

*External Affairs*

between the governments of the United Kingdom, the United States, France and Norway and these proposals have been passed on to the government of Egypt through the secretary general. They are to the effect that the international bank or the United Nations itself should act as a neutral agent for receiving canal tolls of which 50 per cent should be paid to Egypt immediately and the balance held pending determination of its disbursement under a definitive Suez settlement.

As far as I know, the Egyptian government has not yet given its reply to these proposals but the secretary general is in touch with them on the matter and I have no doubt that is one of the questions he will be discussing on his visit to Cairo.

While Canada of course was not involved in the discussions which led up to the formulation of the proposals now before the government of Egypt, I may say we consider that these proposals are sound and offer a reasonable basis for agreed arrangements under which regular canal traffic might be resumed, and we hope that early agreement on such arrangements will be possible. The importance of that to us all is obvious. The arrangements that were agreed last October at the security council provide for the free and non-discriminatory and secure transit through the Suez canal for ships of all states, and in all states I include the state of Israel. We indicated our support for those arrangements in this house last summer.

From what I have said I think it will be clear that our general policy on these matters at the United Nations and elsewhere has been based on the negotiation of differences. Success in such negotiation is not of course possible if through timidity we give in to unwarranted pressures, but on the other hand it is not assisted by abuse of or hissing at any of the governments or personages involved with whom we have to negotiate. Such abuse is an easy escape for emotions, but it hinders rather than helps the search for acceptable solutions which will avoid the use of force. Indeed it often helps to make force unavoidable by provoking wild and angry reactions. Nor is the use of violent language necessarily an indication of either strength or conviction on the part of the person who uses that language.

To state, as has been done, that this government has said anything or has done anything which would condone the use of force in this or any other matter unless that force is justified as self-defence, individual or collective, under the charter of the United Nations, is a misrepresentation of our position and is denied by every act and every

statement on the record of the United Nations or elsewhere. To attempt to explain some alleged and imaginary change in Canada's attitude toward the use of force in the Middle East by tying that fictitious change to the new Eisenhower doctrine for United States policy in the Middle East is a misrepresentation not only of Canadian policy but of the Eisenhower doctrine itself.

It has been stated over the air by the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) that the United States policy to which I have referred is, and I quote from the text of his broadcast which I have received:

If there should be communist aggression in the Near East, American troops—acting on their own—would intervene.

That is the end of the quotation. That is also a distortion of the meaning of the Eisenhower doctrine and it does no good to co-operation between friends or to the effort to avoid conflict. I am sorry the hon. member is not in the house but I suggest he should read the congressional resolution on the subject, the pertinent paragraph of which is as follows:

The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any such nation or group of such nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: provided that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the constitution of the United States.

That is a paragraph from the resolution. How will the President of the United States determine this necessity? What measures will he put into operation after the determination is made, and how will he do it? Well, the president has already made himself perfectly clear on this point, and I commend his statement to hon. members opposite. Here is his statement to congress when he submitted his resolution:

These measures would have to be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States, including the charter of the United Nations and with any action or recommendations of the United Nations. They would also, if armed attack occurred, be subject to the overriding authority of the United Nations security council in accordance with the charter.

To say that that doctrine, as stated by the president and accepted by congress, would justify unilateral action by the United States in the Middle East under the circumstances suggested by my hon. friend is not a correct interpretation of the United States doctrine. It may have its weaknesses, but that is certainly not one of them. That is one charge, that we have abandoned our earlier position