

Supply—External Affairs

Though we have made great contributions to the United Nations' force, because of our attitude in the last few weeks—I reiterate this—we have lost international status. No longer are we regarded as a nation without a national axe to grind and impartially unbiased toward one side or another while standing on principle. It will take a long time for Canada to have restored to it the respect and regard of the African and Asian races. As I see it, unless there is a great change on the part of those nations, it will not be possible for Canada to make any considerable contribution to peace keeping.

Where are we? Our army, navy and air force are in a state of uncertain unification. Traditions are gone. The purpose has been the assurance of an international force. U Thant knew that when he spoke in Montreal the other day and said that Canada's unification plan was designed to provide additional assistance primarily in peace keeping. That was something we could not get confirmed in parliament. The Secretary General knew exactly the purpose which we suspected was in fact the reason for unification.

● (4:40 p.m.)

Internationally there can be no question of the acceptance of anything less than freedom of access by all nations to the gulf of Aqaba. Second, with regard to the problem of refugees I have heard various proposals. The one given by the Prime Minister today I think is one that is in accordance with the facts.

I visited those camps 10 or 11 years ago. I visited them again four years ago. The horror of conditions in those refugee camps is a blot on civilization. I talked to some of the refugees. There was no desire to improve their condition. They were suffering as martyrs for a cause. They were expecting that it would not be too long before once more Israel would be wiped off the face of the earth and they would return in triumph to that country.

This problem has got to be solved. It cannot be solved by force. Mass evacuation, such as the Acadian removals two centuries ago, will not do today. How can the problem be solved? Something must transpire that will bring home to those people, and to the Arab nations as a whole, the recognition that there is no hope of these people returning to their former homes.

As to the mobilization of a peace force, I have already said that I can see no general acceptance by these nations of forces comprised in large measure of Canadians. I think

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

possibly there might be acceptance of Canadian representation on inspection organizations but not in armed forces. As I listened to the Prime Minister I concluded that the government of Canada has the idea that it will be accepted and that Canadian forces will be sent to the Middle East. I say that in 1926 the late Right Hon. Arthur Meighen enunciated the principle that troops should not be sent abroad from Canada for war purposes, which is the danger they will face if they are in any international force today, unless approval is secured in advance from the parliament of Canada. If there is any decision to send troops as a peace keeping force or as part of a peace keeping force, that means that the force must be prepared to undertake actual war in the event that it becomes necessary so to do. I contend therefore that any force of that type to be sent abroad shall not be sent unless there is prior approval of the parliament of Canada.

A moment ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs nodded his head in a way to indicate that my reference to U Thant was not well based. So that the record will be clear let me read from a Southam News Service report of June 3:

—Mr. Thant praised Canada's revolutionary bid to re-organize its armed forces "with the peace keeping function primarily in mind."

That is what we said. The Minister of National Defence denied it. That is what General Allard has said since the debate ended. Now we know it. Internationally we receive the fullest information. That was denied us in the House of Commons.

Mr. Hellyer: You should read General Allard's speech and then you would have some idea about what he actually said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What's that?

Mr. Hellyer: I said you should do General Allard the courtesy of reading his speech because what he said is quite contrary to what was reported in the press and repeated by you.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just sit down unless you are asking questions.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Hellyer: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, what was reported of the general's speech was not in the context of what he had actually said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, that is not—