

Foreign Policy

than the Secretary of State for External Affairs has to agree with Washington on every issue—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And we do not.

Mr. Churchill: Or with the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Lewis: —or with the President of the Privy Council. So I do not think we can be faulted in this respect. I end, Mr. Speaker, by asking the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Prime Minister and the government to consider seriously that the time has come for Canada to speak out publicly on all these issues in a much more forthright way in the hope that it will help to solidify the opinions of many nations in the world and that it will help to mobilize world opinion in the direction of peace.

Mr. Howard Johnston (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by referring briefly to the amendment and the subamendment that have been moved this afternoon, particularly that part which says that the government has failed to state the policies of our country with clarity, without uncertainty, and unequivocally, with regard to Asia. It would seem to me that the government has, as the minister has stated again this afternoon, repeatedly declared its position in this respect. The only problem is that it would seem that we have in Canada today the first psychedelic government in our history. Important members of it seem to have the ability every so often to detach themselves from the rest of the government and its policies and to look back, as it were, to the body they have left temporarily and from that high position, which is usually characterized as a high moral position, to criticize the action or lack of action of the government. Ordinarily the trip that such a member had taken would result in the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) the next day ejecting him completely from the government but the situation here is different and these people are able to return to the government. It would seem that one of the important differences between defection in communist countries and in Canada is that in a communist country when someone important defects they head to the United States but in Canada when someone important defects they go into the cabinet.

As to the topic that is being debated this afternoon, namely, external affairs, it seems to me that we are in a way reaping some of

[Mr. Lewis.]

the price of the settlement of the 1956 Suez crisis in what has now happened in the Middle East. We can contrast the stand that was taken at that time by the Canadian government, when it dared to criticize Great Britain and France in a most forthright manner, with the very delicate, kid glove approach that was announced by the minister in his statement today when it comes to dealing with the United Arab Republic and its relations with the state of Israel, a state that is a creation of the United Nations, to which organization we belong, and to which we gave our assent at the time that nation was created.

There was no delicacy in 1956 in telling Britain that its position was wrong and was completely unacceptable to Canada. There seems to be a great hesitancy to speak out today on the actions of the United Arab Republic particularly and the renewed crisis over Israel. This has not come about within the last few days; it has for a long time been a developing situation. Our government has failed to speak out at any time with any definiteness on the Egyptian intervention in the state of Yemen, Arabia. This has been an important intervention, an armed intervention, a military intervention, and yet there has been a strange silence from Canada in regard to it. I suppose it is to be assumed that because that corner of the Arabian peninsula is so far away, so isolated, so little known to Canadians, so completely out of the minds of the N.D.P. that there has never been a statement from that party on it, the Liberal government never felt it had to counter it and what went on there could be safely ignored by the Canadian government.

There seems to have been no statement made in the United Nations and certainly I have not heard, and I am sure no other member of this house has heard, of the Canadian government through its representation on the International Monetary Fund objecting to the loans from that body to the United Arab Republic to the extent of at least \$108 million, which I am sure have helped it to finance the military intervention in Yemen and now the military build-up on the borders of Israel. There has been a strange silence in this respect as there was a Canadian silence some years ago when the territory of West Irian was handed over to Indonesia. The silence in both these cases comes about as a result of the fact that we in Canada have for a long time operated something of a double standard in external affairs. We have tried manfully over the years to prove that we are the only