

*Supply—External Affairs*

to the general situation in the Middle East, and I went on:

What has Canada done since then? Well, I read the records of the United Nations where Canada is forever speaking on resolutions but lacking resolution and displaying no definiteness.

That is true today, Mr. Chairman. There is an attitude of empirical uncertainty, an aura of fear of responsibility in facing issues. I went on to say:

I say to my hon. friend that last Saturday was an example when the vote took place in the United Nations, a repetitious vote, on the motion to order Britain and France out of the Middle East. I read with pride in the press that my hon. friend—

That was the present Prime Minister.

—had made such a strong and bitter castigation of the U.S.S.R. that Shepilov shook, that the members of the assembly were silent, and finally they applauded. Magnificent! But then Canada abstained. Speaking on resolutions, lacking resolution!

That has been so throughout. On the question of Israel and the Arab states Canada's attitude has been uncertain. It has been trying diplomatically to be in agreement with both sides. In the last couple of weeks Canada, because of the uncertainty inherent in some of the words expressed by the Prime Minister and Secretary of State for External Affairs, has lost any claim to being able to bring together the warring elements in the Middle East. The Arabs no longer trust us. The Israelis wonder about us. In the current issue of the *Canadian Jewish News* the following words appear under the heading: "No, Mr. Pearson: This Time Peace, No Armistice":

No, Mr. Pearson, this time there will be no armistice. There will be peace or else. We, the Jews of this generation who have trusted the world while our nearest of kin were burned alive with their womenfolk and offspring in the Auschwitzes and Maidaneks, will not exchange security neither for a Nasserite scrap of paper nor for new "assurances" from the debating club at East River.

That is the beginning of the article. It goes on in the same spirit. Because of uncertainty about where this government stands, this nation finds itself in the position of having lost face in the last two or three weeks. The resort is to ancient quotations about meetings of past years. Sir, historical analogies and quotations cannot take the place of needed international action in 1967.

So far as the city of Jerusalem is concerned I think consideration must be given to Israel retaining the entire city.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** If it cannot be done directly now, then old Jerusalem which is confined within the territorial limits of Jordan should be internationalized.

I agree with the Prime Minister with regard to the gulf of Aqaba. It must be immunized against interference by the Arabs or any other nation. Regardless of arguments advanced by the Arab nations the gulf of Aqaba is an international body of water. If the U.A.R. had the right, as it thinks it has the right, to close the gulf to freedom of navigation it would mean that Denmark or Sweden could close the Baltic or that other Baltic nations could close the Baltic, or that the U.S.S.R. could be closed out of the Mediterranean. There can be no equivocation on this question whatsoever. Sir, I hoped for more assured declarations by the government of this country than we have had today.

Next, can anyone believe that Canada, in view of the stand that it has taken in the last couple of weeks, will find ready acceptance in contributing troops to enforce international rights on the gulf of Aqaba or the boundary determinations that must be made? We were put out, driven out by Nasser. Unless there is a vast change of mind and opinion by the Arab states there is no possibility of Canada being given the right to contribute any forces to an international force.

What of the international force? I was in San Francisco in April and May of 1945 and I believed that we had arrived at an agreement whereby mankind would set up an effective international force. That has been the dream of international lawyers since Grotius and Pufendorf. Only through the instrumentality of an international force strong enough to enforce the edicts of the United Nations can peace be attained.

There is no possibility of that international force being set up now. The great powers are against it. It is far beyond the realm of probability that any force could be set up which would be effective in maintaining peace. Much is said about the UNEF force and that it maintained the peace in the Middle East. It maintained nothing of the kind. It never maintained the peace at any time. It was simply an international body with a supervisory capacity but without the ability to direct, order, or enforce. Indeed, both leaders of that international force told me on more than one occasion that the UNEF force was never expected to be or ever was a force to compel law, international or otherwise.