

*The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker*

that the source of strength of Egypt in the Middle East is her geographical and strategic position which embraces the crossroads of the world, the thoroughfare of traders and the passageway of armies. He says:

There remains the third source—oil—a sinew of material civilization without which all its machines would cease to function. The great factories producing every kind of goods; all the instruments of land, sea and air communications; all the weapons of war, from the mechanical bird above the clouds to the submarine beneath the waves—without oil, all would turn back to naked metal, covered with rust, incapable of motion or use.

He says in effect that his main ambition is to take over the Middle East and then, having done that, to take over Africa, to mobilize the people of the Moslem world. There are 80 million in Indonesia; 50 million in China; millions in Malaya, Siam and Burma; 100 million in Pakistan; more than 100 million in the Middle East and 40 million in the Soviet union. There is the blueprint.

Never has anyone written in so few words so terrible a prospect for mankind. I speak only from my own interpretation of it. When I read of Khrushchev saying "We will bury you," as he speaks of the free nations, when I hear Bulganin threatening missile warfare and the sending of so-called volunteers from Russia and China, I ask myself this. What must we do? What course shall we follow? Whatever action we take, upon that we will be judged. We cannot secure an international force such as was dreamed of at San Francisco. Within this time and generation, as I see it, we will have to be restricted to international forces, temporary in their character, meeting local situations as they arise.

What would the U.S.S.R. have done with the instruments that it made available to Egypt if it had waited until the United Nations would act? As reported in the *New York Times*, here are some of the weapons that have been delivered to Egypt recently: At least 50 Il'yushin bombers, 100 MIG fighters, 300 medium and heavy tanks, a substantial number of T-34's, the largest tanks there are, between 400 and 500 field anti-tank and anti-aircraft guns, several rocket launchers, mines, radar and wireless telegraphic equipment, two destroyers, four minesweepers, 15 to 20 motor torpedo boats.

Where do I stand, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this force? One gives the deepest thought to these things, and I stand where I stood on the 31st of January in this house. At that time there was an interruption on the part of the Minister of National Health and Welfare when objection was being raised to the fatuous policy on the part of the government of supplying Egypt with one type of armament and Israel with another. What I said was as a result of having seen these

tenuous lines that separate the Arab lands from Israel. As far as I could see, the only immediate hope was to set up an international force to protect and assure the boundaries and at that time, as found at page 723, I said:

I suggest to my hon. friend who interrupted that one of the things he can do, with his influence in the United Nations, is to see to it that something in the nature of an international force is established to the end that this dangerous situation shall be obliterated. If it is not, and war breaks out there, we shall have war all over the world . . .

I am glad that that part of my statement was not correct, for in every generation war has seen a march of conquerors. It is almost like a beaten road to war. The Secretary of State for External Affairs answered me the next day, as found at page 777 of *Hansard*, and he indicated that such a force would not be effective because there was no permanent boundary line. I say to my hon. friend today that if what was done on November 2 had been brought before the United Nations earlier the tragic beginnings of this situation as Israel marched might have been averted. It is one of the ifs of history, but I say that I made that suggestion in the attitude I have always tried to assume in parliament. As a member of the opposition I have my own responsibilities to present those things which I believe will be of some benefit. The view was held in Jordan, the view was held in Israel that such a force would be effective.

What has Canada done since then? Well, I read the records of the United Nations where Canada is forever speaking on resolutions but lacking resolution and displaying no definiteness. I say to my hon. friend that last Saturday was an example when the vote took place in the United Nations, a repetitious vote, on the motion to order Britain and France out of the Middle East. I read with pride in the press that my hon. friend had made such a strong and bitter castigation of the U.S.S.R. that Shepilov shook, that the members of the assembly were silent, and finally they applauded. Magnificent! But then Canada abstained. Speaking on resolutions, lacking resolution!

What about the last three weeks? Are we going to place Britain and France in the same position as the U.S.S.R. with its attitudes, its actions, its cruelty, its tyranny in Hungary in the last three weeks? According to information there has been a reshuffling of Soviet forces in western Poland and a concentration of Russian troops in East Germany on the Oder river and along the Austrian border. The strait-jacket of tyranny is to be restored to the puppet states under the control of the U.S.S.R.

I am not here to castigate but I say to the Prime Minister that his words of the