

*External Affairs*

have been asked. The answers given were selective answers. We want to know what is the truth of the situation. There was no mention of the fact that today Egyptian civil administrators are entering Gaza to enforce President Nasser's demands for the immediate cessation of United Nations rule over that controversial strip. There was no information regarding the appearance of the government meaning an end to the United Nations' attempt to set up its own civil administration. Then there was no answer to the despatch, which has been reinforced by repetition in several news agency reports, to the effect that General Burns was confused by the vague directive from United Nations headquarters which assumed that he could administer the strip without Egypt during the first part of the take-over from the Israelis.

How long is General Burns to stay there? What plans have been made? Why was this information concealed from us? I ask further if it is true that President Nasser's reassertion of Egypt's rights in Gaza obliged the United Nations to capitulate, as is stated in this morning's *New York Times*? If so, what is this debate about?

If once more Mr. Nasser is able to say that which is in accordance with his own desires and which represents a contemptuous disregard of United Nations wishes, why do we prate of peace having been achieved? Why do we say that what has happened has prevented a world conflict? If this be true, all that has taken place in the last few months is that Nasser has retreated from power to power and today is in a position where he can challenge the integrity of Israel and achieve the culmination of the threats he has made in the last few days.

Only recently he stated, as reported by a news agency, that his aim is still to destroy Israel. What is to stop him when the United Nations force removes itself? Who will stand against him? Those are questions which have to be answered. Those are questions that affect the lives of Canadians who are over there. Their people at home have the right to know the degree to which they will be in jeopardy as a result of the action being taken.

This is no longer a subjective matter. One-fifth of the force is Canadian. A further force has arrived over there. One minister has said that they do not know where they are going but they are on their way, and another has said that they are there as a result of a plan. Are they in danger? What is the situation there? What does the minister consider will be the course taken in the event that tomorrow Nasser says "Get out." What then?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

My hon. friend laughs but these are questions to which we have a right to have answers. Indeed the collective wisdom of this cabinet as evidenced by the answers that have been given in the last few days indicates that there is no direction, that there is confusion as between ministers, and that except for a generally pious statement as to the hope for peace none of the ministers has any idea of the situation in the Middle East.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs made a lengthy speech clothed in melodious language—for a phrase-maker he is—but scan that speech and find, if you can, the answer to the matter that brought about this debate, namely, at what point must the United Nations force get out. Must it get out when directed to do so by the dictator? And if it does not go out when directed by him, then what are the plans for the future? It was interesting to hear how delightfully vague the minister was in that regard. He said that Mr. Hammarskjöld is going abroad tomorrow, and is going to visit the Middle East, and that we should not in advance prejudice the probability of his mission being successful.

Would that prejudice it? Must it all be done in silence? Is not the fact that so many deals were apparently made outside the United Nations between nations making one promise to Israel and another to Egypt—is not that fact one which more than anything else has brought about the uncertainty and the dire peril to peace which now exists?

This morning I mentioned force at the Suez, and I referred to an editorial in the *Montreal Star*. I am not going to quote the editorial which deals with the vicissitudes of the answers we have received, but it ends this way:

With these statements, not all of which can be easily reconciled, we must be for the moment content. If things go smoothly in the Middle East, if the canal is reopened on terms satisfactory to all, and if stability is restored to the area as a whole—two very big "ifs"—the Canadian position will not be important enough to worry about.

I emphasize those words.

But if all does not go smoothly, then further government statements will have to be made.

Today things are not going smoothly. Today, the forces of this dictator—the civil administration force if you will—and all of us know what civil administration forces are—are marching in. All is not going smoothly. And yet all we received today was a march of words to official confusion.

Sir, what about the Suez? That was left as delightfully vague as everything else. On the 13th of October last the secretary general's formula was that the Suez was to be free and open without discrimination; that the matter of fixing tolls and charges should be decided