

External Affairs

mute in connection with the Suez crisis, and went beyond that and voted that the world bank should grant that loan.

It is true that the Secretary of State for External Affairs in this house did say to us that our stand on the Suez crisis was well known. I say that that is not sufficient.

Mr. Green: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I made no such statement.

Mr. Crestohl: No, not during this session. The minister will recall that I did ask him, I think in the last session, something about Suez and he did say, "Our stand on Suez is well known", and I accepted that statement at the time. I have not the quotation here, but I am absolutely right on that. I can understand the minister saying that, and perhaps it is well known. But I say that in these crises it is not sufficient to state that your views are well known. Do not leave it to chance. It may be all right when answering someone during the question period to say that our stand is well known. I say, most respectfully, that the minister or the government should say what that stand is, and then we will know what it is. I say that to have supported the loan made by the world bank was morally wrong.

Mr. Green: May I ask the hon. member what the policy of his party was with regard to the loan of the world bank?

Mr. Crestohl: I beg your pardon?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Crestohl: What is there funny about that? Our hon. representative in the United Nations laughs very heartily. What is there humorous about that?

An hon. Member: You.

Mr. Crestohl: I am sure even hon. members in the government will agree with me that if the government had had the moral courage to say, we will support the world bank, but you Egypt have a moral and legal obligation to the United Nations to keep the Suez canal open; you want money to extend the canal, and you want us to help provide that money, but you, Egypt, must conform to the decision of the United Nations and of international law. If you want the benefits, you have to fulfil the obligations. That would have been a perfectly wholesome position for Canada to have taken. I could have expected nothing more; the world could not have expected much more than that we should have said: yes, we will vote for the loan, but we draw to your attention the terms of the United Nations decision. You are members of that organization and we are members, and we call on you to obey that decision of the United Nations.

If Canada had taken that position it would have been all that could have been expected. But Canada has not done so, and I do not know why.

Mr. Green: May I ask the hon. member what is the Liberal policy on this question?

Mr. Crestohl: If the Liberal party had to make a decision on that matter I have sufficient confidence to believe that if they were sitting on the benches opposite they would certainly have taken the position of pointing out to Egypt that it was in violation of a United Nations decision.

Mr. Green: They have been awfully quiet about it.

Mr. Crestohl: They are not the ones who are responsible now. If hon. members opposite will allow us to speak for the government, we shall do so. Let the Conservative party take a stand on this issue and we will back it up. I do not think it is a proper answer to say simply that the government did not do something because they did not know what the opposition would have done. I say, with respect, that the government could have taken a more laudable position. It would not have interfered with its policy very seriously. But they did not do so. Instead, they followed blindly the course of action taken by the United States and that is a dangerous thing. Perhaps they are afraid to displease the United States. I appeal to the government not to follow the United States quite so blindly, and my appeal is based on how the United States has acted. I am reading, now, from the *Israel Digest* of January 8, 1960:

The world bank is an instrument of the society of nations, the same society to which President Eisenhower was referring in his television address to the American people on February 20, 1957, when he said:

"Egypt by accepting the six principles adopted by the security council last October in relation to the Suez canal, bound itself to free and open transit through the canal without discrimination and to the principle that the operation of the canal should be insulated from the politics of any country."

The President emphasized that it should not be assumed that in the future Egypt would prevent Israel shipping from using the Suez canal and said that if Egypt violated her international obligations, then—

and I am quoting his very words—

—this should be dealt with firmly by the society of nations.

But what does the United States government do after this declaration by the president who so forcibly says to Egypt: do not take this action; if you do, you will be called to answer before the United Nations. Mr. Speaker, only a short time after that the