

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

demanded, not the day to day communications. Certainly no one would ask for the production of all of the correspondence. But only the one was referred to and only the one was asked for.

We now come to the question of an international force. I think that this is a step in the right direction. I think it is something that is *ad hoc* to a particular situation. I think it represents the first time that the United Nations, since the uniting-for-peace resolution, has established the beginning of a principle which, since the days of Grotius to which my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred yesterday, has been the dream and the hope of mankind.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs said today that Nasser has nothing to say as to the identity of the force. Well, one of the U.N. officials said so. My hon. friend says he had no authority. It is impossible for anyone to follow the kaleidoscopic changes and alterations that took place in a matter of two weeks over the Queen's Own. What happened? Was this letter from General Burns an escape hatch for the government? Did they suggest to him in any way, after consultation, such a letter? I read from a press dispatch which says that the government is embarrassed. I have not seen any evidence of that in the last couple of days but this was back on November 20.

The federal cabinet, admittedly embarrassed, met today to make its decision on the dispatch of Canadian troops to Egypt . . .

Then, there is a reference to the letter from General Burns, and it says:

The General's letter was written in close consultation with the Canadian government. It is accepted here that it is meant to provide a face-saving out from the embarrassing position of having had the proposed contribution of the Queen's Own Rifles turned down by Egypt's veto.

I need hardly say that this comes from one who enjoys the confidence of the government. I refer to Mr. Robert Taylor of the *Toronto Star*. He seldom does anything to embarrass. Here is what the *New York Times* said in regard to this question. At any time the Egyptian government desires it withdrawn, the force will be withdrawn immediately. Then the article goes on:

. . . Egyptian approval was necessary in the choice of countries that would participate in the force. In addition, Egyptian approval was required as to where the force would be stationed and when it would arrive, . . .

They have accepted the police force to ensure that the British and French and Israeli troops leave the country and that is all.

My hon. friend indicates that he does not agree with that.

Mr. Pearson: It is not true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I may say that is quoted from a reputable writer in the *New York Times*. I say this, sir, that if it is not true it is surprising how this force has followed the course that Nasser would want it to follow. As a member of the profession of law, Mr. Speaker, I ask what kind of police force would you consider it when a thug would be able to determine the personnel of the force, the beat on which it operates, its tenure of office and the time when it would conclude its operations? I should like further enlightenment from the minister in connection with this force and the role it is to play, because if in fact these statements are correct then this force does not meet the need of the moment. It does not establish the beginnings of that international rule of law which was referred to by Selwyn Lloyd in the British House of Commons when he said:

Law and order cannot be maintained in any country without policemen. A burglar is not deterred because society's property owners pass a resolution condemning housebreaking. Unlawful wounding is not stopped because the victims may all condemn violence. So it is in international society. We have to face the facts, and the fact is that collective security under the United Nations has only once in a real crisis proved effective and that was in Korea in 1950, and then only because of an accident that Russia was absent from the security council.

I say this, sir, I believe that with halting and faltering steps this international force, if the conscience of the free world will give it the power that Nasser does not want it to have, may well prove the beginnings of a new era. History tells but one story, Mr. Speaker, and that is in every few hundred years man has feared the avalanches that would destroy freedom, but always when it is darkest the stars are brightest. I say to the Prime Minister that the references to supermen, regardless of what the situation might be, and the condemnation of those nations which have stood for freedom for generations should not have fallen from the lips of a man who enjoys the respect the Prime Minister does. I say this not in anger; I say it in the deepest feeling of sorrow, that Canada should have permitted the use of words which cannot hurt those against whom they are directed but will raise the hopes of communists everywhere in the world and bring solace to the Khrushchevs and Bulganins. That is the position in which Canada is.

Now, I have said all I am going to say in that direction, except that as one who believes in the responsibility of an opposition I have one suggestion to make, a major one, and one or two others. I am going to say to the Minister of Immigration that I am glad he is taking the course he is and going over to Austria. By his presence he will let them