

Supply—External Affairs

nations to war were dealt with at considerable length by Sir Anthony Eden, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, in his address on foreign affairs one week ago today. The minister has stated that the mutual deterrent of war has resulted from the certainty of mutual destruction. To put it another way, the fear of thermonuclear war has made peace popular even with the aggressors of the U.S.S.R. The minister did add a qualification, I think, when he stated that protection against the effects of hydrogen war might, in the not too distant future, dilute the deterrent effect of fear today. I had thought, however, that the minister should have dealt at somewhat greater length with the situation prevailing today in the Middle East.

First, with regard to Israel, I had hoped that by now the government would have been in a position to advise the house and the country that the request of Israel for export permits for sabre aircraft would have been granted. I feel that, having regard to recent events, there can be no justification for further delay in this regard. For a long period of time the dictator of Egypt was believed to have non-aggressive designs. His speeches of the last few days, and in particular the one which he delivered when announcing the stand his government intended to take to nationalize the Suez canal, had all the exuberance, all the flamboyance and all the threats that were at one time common to Mussolini. In his recent address Nasser had led the free world to believe that he has taken to himself the garb of a dictator, as did Hitler and Mussolini, and he has indicated that he dreams of the day when his nation will control northern Africa from the Atlantic to Iraq and Iran.

Certainly the U.S.S.R. has been giving every assistance to Nasser to feed his appetite for aggression. Today Egypt has 150 MIGs and 45 bombers. Israel does not ask for assistance in aggressive warfare in the form of bombers and the like; what she is asking for is a few fighters to enable her to raise her defences should Nasser change from mere truculence in words to actual aggression.

Then with regard to the Suez canal, the arbitrary action on his part, challenging as it does international law, freedom under law among nations, breaking as it does the pledged word, may I say that I feel that Canada as the leading member of the British commonwealth at this time should give public encouragement to the stand taken by Great Britain, France and the United States. We should indicate that the reasonable attitude of mind and the calm consideration

which these nations are giving warrants the moral support of Canada in these dark hours.

I would have thought that the minister would have enlarged somewhat upon our relationships within the British commonwealth and would have given more information than we have received as yet from the Prime Minister with regard to the decisions or at least an indication of the decisions reached at that conference, representative as it was of a large proportion of the world's population and a major assurance for the preservation of world peace.

As far as the Suez canal is concerned, if the canal is closed the danger to Britain's lifeline and to freedom's defence is fearful to contemplate. The closing of the Suez canal would bottle up freedom's defence in the Mediterranean. It would make almost impossible the maintenance of British trade which is being challenged today as the result of the economic offensive of the U.S.S.R. At the moment Nasser claims he has no such intention in mind, but it is only a few months ago that he with sweet words and in symphony with the U.S.S.R. spoke so warmly of his intentions with regard to Britain and the other free nations. His word has been proved to be false and valueless.

The minister was kind enough to let me have some figures indicating the importance of the Suez canal. Apparently the figures for 1953 are the last that are available but they indicate the following tonnages passing through the canal:

	Shipping Tonnage
United Kingdom	31,262,257
Norway	13,926,235
United States	4,123,498
France	8,425,534
Italy	4,991,152
The Netherlands	4,230,149
Sweden	3,169,113

Those figures indicate the need of maintaining and preserving the Suez canal for our survival. The oil from the east, which represents some 75 per cent of British imports, comes through the Suez. United States imports of oil and byproducts are also very large. The economic effects that would follow are indicated by the fact that if the United States had to change the direction of its ships around the cape it would add \$46,000 to the cost of every tanker. That indicates the importance of the Suez, not only as a lifeline of freedom's defence but because of what it means to British trade now fighting a life and death struggle for survival against the U.S.S.R. in its new state-directed economic offensive. I ask even now that this government give to the world approval and support of what is being done