

External Affairs

Mr. Martin: That may be an additional argument.

Mr. Green: The trouble with the power of moral force in the world today is that it only applies to those nations which "play the game". The power of moral force has been applied to Israel within the last few weeks, but it certainly does not apply to Egypt; it has not been applied to Egypt during those weeks. Egypt pretended she would comply with what she knew perfectly well were the intentions of the nations at New York, but the moment the Israeli forces had withdrawn from the Gaza strip she moved in, completely ignoring any moral force, in exactly the same way Russia did in Hungary. I do not mean in so far as troops are concerned; that I presume is still to come. But Egypt ignored the power of moral force entirely, and it is about time the freedom-loving people, including hon. members of this government, woke up to the fact that that is the way in which these nations still function. The present situation, Mr. Speaker, cannot be glossed over by fulsome statements by the minister in the House of Commons; and as to the Suez canal—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Applewhaite): It is five o'clock. It has been indicated to me from various quarters that it is the wish of the house, by unanimous consent, that this debate should be continued. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Applewhaite): All business reserved for private and public bills having been allowed to stand by unanimous consent, I call on the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green).

An hon. Member: Changed your minds.

An hon. Member: The Conservatives have no minds to change.

Mr. Green: Perhaps I could get into this act.

The Suez canal has now been partially cleared. We understand it will be open some time next month. The cost of clearing that canal is to be paid by the United Nations and, as I pointed out some moments ago, Canada has already advanced far more in proportion to her population than any other nation. Egypt blocked the canal by a piece of malicious sabotage; it could not be described in any other way. Now she is demanding that all ships passing through that canal shall pay the full tolls to her.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs made one of his covering-up statements on this point today, when he intimated that the United States, the United Kingdom, France

[Mr. Green.]

and Norway many weeks ago had made to Egypt a proposal under which the tolls would be paid to the world bank, one half to be remitted to Egypt at once and the other half to be held pending a settlement. I also understood him to say that Egypt has not yet given a reply to those suggestions.

May I say that Nasser gave a reply to the public. I suppose the minister thinks that does not count, and that just because there may not have been any formal letter therefore there has been no reply. But the press of March 10, just five days ago, had this to say under the heading "Nasser Insists Egypt be Paid All Canal Tolls". Referring to Nasser it states:

He also told an Indian newspaper editor that British and French ships would be allowed through the Suez canal if they paid the entire tolls to Egypt. No decision has been reached yet, he added, on whether Israeli ships also would be allowed transit through the canal.

There seems to be a grave danger that Israeli ships will not be allowed through the canal. The dispatch goes on to say:

Col. Abdel Hatem, Egyptian information minister, announced that western proposals for 50-50 payment of tolls to Egypt and the international bank violate the 1888 convention of freedom of navigation through the canal.

There we have a definite rejection of the proposal. Egypt's action with regard to the canal certainly amounts to blackmail, as was stated by the premier of France in this chamber just a few days ago. But, so far as one can find out, Mr. Speaker, Canada has made no protest whatever to Egypt about this situation. That, I submit, is condoning this blackmail. Canada should have protested to Egypt.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs told us last November that one of the objectives of the United Nations emergency force was to see that the Suez canal problem was settled. I have here *Hansard* of November 29. At page 168 he is reported to have said:

Those functions—

Referring to the functions of the United Nations emergency force.

—under that earlier resolution were to bring about a cease-fire, and that has been done; to bring about the withdrawal of forces behind the armistice line; to desist from raids across the armistice line into neighbouring territory; to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreement, and to take steps to reopen the Suez canal and to restore and secure freedom of navigation.

Our complaint about the stand of the Canadian government is that in the first place Canada did not protest to Egypt about the delay in opening the canal.

Mr. Pearson: They are ahead of their schedule in clearing the canal. I told you that this morning.