

*The Address—Mr. Brooks*

What happened when Great Britain left? A vacuum was created and there was no nation which could control not only the Arab nations but any other nation which tried to exploit the area. The fact that she moved out created a danger to all the nations in the Arab world. She was asked to move out, and she was guaranteed that when she did there would be some force in the area to take over and control the situation.

What has been United States policy? As we know, today the United States is the leading nation of the western world. We all have great respect and regard for the United States, because they are our neighbours, they are the same people as we are. But we know also that the United States has had little experience as a leading nation; she lacks knowledge and understanding. After the British were moved out of this area the policy of the United States was to arm the Arabs. We were told that by arming the Arabs they would be able to protect not only their own interests but the interests of all other nations in that section.

What has been the result? In 1954 a delegation consisting of 20 men from every walk of life in the United States visited Arabia, Egypt and all the Middle Eastern countries to see what was going on, and when they came back they made a report to President Eisenhower. They said it had been a great mistake for the United States and other nations to ask Great Britain to leave, because when she had left the only stabilizing influence in that area had gone with her. They went on to say that it was a great mistake for the United States to think that by arming the Arab nations they could take the place of the forces which had been there before. I have here a book which I am sure most hon. members have read and which is entitled "Security and the Middle East". This book contains the recommendations made to President Eisenhower, among which were the following:

There are no stable governments in the Arab world. Most important, no Arab population can be counted on to support the west . . . arms are certain to be used either to put down internal rebellion or to attack Israel.

How true that has turned out to be. As I said a few moments ago, the only unity to be found among the Arab nations was their hatred of Israel, the only nation which the western world could count upon as its friend. That has been the policy of the United States up to the present time. I should like to read, if I may, an article which appeared recently in the *New York Times*. Dealing with the policy of the United States it said:

Our policy in the Middle East for some years has been weak, tentative, groping. From the moment Nasser made his arms deal with the Soviet union

in September, 1955, it should have been clear that he was a great danger to the democratic west.

The situation has been especially clear for a few weeks. It is not being cynical to say that moral principles and the laudable desire to "let the United Nations do it" have clouded the issues. The realities of power politics were what everyone should have kept his eyes on. Russia is not being moral. Russia does not give a hoot about the United Nations.

There could have been no truer statement than that.

They saw their opening in the Middle East and they went for it. If they succeed in controlling the Persian gulf oil fields and the Suez canal—even just by denying them to us—the Soviet union is going to be a greater world power than the United States. This is simple geography, economics and, above all, power politics. Nothing succeeds like success in this game. If we cannot protect the Middle East from the Russian communists, the free world will lose much of Africa and Asia. We should have no illusions on this score.

That is taken from the *New York Times*, one of the four great newspapers in the world. The article concludes:

The Russians respect strength. So do the Egyptians. So do the Arabs. At least as far as the Russians and President Nasser are concerned, we can safely say they respect nothing else. We have this strength. Let us be prepared to use it and make the Russians understand that we are so prepared. That will almost surely stop the "volunteers" for Egypt. That is the way to keep the peace if—as we all must suppose—the Russians really want peace.

That has been the policy of the United States. That is the criticism which their own people make of that policy. What has been the Russian policy? The Russians have never contributed anything to the advance of the Arab nations. They have until recently stood on the outside. What have they been doing in recent years? They have been supplying them with arms. Israel captured \$50 million worth Russian arms in the recent fighting. Russia has also sent to Egypt and other Arab nations hundreds of mechanics and technicians to instruct in the use of those arms. With a rate of illiteracy as high as 80 or 90 per cent the Arab people were not able to operate the tanks and other technical weapons which must be used in a war today, and Russia has been supplying these people. Russia for some time has been stirring up trouble among the Arab nations in the Middle East. Russia is backing Syria today as she backed Egypt. That is the condition which France and Great Britain found in those countries a few weeks ago.

I have tried to point out the conditions which existed in the Middle East after Great Britain was forced out some two or three years ago. At that time Great Britain maintained a force of 80,000 men to protect the Suez canal. As I say, the