

Interim Supply

line there has been an encouraging degree of stability in this highly sensitive area. That is according to the report we have received and I believe that the commander of the force, General Burns, is satisfied with the way in which the force is able to carry out its function, although of course its task would be facilitated if it were in a position to operate on both sides of the demarcation line.

Mr. Green: On this question may I ask the minister whether there is any so-called gentlemen's agreement between the secretary general of the United Nations and Nasser that the United Nations emergency force will get out if and when he requests them to do so?

Mr. Pearson: You refer to a withdrawal?

Mr. Green: Yes.

Mr. Pearson: No, Mr. Chairman, there is no such agreement and, on the contrary, the secretary general has stated more than once to the assembly and to the committee of seven that if any request of that kind were made by Colonel Nasser or the Egyptian government that request would be taken up with the committee of seven and then, if the committee so decided, by the full assembly of the United Nations, before any action was taken. That is the position of the secretary general and it is our position.

Mr. Green: Is the minister yet in a position to say whether there will be a subcommittee of the advisory committee sent over to Gaza to look into the situation for themselves?

Mr. Pearson: As I said the other day, that suggestion which my hon. friend raised will be taken up at the first meeting of the committee to be held, I hope, in a day or two and at that time we hope also to have a report from Mr. Bunche on the operation of the force in the strip. That meeting has not yet been held, for reasons for which we are not responsible, but it will be held shortly—I hope perhaps before the end of this week.

Mr. Green: Is the minister raising that suggestion?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, I will be very glad to raise that suggestion at the meeting of the committee to which I have referred.

Now, yesterday the Leader of the Opposition, and I am quoting from page 3407 of *Hansard*, said:

I am not going to deal with the Norman case in that connection, but I point out that in 1951, when the allegations were first made by the subcommittee of the Senate of the United States, instead of the Canadian government standing up and asking for proof rather than suspicion it took the action of transferring Mr. Norman from the United Nations in New York to far-off New Zealand.

[Mr. Pearson.]

I propose to put on record what happened to be the facts in this aspect of this tragic case. When this matter was raised in 1951 this government dealt with it in a way that seemed to be open to us, and it made its position known, not publicly, but to the United States government. The results of that stand seemed to be effective because for a good many years we heard nothing in Washington about the suspicions, the innuendoes and insinuations. It looked as though, so far as Washington was concerned, this matter would be dropped.

So our action seemed to be effective at that time, and when these allegations were revived in March 1957 we again took action at once by means of a diplomatic note, the terms of which have been put on record, and later by public statements. Thus it is not accurate to say that we did not make our position known, and it is not accurate to say that at that time our position was not effectively made known and that it did not have results.

As for taking the action, in the words of the hon. gentleman, of transferring Mr. Norman from the United Nations in New York to far off New Zealand—and in the context in which those words were used I think I would be justified in interpreting them as meaning that in consequence of United States pressure we removed an important official from the United Nations to New Zealand—the facts are as follows: Mr. Norman was never the Canadian permanent representative to the United Nations. On the death of Mr. Riddell in 1951 we had to find a successor as permanent representative, and we decided to appoint Mr. David Johnson to that position, and accordingly transferred him from the post he then held in Pakistan to New York. However, various considerations made it impossible to get him to New York from Pakistan within a period of, I think, between three and four months, during which time the position was held on an acting basis, first by Mr. John Holmes for a few weeks and then, when he had to leave to take up another appointment, for a short time—about two months, I think,—by Mr. Norman on an acting basis pending the arrival of Mr. Johnson.

Far from having transferred Mr. Norman from that very important position as permanent representative at the United Nations, which was to be filled by Mr. Johnson, to far off New Zealand, when he had completed his work in New York on this acting basis he was brought back to the Department of External Affairs and made head of the Far Eastern division of the department. Only in 1953, after he had been promoted to a grade which made it possible for him to