

The Address—Mr. Knowles

be stronger and not weaker because the truth has been spoken by representatives of this country.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if our friends to the right want to strengthen the commonwealth of nations, as they avow to be their purpose, they should stand behind the attempts made by the representatives of Canada to speak with moral authority on an occasion such as that which we are experiencing at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree that the situation in the Middle East is so complex we cannot begin to analyse it or assess blame amongst those to whom blame might be attached. There is no doubt but that some blame is due to all parties to the present situation. Some blame certainly is due to the governments of the United Kingdom and France. Some blame must be attached to the state of Israel. Some real blame must be attached to the United States for its policies in the Middle East over a long period of time. Considerable blame must be attached to Egypt and to what Nasser has done, and blame must be attached also to what the government in Canada has done, and I would even attach some blame to some of the parties in this house.

An hon. Member: What about Russia?

Mr. Knowles: May I remind my friends to the right that on February 1, after we had presented to the house a subamendment which asked that before arms were shipped to the Middle East the government should make sure peace in that area would be guaranteed either by the United Nations or by the three parties signatory to the tripartite agreement, my friends in the Progressive Conservative party, as well as those in all parties but ours, voted against it.

Mr. Fulton: What else did you have attached to it?

Mr. Knowles: I have given you the whole of the subamendment we presented to the house. The only other matter before the house at the time was the amendment moved by my friends of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. Fulton: You wanted to strike out our amendment.

An hon. Member: Be quiet.

Mr. Knowles: No; we added ours to yours. Even after one has assessed the present situation in the Middle East, even after one has given his particular interpretation as to who is to blame, let it be crystal clear that the whole of that situation, bad as it is, is not

a patch on the horror and the tyranny that is being perpetrated on the people of Hungary by the U.S.S.R.

Nevertheless, what the United Nations was confronted with when it met in New York at the end of October and early in November was the fact of open hostilities in the Suez area and in the Sinai desert, and what the United Nations had to cope with was that situation; and it was in that context that the Canadian decision was taken that the time had come to establish the rule of law in international affairs.

I confess to some amazement at my friends to the right in the Progressive Conservative party in their inability to follow those of us who feel the rule of law is something that should be maintained at all costs. In this House of Commons earlier in this year 1956 our friends in the Progressive Conservative party and we in this party felt that the rule of law was being abrogated in this house. We felt that a certain gentleman across the way was so anxious to get through a certain policy he believed to be right that nothing else mattered. The Progressive Conservatives who joined with us then in saying that it was not only important what you do but that the way in which you do it also matters, now stand up and defend the policies of another government on the ground that even though they had to by-pass the United Nations at the time the thing they were trying to do was all right in itself. They now argue that the end justifies the means. That is a different tune from the one they sang here in May and June of this year, when in their view and in ours the rule of law was being abrogated in this house.

My same friends to the right have been vocal with those of us in this group and in the group to the left and the group across the way down through the years in taking the position, particularly since the end of world war II, that the only hope of world peace lay in the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

I have been interested in reading some of the speeches that have been made by my friends to the right and in particular I have been interested in reading some of the speeches made by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and I find that on two or three occasions he has referred to the dream of Grotius. I confess I had forgotten who Grotius was and I had to look him up. It is a very interesting reference which the hon. member has made. He has expressed in referring to the dream of Grotius the view of all hon. members in the house that the only hope of world peace is in collective