

External Affairs

by agreement between Egypt and the users. To all this, Nasser says now: "Nothing of the kind—all of that is past. I insist on the tolls. I insist on the right to say to any nation in the world 'You shall not go through this canal for, after all, it goes through the political boundaries of Egypt.'"

Mr. Pearson: It does.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The maritime powers have suggested a plan whereby Egypt would get half the tolls and the other half would be held by the world bank pending settlement. What is the latest information on this? Is the gulf of Aqaba to be left open? Are the Israeli people who relied upon the world conscience to be deceived? Did they not, from individual nations including Canada, receive unofficial promises that while there would be nothing official in the declaration made by the United Nations, if they would withdraw from this area the United Nations forces would enter and they would be protected from the raiding operations of the Egyptians?

After a long delay they withdrew, and today unless there has been an assurance as to future action in the event that the area in Gaza is again chosen as a base for reconnaissance raids on Israel, then all this discussion today regarding the possibility of peace will be as fatuous as many of the resolutions which have been passed in recent months.

As far as the United Nations is concerned, all of us hope that it will achieve the aims and purposes it was intended to achieve. But the last few months, because of uncertainty, have brought about a situation whereby, if the great and the powerful are under the tutelage of the U.S.S.R., they have nothing to fear from any resolution that may be passed. In the Middle East crisis the assembly's action against Britain, France and Israel was effective. It has not been effective against the U.S.S.R. or, indeed, against India.

Nasser has held out for everything, and has achieved almost everything he said he was going to do. To too great an extent he has been treated as the innocent subject of aggression. He has been encouraged by the statements made by some of the statesmen of our freedom-loving nations that he had a right to take the action he did relative to the United Nations forces. I was surprised to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) saying the other day that he had that right in so far as the Gaza area is concerned, if I understood him correctly.

I know of no rule of law, international or otherwise, which allows an aggressor who enters into an armistice agreement, and

who is the *de facto* occupant of an area by reason of that fact, to be elevated to the position of one whose wishes must be accepted and whose desires must be considered before any international action can be taken.

If you accept that doctrine, then indeed you have placed upon the aggressor the seal of approval. Nasser has achieved beyond his fondest expectations, first the humbling of the great powers, the so-called "supermen", and second, suzerainty over the Middle East, with communist assistance or, certainly, with their active approval.

Why, only yesterday there came to hand some of the literature that was found in that area of the desert when Israeli arms were successful there. Everywhere was Hitler's picture—everywhere were copies of "Mein Kampf" as part and parcel of the supplies each officer had; everywhere were copies of Lenin's life in three languages. Nasser has dominated. He has been successful. He has done that which Hitler did not achieve against the league of nations in the one area in which there was a bastion for freedom in the Middle East, and that the state of Israel. The Israelis find themselves in a position today of having accepted the promises unilaterally given by various members of the consulting states; they find themselves in a position today when their hope for existence as well as their integrity as a nation is dependent upon the whim of one who has treated his promises as disdainfully as scraps of paper and who has been successful in dominating the Middle East because of the fact that the free world became divided and, becoming divided, the aggressor has taken the laurels.

I summarize shortly, Mr. Speaker, the stand that we believe should be taken. It is first, that the right of free and innocent passage of the gulf of Aqaba and of the Suez canal must be assured for the ships of all nations. Without that, the world has gone through six months of travail, uncertainty and confusion and nothing will have been achieved. I should like to know whether the secretary general will be able to speak for the heart and conscience of the free world and demand that when he again consults with Nasser tomorrow.

Second, we believe that the United Nations must assume direct responsibility for the Gaza area in order to preserve and maintain that area from actions on the part of Nasser which will contribute to, if not assure, a world war.

I cannot express the extent of my fears when I see that area as I saw it and realize that Nasser today enters Gaza with all the emotion of nationalism that will be aroused.