

*External Affairs*

for that reason that the tributes referred to by the Secretary of State for External Affairs have been paid.

I should have thought that the Leader of the Opposition, having found that he and the Secretary of State for External Affairs were in agreement on the objectives, would have found it possible at least to recognize that Canada was deserving of the tributes which I think have not been overdone, because I happen to know of some of the things that have not yet been published and cannot be published for some time, concerning the work carried on both by the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the past few months.

My hon. friend spoke of the United Nations. No one for a moment can fail to recognize the limitations of the United Nations. When my hon. friend asked where its sovereignty lay in the Gaza strip and what power the UNEF has in relation to Egypt, provoking the reply of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as to the role of the advisory committee and then possibly of the assembly, my hon. friend in those questions was merely indicating what we all know, that the United Nations does not provide every answer to every situation. And because it has obvious limitations the Secretary of State for External Affairs postulated this morning that at the present time notwithstanding all its accomplishments, the United Nations cannot be regarded as a substitute for wise national policy. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs said this morning, in whatever assessment we make of the United Nations we cannot help but recognize that this particular problem of the Middle East, as discussed at the United Nations, is only one aspect of the whole Middle East problem itself.

The hon. member for Peace River said he felt in a matter of this sort we ought to recognize the great potential power of moral force in the world. I am sure we all agree with that. I am sure that back of the resolution which the Secretary of State for External Affairs introduced immediately following the proposal for a cease-fire in November was a recognition of the value of moral force as expressed in the decisions of the United Nations, a decision which by the way was recognized by Great Britain and France although at least 10 resolutions have not moved the Soviet union to recognize the implications of the resolution passed by the United Nations in protest against aggression by the Soviet union in Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, this whole matter has been a complicated one. It is one to which most members of the United Nations have contributed their honest efforts over a period

of months. If solutions have not been arrived at to the satisfaction of every hon. member of this house, and in particular to the Leader of the Opposition, that is not because of any failure on the part of Canada or of its delegates or of the Secretary of State for External Affairs who have sought to bring about by wise negotiations settlements that might lead to satisfactory conclusions.

During the course of the last 10 days or so in this house we have seen a practice develop which I do not believe is in the interests of the development of good foreign policy, which I do not believe in matters of this great importance should be recognized as the traditional manner of debate or of interrogation in the House of Commons. I doubt if in the United Kingdom parliament, to which the Leader of the Opposition directs our attention so frequently, it would have developed into a tradition that questions having to do with relationships with other countries would be projected before the responsible ministers without adequate notice being given, so that full consideration of all the implications of replies could be considered.

My hon. friend has asked me such questions on several occasions during the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and when I said to him I thought these were matters I would like to look at again he has rather given the impression that a reply should have been made at once. When delicate negotiations are under way, such as those in which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has participated in the last few months, I am sure no one recognizes better than the hon. gentleman how important it is that there be time for the exposition of the results of such negotiations. Negotiations when in the process of being developed or proceeded with are one thing; whether or not there should be a divulging of those negotiations at a particular moment is another. There can be no question that the policy following negotiations must be made known and debated. But to expect that when nations are engaged in matters having to do with the security of all nations and the peace of the world quick answers should be given to quick questions is, if I may say so with the greatest respect, not a responsible way in which an opposition should conduct itself.

I want to make one more point. The suggestion was made by the Leader of the Opposition today, as it has been made several times during this session by interjections which one hears from those who sit behind the Leader of the Opposition, that the policies of the government as prosecuted by the Secretary of State for External Affairs during the past few months were directed