

If I were in charge in Israel I would not give in, because the minute that was done Egypt would start her attack all over again. Look at the ratio of prisoners exchanged between the two countries the other day.

The United States said that Britain and France must get out of the Middle East. But now the United States is going in there with its men and money, and doing so without the consent of anybody.

I believe that you do not make a friend of any man by lending him money; indeed, you are more likely to make an enemy of him. I can understand the difficult position in which our Government is placed. But I believe it made a mistake in the first place; it should have taken a firm stand at the United Nations and insisted that if Britain and France had to leave the Middle East, then Nasser must go too, and let the U.N. take over the control and management of the Suez Canal. But Canada did not take that stand, and perhaps she is not to be wholly blamed for not doing so. But my point is that we cannot go on making deals with a man like Nasser. We cannot rely on a dictator, a man who has no intention whatever of carrying out his word or obeying the law. I understand that our Secretary of State for External Affairs has tried very hard to do something constructive, but I think he fails to realize that when we are dealing with a crook we must treat him as such and keep our powder dry. That is the situation in the world today, and believe me we are much worse off now than we were five years ago. Russia has defied us, and so has India; indeed the whole of Asia has defied us. And what progress has the United Nations made toward a solution of the present world problems? Why should it allow a little nation of 7,000 people the same voting power as that of a big country like the United States? Certainly a small nation has not as much power in foreign affairs as has United States, Russia, Britain or France.

I would say to the honourable Leader of the Government that Canada can never expect to get back a nickel of this loan. The only way we might get some return would be by lending a further \$2 million, and then we might get our first million back. If you complain to Nasser he will tell you you can jump in the ocean, and you will have very little choice. That is the situation Canada is facing today.

We must realize that the United States is a new nation in world affairs and does not understand and appreciate world problems. How can she do otherwise when her own nation is divided within itself? How could the Government of Canada establish a proper

foreign policy if the Prime Minister was a Conservative and the majority of the members in the House of Commons were Liberals? We would find that an impossible situation. President Eisenhower can only get effective support when the Senate of his country supports him.

Speaking for myself, I am thoroughly disgusted with the United Nations. Unless there is from now on a change and a rebirth of independence in that body, and unless men and women whom we send there to represent us are willing to stand up and say what they really think, I see no future for that organization. Nobody in my part of Canada thinks that Nasser can be trusted; nor does anyone think that Mr. Dulles is the leader of public opinion in the world today. Indeed, the people in my part of the country sometimes wonder why he goes off on tangents as he does. I quite admit that our own Mr. Pearson tries harder than either Mr. Nasser or Mr. Dulles to get near the truth. Yet, he does not stand up and fight for it as we sometimes think he should. Whether that is because the Government here does not want him to do so or because he himself does not choose to do so, I cannot say.

I come back to my point that we will regret making a loan in this amount to finance the clearing of the Suez Canal. To my way of thinking it will be lost money—we will never get a cent of it back. Not only will we not get it back, but we will make enemies by lending it. It will go down the drain and be lost forever.

Hon. J. W. deB. Farris: Honourable senators, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig). I am not so much concerned with what he had to say about Vote No. 541 for university grants, but I am concerned about and interested in what he had to say about Vote 545, which would provide a loan of \$1 million to the United Nations Organization, a loan which he says will never be repaid. To me, that is a small consideration.

This item reads:

Loan to the United Nations Organization to help finance the clearing of the Suez Canal, \$1 million.

What is meant by the "clearing of the Suez Canal"? If it means only the raising up of the sunken ships, enough is not being done. To me the real issue is, how is the canal to be cleared so that those nations who are entitled to use it may use it?

I think Israel's position in the Middle East is the vital issue today. She has taken her stand, and I must say I fully support her in that stand. In effect, Israel is saying: We