

Supply—External Affairs

according to reports just handed to me, considerable fighting going on in certain sections of the area.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I think the Canadian government owes it to this house and to the Canadian people to indicate not only its concern with this problem but also how it has dealt with it from the time the problem first arose. It will be recalled that an indication of a possible withdrawal of the United Nations emergency force caused me to go to New York and to confer with the secretary general. I do not want to go over ground already covered. I will simply state again that I believe it was regrettable that the force was withdrawn. I have not questioned the sovereignty of the host country that asked for its withdrawal, but I am firmly of the view that there was no clear legal basis for the way in which it was withdrawn. In any event one should take every step to preserve an institution which for ten and a half years has been such a responsible and constructive factor in keeping the peace in the Middle East.

I understand now, as I understood when I talked with him, the problems of the Secretary General, particularly when it had been intimated by India and Yugoslavia that for reasons best known to them they did not propose to continue in the force once one of the host countries had asked that it be withdrawn. I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman that this was a humiliation for Canada. I do not agree with the newspaper which had a big headline reading "Canada Humiliated". The humiliation is not on our side. We have nothing to be humiliated about. For ten and a half years, along with the other countries in that force, we used our defence forces for the purpose of keeping the peace, and I was surprised when my right hon. friend said that the force had not kept the peace in the Middle East. That is not in accordance with the facts. There is no doubt, as was attested by the public declarations of the governments of Israel and the U.A.R. a year and a half ago when there were suggestions for a reduction of the force, that this would mean removing a factor of stability in the area.

When I went to the United Nations that Saturday morning I took the occasion to discuss also the desirability of giving consideration at once to a successor to the United Nations emergency force, if this were acceptable to the host countries, of course, and if it

[Mr. Martin (Essex East).]

were possible to get additional powers accorded to it by the security council. I was referring of course to the United Nations truce supervisory organization already in existence and working with the four mixed armistice commissions already established by the security council. It has a capacity to add to its numbers as it has done from time to time. It is now a force of about 120. At one time it had 700 men. True, it would have to acquire further powers from the security council for additional relocation.

I think it may be said that the Canadian suggestion about the possibility of a use of UNTSO at the appropriate time was a useful one, as has been recognized by the Secretary General of the United Nations. Later in my speech I propose to deal with the suggestions of the right hon. gentleman, which I do not believe were the kind of suggestions that one would have expected in a situation like this in relation to one of the notable foreign policy contributions of our country. We do not seek to participate in United Nations peace keeping operations unless we are wanted. I will deal with that later as I do not want to anticipate my argument. However, I cannot understand for the life of me why there should have been a suggestion in this house that Canada, because she was forcefully removed out of Egypt, would no longer be acceptable in any peace keeping operation in that area of the world or in any other.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not say "any other". I said "in that area".

Mr. Martin (Essex East): We are not seeking additional responsibilities in this area. Canada need not be ashamed of her record in peace keeping all over the world.

On that recent occasion in New York I talked with the ambassadors of Israel, the United Arab Republic, Great Britain, the United States, Syria and France, with the idea of trying to do what my right hon. friend had said in the house only two days before we should do, to see to it that the United Nations was put to work. Imagine the security council not being in session in this situation. It was as the result of action taken by Canada and Denmark that the first meeting of the security council was held in this matter. So let no one say we have not been vigilant and tireless in our efforts in this matter both in the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa and through our ambassadors in Lebanon, Israel and the United Arab Republic. Few countries have a finer foreign service than our country and I want to pay