

*External Affairs*

Why, I seem to remember that last fall the Prime Minister spoke of Nasser. My hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs visited Nasser but we have not had a report on that visit. When the Prime Minister spoke of Nasser he said there was some divergency of opinion regarding him; some thought he was pretty good and some had a different opinion, and as for himself he had not arrived at any final conclusion.

Sir, what reliance is to be placed on Nasser? Today he and his forces have already entered Gaza. They have already taken over part of the civil administration. What will be the result?

The Prime Minister alluded to force on one occasion to which I have already made reference when he spoke in this house. What will happen if Nasser orders the United Nations emergency force out of Egypt? That is the question that is actuating the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere. Wait and see? Are we to wait and see? That is insufficient. Canadians representing as they do one-fifth of the entire force have a right to know exactly what is to be done. What course is to be followed? Is it to be one of vacillation? Has the experience of the past not been that uncertainty in so far as dictators are concerned has always been an invitation to disaster for the forces of free men?

What is Nasser going to do? The March 15 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* states that the situation is very serious and sets out in detail what is actually happening: that communism has moved in to a degree that few realize; that communist control in the Middle East today is beyond anything that existed a year ago; that the Egyptians today realize there is a pay-off in defiance and they are not going to back down on any of the big issues; that the men around Nasser believe that they hold all the cards and plenty of them and are aware that they have nothing to lose by playing them.

On page 85 of the current issue of the magazine to which I have referred the article also points out:

Egyptian officials will tell you that Egypt, not the United Nations emergency force, should be in charge in the Gaza strip—and that this should start happening in short order. They tell you that the gulf of Aqaba and the Suez canal are territorial waters of Egypt, and then ask: How can you let ships of a nation that is at war with you go through your territory?

They regard the situation as beneficial to themselves and regard the future as holding a continuance of the advances they have made in recent days. They believe that, whatever stand they take, triumph will come to them. That is the attitude which they are taking. Indeed the article states that the Egyptians are confident. Reports that are generally

authentic state that Russian influence is much more in evidence than it was a few months ago, that the news from Moscow is that whatever the Egyptians do they will have the U.S.S.R. behind them, and that Soviet Russia has entered into Egypt's way of life.

Indeed that summation indicates that what has happened is that communism has extended the boundaries of its iron curtain and now comprises a considerable portion of north eastern Africa and the Middle East.

The premier of France warned this house and this country regarding this matter. My hon. friend spoke in the most glowing terms of the words of the premier of France regarding this government. I wonder whether the secretary of state brought to his attention the superman speech? I wonder whether the premier of France would have appreciated the welcome he received here when he and the British leaders were joined together last fall as those supermen whose days of power are about over. That speech and that reference to supermen did not receive much commendation in this country. Whatever the view of the people as a whole may be, to refer to them in those disparaging terms, to say that the era of the supermen in Europe was over, was a revelation of the attitude of mind on the part of this government to an extent that few could have realized. There is no question of misinterpretation. There is no need of an interpreter or a reviser such as the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Those words stand out and the interpretation given to them by the *Chicago Tribune* was as follows:

Those words are an encouraging growth of isolationist spirit in unexpected quarters. An American official could not have put the case better.

Nobody could have put it better, nobody could have put it clearer. That statement, regardless of what the merits may have been regarding occurrences in the Middle East, was one that did create disunity in parts of this commonwealth. Ever since we have witnessed a parade on the government side of the house of hon. members speaking in such feeling terms of the commonwealth as were never before witnessed. As far as we are concerned, we believe in a Canadian policy but we do not believe that that Canadian policy should consist of casting disparaging remarks at the leaders of France and Great Britain and placing them in the same category as Hitler, Mussolini, Bulganin and Khrushchev. On November 27 the secretary of state deprecated chattering instead of thinking. I redirect those words to him and to those with whom he is associated.

The situation is such that we have a right to information. The information furnished today does not cover the questions which