

Supply—External Affairs

I notice that the Secretary of State for External Affairs has becoming very touchy this evening, almost as touchy as the Minister of National Defence was this afternoon. I thought that the defence minister would go sailing through the roof of the chamber when he became stirred up by the Leader of the Opposition on this subject.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I like my hon. friend too much to get stirred up.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister usually sits in his place, with his words sort of giving the impression of a taste of honey. He has that bland look on his face. But he got a little exercised this evening.

Despite the minister's denials and protestations, even he will agree that one of the major goals of Canadian defence policy, which of course is only an arm of Canadian policy, is for a peace keeping force to be used not only with the United Nations but perhaps for NATO or for places like Viet Nam. In the recent meeting of the external affairs committee the minister said that if Canadian forces were wanted in Viet Nam they would be available for peace keeping operations. Having said that, surely he cannot deny what the major goals of unification are. The major effort of Canada, through the United Nations last fall, was to develop guide lines for peace keeping. Though the resolution was excellent—I liked its terms—Canada got a very severe rebuff at the United Nations.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That is not accurate; my hon. friend knows that.

Mr. Nesbitt: What is that? I did not hear the minister.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): The matter is still before the United Nations. It is being discussed.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister knows better than I do that the matter was put on ice by referring it to that committee. It will stay there for a long time. Only because Canada is well regarded at the United Nations was it dealt with as kindly as it was. The effect is that the resolution did not pass. There were many abstentions, and it was a very minor resolution. One of the reasons for the resolution's failure is that the United Nations had difficulties with the Soviet union and France over the payments for peace keeping operations. Also there is a general lack of will- ingness at the United Nations to bring the matter up at the present time because of what

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

happened a couple of years ago when they had to cancel the session because of the difficulties between the Soviet union and the United States. It was not an appropriate time to bring the matter up.

I think the idea is good; I am in favour of it. I like the terms of the resolution, but I think the timing was bad. Because the United Nations at that time was not too interested in peace keeping, and for a number of reasons it was not a good time to bring the resolution forward. Despite what the minister said a few minutes ago I thought that Canada was put in a humiliating position by having her troops kicked out of Egypt by Colonel Nasser. This is the fault entirely of the government, which is always talking about quiet diplomacy.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Do I understand my hon. friend to say that it was the fault of the government that our troops were asked by Colonel Nasser to leave?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes, and I will tell the minister why.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Why? That is most illuminating.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister may not agree, but I shall tell him why that is—

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I am overwhelmed by that suggestion.

Mr. Nesbitt: The minister can get as sarcastic as he likes, but facts are facts. The present government has always talked about quiet diplomacy in Viet Nam and elsewhere. Probably it was a good idea. If there had been a little more quiet diplomacy a couple of weeks ago with respect to the Middle East there would not have been so much trouble. First of all you have the Prime Minister making announcements that he and President Johnson had agreed on what was to be done, and that they had things cooked up; and then President Johnson denied that. The Secretary of State for External Affairs made remarks one day to the effect that Egypt had given up some of her sovereignty when the United Nations force came in; and he made a statement to a quite opposite effect on another day. This kind of thing annoyed the Arbas.

The government decided to be neutral and provide peace keeping forces in this area, yet I do not think it should be neutral in this matter, for the reasons that were outlined by the right hon. Leader of the Opposition. I do not think we should be neutral toward