

*Supply—External Affairs*

**Mr. Brewin:** Mr. Chairman, I was relaxing in anticipation of hearing the Secretary of State for External Affairs before participating in the debate. We are discussing the estimates of the Department of External Affairs at a dramatic moment in a dramatic age. In my view it is a dramatic age because this generation is faced with startling alternatives, the alternative of building a world community based on the acceptance of world law or the alternative of the destruction of civilization through the use of weapons of mass destruction. This is a particularly dramatic moment because history is being made before our eyes. The crisis which has taken place in the last few days will have results which may very well be decisive for good or evil for many years to come. For that reason our attention in this debate, although it is generally on the full estimates of the Department of External Affairs, necessarily is centred around the crisis in the Near East.

The rapid military development and the security council's unanimous request for a cease fire, which we understand has now been accepted at least conditionally by the combatants, removes some of the very worst forebodings which people throughout the world have had in respect of this crisis. Nevertheless it is of the utmost importance that the crisis should be used constructively to work out necessary political settlements, to strengthen the foundations of the United Nations and to strengthen the function of the United Nations in maintaining peace and security.

The Prime Minister himself, I believe, has often said, and we have observed it to be true, that it is upon situations of crisis that sometimes we are able to build new structures of peace. The Cuban crisis, of course, is one illustration. Out of the Cuban crisis emerged the test ban treaty and the détente in the cold war. I urge that following this crisis we not sink back into complacency. Such complacency could, and undoubtedly will if indulged in, produce in the present unstable world new crises. The outcome of each new crisis may be far worse than even the tragic results of the present hostilities.

I do not intend to comment at length on the situation immediately facing the security council. We in this party should like to express our full support for the initiative of the Canadian government in introducing the resolution which sought a means of securing compliance with the cease fire resolution of the

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

council. I should like to congratulate our ambassador, Mr. Ignatieff, for his part in the presentation of this resolution.

At the moment I wish to speak more generally upon the future of the United Nations arising out of this crisis. There are some cynics, both in public life and among the representatives of the press, who, when difficulties arise and when defects appear in the embryonic international institutions which exist today, hasten to proclaim, sometimes with ill-concealed glee, that these institutions have failed. There have been a number of headlines and comments which have appeared in the last few days proclaiming that the United Nations is dead, that it is through, that it is ineffective.

It has been asserted by some people that the peace keeping operations of the United Nations have been shown to be futile. It is my submission that precisely the opposite is the lesson of the last few weeks. It was the inadequacy of the original arrangements in respect of UNEF which produced the hurried withdrawal. I do not think we would gain anything by laying the blame for the withdrawal at any door. The withdrawal, however, was the almost immediate prelude to the outbreak of hostilities. Indeed, the withdrawal constituted, perhaps inevitably in the circumstances, a clear and present threat to the existence of the state of Israel.

I ask, could there be a clearer demonstration of the importance of an international presence than the fact that when it is removed there is an outbreak of hostilities? The obvious answer in this situation is not to abandon UN peace keeping operations but rather to establish them on a firmer basis. That basis, I venture to suggest without enlarging at length on the topic, involves the willingness of the great powers to work together in the security council in a different way than they have in the past, with a willingness perhaps to give effect to article 43 of the charter under which the great powers are supposed to work together to maintain peace and security throughout the world on behalf of the nations of the world. Until the great powers assume that responsibility it cannot be said it is the fault of the United Nations itself if that organization is ineffective. It is the fault of the governments of the nations which fail in accepting their responsibility.

The outbreak of war in the Middle East was not due to too much international concern or to too great a willingness to accept international responsibility. The opposite is the truth. Some at least of the great powers