. First of all, it embodies the resolution put forward last night by the Canadian ambassador. The second portion requests full compliance with the cease fire resolution of the security council. These are some of the ideas embodied in the United States resolution which was tabled today.

This resolution also calls for the Secretary General or the president or someone else other than the Secretary General or the president, to try by bilateral contacts between the two countries involved to implement the terms of the cease fire, and for the United Nations to work toward a solution of the fundamental problems of the area. It calls upon all nations to co-operate toward that end. Implied in this operative part is an invitation to the great powers to use their influence in that regard.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I am certainly very pleased to have this information. If I may say so, I think this resolution is a considerable improvement over the terms of the Canadian resolution. The Canadian resolution, in effect, left the arranging of the cease fire in very broad, general terms at the discretion of the secretary general and, of course, the current president of the security council. This is a help, I think, but of course the security council president changes every month. It is not very likely the United Nations would have been able to work out the problem very quickly—they never do and this way have caused some problems.