

*The Address—Mr. Pearson*

no statement to show that Canada's policy in the Middle East is any different from that of the United States.

The situation is very clearly summed up in one of our British Columbia weekly papers, namely the Agassiz-Harrison *Advance* of November 15, as follows:

Canada and the United States would have been wise to remember that Britain and France were the best friends they had. They have gone a long way now towards destroying both the friends and the friendship, without gaining anything to replace them.

This policy of the Canadian government may well be disastrous to Canada. The United States would have far more admiration for Canada, Mr. Speaker, if this government stopped being the United States chore boy.

Then the third paragraph of the amendment reads:

(3) have placed Canada in the humiliating position of accepting dictation from President Nasser;

Oh, the Prime Minister was so naive about that paragraph yesterday. Dear old Nasser, he would not do anything wrong. The Prime Minister said Canada has had no dealings with President Nasser. Then he went on to admit that the statements carried in the press about Nasser vetoing the sending of the Queen's Own Rifles to the Middle East were correct. He admitted that President Nasser had advised against it. Then he went on to say that we had to take time because these Canadian troops were going to serve in the Sinai desert. I thought they were going to serve in the Suez canal area, and that some steps were being taken by this United Nations emergency police force to settle finally the Suez canal dispute. Apparently the Canadians are to be sent into the Sinai desert.

All the way through his remarks about this paragraph of the amendment the Prime Minister had nothing but soft words for President Nasser. Why, he said, President Nasser had told General Burns, I think it was, that he was anxious to retain good relations with Canada. Why on earth would he not be; this tinpot dictator, to whom Canada has been a better friend than she has to the United Kingdom and France in this crisis?

This Suez crisis has shown once again very clearly that the present Canadian government has been too long in office. Their actions in connection with the amendment to the Defence Production Act in 1955 showed us how they thought they were supermen, that they had all the answers. This year there was a similar type of action during the closure on the pipe-line debate. Now this government, by its actions in the Suez crisis, has made this month of November, 1956, the most disgraceful period for Canada in the history of this nation.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Green:** It is high time that Canada had leadership more in line with the forthrightness and the courage of the Canadian people. It is high time Canada had a government which will not knife Canada's best friends in the back.

**Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs):** May I begin, Mr. Speaker, by offering my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Legare) and seconder (Mr. Weselak) of the address. They are valuable members of our delegation to the assembly in New York, and if and when this debate is completed they will be continuing to perform useful service for their country and for peace at the United Nations assembly.

We are facing today a situation of gravity and danger, far too serious a situation to be dealt with from a purely partisan point of view. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat talked about Canada being the chore boy of the United States. Our record over the last years, Mr. Speaker, gives us the right to say we have performed and will perform no such role. It is bad to be a chore boy of the United States. It is equally bad to be a colonial chore boy running around shouting, "Ready, aye, ready". A well-known Conservative newspaper, the *Ottawa Journal*, in commending the policy of the government at the United Nations in recent days, a policy of care and restraint as it was characterized, a policy of consideration for its friends, ended an editorial on this subject on October 31 as follows:

At best, we are going to be in very great danger of all-out war for some time now. We must learn to think before we chatter.

Chattering instead of thinking—if we fail because of idle chatter and not enough thought in our efforts to resolve the problems that face us today in this country and in the world, it will not make much difference who has the halos or who has been humiliated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment to the motion. I might as well say at once—and this will be no surprise to the house—that I think it is an amendment worthy of no support at all. It is inaccurate in its facts, as I shall hope to prove, and it is wrong in its conclusions.

Before I deal with the matters referred in the speech and in the amendment on the Middle East, may I say just one word about Hungary. The Canadian government has already expressed its views in Ottawa and at the United Nations assembly on this matter. We have witnessed as brutal and as grim a betrayal of a people as history has ever seen,