

*Foreign Policy*

Israel has the right, together with its neighbours, to live in peace, there is therefore a special obligation upon the UN in view of the accomplishments of that country, in view of the fact that the state of Israel has not disappointed the world or abused the confidence which was placed in it. In these circumstances both the United Nations and Canada as a member of that institution have duties greater than merely hoping restraint will be shown.

Let me illustrate more definitely what I am suggesting—I hope not without some validity, and certainly with a full sense of responsibility. I find it impossible to understand the Secretary General's haste in withdrawing the United Nations emergency force. Earlier today I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs during the orders of the day to give us the reasons which motivated this course of action. The hon. gentleman was very frank and full in his answers and I thank him for this.

• (5:10 p.m.)

But the most important implications created for Canada and other nations by Mr. U Thant's action is that he has set a most dangerous precedent for peace keeping. By his action, no matter how honestly and sincerely taken, he has weakened the potential usefulness of peace keeping undertakings by the United Nations. If, the moment a host country demands that such a force be withdrawn, the Secretary General of the United Nations acts without going either to the assembly of the United Nations or to the security council, if he acts on his own authority at the mere request of a host country then, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the whole notion of peace keeping is endangered beyond exaggeration. Time and time again we will be in the same position where a United Nations peace keeping force will necessarily be stationed on someone's territory and will necessarily have to be stationed there with that government's consent. Thus the precedent which the Secretary General has established seems to me to be dangerous not only in the present situation in the Middle East but dangerous for future peace keeping in the world.

Therefore in my estimation this government and the Secretary of State for External Affairs would have been justified, and would have served the cause of peace better, if they had concretely and forthrightly criticized the Secretary General for taking that step and demanded an immediate meeting of the security council on the subject, not merely, I

repeat, because of the danger it represented in the Middle East but perhaps in the long run and more important because of the fact that his action undermined—I do not think that word is too strong—the potential usefulness of peace keeping in the future.

Of course I and my colleagues join with the Secretary of State for External Affairs in hoping that the visit of the Secretary General of the United Nations to Cairo will enable him to go to other capitals and that that visit result in an easing of the present situation. From my visit to Israel I do not see how it is possible for the state of Israel to accept the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba and the blockade of the port of Eilat which represent its only means of carrying on trade with the Far East and its only access to oil. I simply do not see how the government of that country can sit by and accept the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba, for the reasons I have given. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should continue to demand a meeting of the security council, as apparently he has done, so that something concrete may be done to avoid the war which is clearly at our doorstep in the Middle East.

I agree with the right hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) when he states, if I understood him correctly, that the Middle East situation is the direct result of the situation in Viet Nam. I think he is right because when the United States has acted the way it has acted in Viet Nam it opened the door for similar action by countries like Egypt and made it impossible for the United States to carry out the role which it might otherwise have wanted to carry out. At least it made it very difficult for the United States to carry out the role of honouring the undertaking—I think it was in 1948—that the borders of the various countries in the Middle East must be protected, and difficult to carry out the convention that international waters like the Gulf of Aqaba must be available to all innocent shipping.

I say this because I can almost hear President Nasser and spokesmen for the Arab states saying to President Johnson, "Who are you to teach us international morality? Who are you to tell us what we may or may not do in terms of international law? Where has your consideration of these questions been when you decided to bomb North Viet Nam, and more recently to invade the demilitarized zone?"