

External Affairs

the Secretary of State (Mr. Pearson) last fall. What is the situation over there today? All the world is very fearful. The nature of the world situation deserved a less politically partisan speech on the part of the minister.

An hon. Member: What is yours?

Mr. Diefenbaker: He seemed to fail to realize how dangerous the situation is although, in one of those perorations which are designed to erase everything, he finally returned, in the last paragraph, to the world situation, dangerous and foreboding as it is. He did not discuss the situation as to whether or not the United Nations should remain in Gaza. He destroyed most of his argument when he said that Egypt had no sovereignty over the Gaza strip. If it has no sovereignty over the Gaza strip then I ask him this question: Why should there be on his part an attitude of tacit approval of the entry of Nasser and his legions to take over the civil administration of that area?

Only yesterday in the House of Commons at Westminster Mr. Lloyd, the foreign secretary, stated that if the Egyptian government intends to take over the administration immediately, there will be fearful results—that by implication—and his suggestion was that the United Nations administrative force remain there. Was there any suggestion on the part of the minister in that connection? Not at all.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Martin: It was the whole thesis of his speech.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It was always Nasser, the man who since last fall has dominated the world as has no one else since the days of Hitler.

My hon. friend sank to a new low when he said that, had the attitude of this party been adopted last fall, the situation would be different for world peace. I say to him this. That statement is false and he knows it.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I never made any such statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All right.

An hon. Member: It is on *Hansard*.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, even a withdrawal and retraction now is beneficial.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, yes. That is the statement. Over and over again we from this part of the house advocated, from January, 1956, the setting up of an international patrol force in the Middle East. That was nothing

novel when it was introduced by the Secretary of State at the United Nations. It was advocated in the House of Commons in January, 1956, from the official opposition. There was nothing original in that suggestion either; for, when I happened to be there in the Middle East two and a half years ago, on every hand the request was made, not only from those living in Israel but also from those living in Jordan—it being contended that such a force would prevent the forays which were taking place and which would inevitably lead to conflict between the armed forces of those nations. If the United Nations had set up such a body at that time, it might have prevented a continuance of those things which ultimately brought about this terrible situation of last fall.

I am going to refer to the record; for after all, the record since November 26 last, in the answers given in the House of Commons, even as late as last week, reveals a succession of hopes expressed and of statements not in keeping with the facts. Indeed, my hon. friend mentioned the praise that he and this government had received from various sources. Last week several editorials in Britain and in France praised the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) for having stated that if force became necessary it would have to be used.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I never made any such statement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I will quote the Prime Minister. Yes, he did. He had to have that revised by my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson).

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Go ahead, quote him.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I intend to quote more than the right hon. gentleman will like to hear. He received praise for that on his fine statesmanship. He received condemnation for the first time from Nasser. Then, there was the revised statement. There was my hon. friend's speech in Toronto, many sections of which found their place in his speech today and in which the Prime Minister's remarks, while not quoted, were revised in the light of public criticism.

My hon. friend says, let us have the record, and I intend to give him just that. This morning, on the basis of the records of *Hansard*, my hon. friend tried to leave that—oh, I could designate it—that innuendo, that if our attitude had been adopted, the situation would be different today. Never, never was there a more improper suggestion made by anyone occupying a position of responsibility. Let us go back to November 26, 1956. The question was raised in this