

*The Address—Mr. McLeod*

heal the breach that has been caused by what I assert was too hasty action on our part in the present crisis. When everything is known of the situation that exists as between Egypt and the powers of Britain and France, I think possibly there will be a different decision and a different thought in the minds of some of the leaders of the world. I have a great deal of confidence in the years of diplomatic tact that Britain has shown over past generations in bringing various parts of her empire to the stage where self-government was possible. At the same time, this same empire was the great stabilizing influence for peace in the world. The leader of the C.C.F. pointed out this fact the other evening and did it very well. I therefore need not elaborate further.

I have a great deal of respect for the close relationship that has existed for generations between Britain and Canada. We owe a great deal to Britain, Mr. Speaker, and we have on every occasion until the present done our best to acknowledge that debt. But I feel that now something has happened. What is behind this rift that has occurred? In common with many other people in the world at the present time I think we are safe in believing that the British commonwealth is on the brink of disaster. I lay the blame in large measure on the policies of this government in the present crisis. We have switched our course in order to tie in with United States policies set up by—and I hate to use the word when it comes to describing diplomatic agents and people learned in international diplomacy—a bunch of amateurs. We have committed ourselves to follow the United States pathway and to follow United States policies that express such confusion and vacillation as I am sure have not been expressed in the approach to any great international problem by any other leading power of the world at any time.

I am not making that statement on the strength of my own observations. I am borne out by many statements by United States students of world affairs. I have here an article by Walter Lippmann. It is headed "U.S. Appeasement Failed. Nasser 'Forced' Conflict". We see used in that heading the words "U.S. Appeasement Failed". Along with every other member of this house I hate that word "appeasement". How the Americans scoffed and sneered a few years ago when an Englishman, with an umbrella on his arm, made the trip to Munich, and has ever since then been branded as the great appeaser of all time. The thinking at that time found great fault with this method of appeasing dictators. Today, according to Mr.

Lippmann, the whole policy which they have followed in this crisis has been branded as one of appeasement.

What has happened in this great nation to the south to cause that change of heart? Today, when Britain is backing away from appeasement we find this nation, possibly the most powerful in the world, willing to go hat in hand to one of the dictators of the world in an effort to try and appease, to find a settlement by accepting dictates from that dictator. I could back up this statement, Mr. Speaker, by editorials which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post*. This magazine has written very strongly of the blunderings in United States foreign policy. However, I do want to put on the record a few words by Ernest K. Lindley, a writer in *Newsweek*, the issue of November 26, 1956. In an article entitled, "Our Stand in the Crisis", he has this to say. He has reviewed the situation and then he concludes with these words:

As this brief outline suggests, our government's policy in the Middle Eastern crisis is not yet completely clear.

Remember, this is as late as November 26.

In the first shock of the Israeli-French-British actions it was coloured by anger. It overlooked, momentarily, the aggressive ambitions and actions of Nasser. It seemed to lose sight of what should have been one of our primary objectives: To keep the Russians out. Second and third thoughts have moved our policy toward a somewhat better balance.

Hoover—

This is a reference to the under-secretary in the United States, and these are his words:

"We have a chance for a fresh start". This applies also to American policy in the Middle East, which cannot be cleared of responsibility for the dangerous mess. Our wavering course after Nasser's seizure of the canal led directly to the present crisis.

This is an indictment, Mr. Speaker, by a keen student of international affairs published in one of the leading magazines of the United States. The United States policy stands condemned in the United States by many of her own experienced students of international and world affairs, yet she seems to chart the course that this Canadian government chooses to follow and the Canadian people are asking why.

In his speech yesterday our Secretary of State for External Affairs tried to excuse the lack of United States interest by referring to the Panama canal. These words appear at page 52 of *Hansard* for November 27, 1956:

The vital importance of the Suez to western Europe is perhaps not appreciated in Washington, and it might have been better appreciated there if this situation could have been related by them to the Panama canal.