

*External Affairs*

money should be provided at all by the government of Canada for the purposes the secretary general had in mind.

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the two points which the Leader of the Opposition laid down as the objectives, as he said, of relentless pursuit, I say the Secretary of State for External Affairs, by his outstanding efforts during the past few months at the United Nations, has been directing himself and likewise the policy of the government toward these very purposes.

There is one point I think deserves mention at this time, because the Leader of the Opposition spent some time in dealing with it. I think the question put to the Prime Minister on March 7 by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre put the matter in proper perspective. The question was as follows:

Mr. Knowles: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. Does the Prime Minister think the situation in the Suez has reached a point where even such a possibility should be suggested by one such as the Prime Minister?

There are several implications in that question, one of which is that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre was expressing what everyone in this house knows, and what everybody in this country believes, namely that the Prime Minister of Canada is not the kind of man who was anxious to see force used in the suggested manner as implied by the Leader of the Opposition in his speech this morning.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Not prescribed.

**Mr. Martin:** This is what the Prime Minister said in reply:

I am not suggesting anything. I thought I was pointing out to the house that that was an alternative that could not be considered. Therefore when the words "is the whole thing subject to the whim of Mr. Nasser?" are used, there is no other way of obtaining the acquiescence of the governments concerned that can be resorted to unless fighting is to flare up again in that region.

This indicates clearly what the Prime Minister had in mind, a plea for negotiation, not a plea for the use of force.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** Twenty-four hours later.

**Mr. Martin:** One thing I would like to say as a member of this house is that I was a little surprised this morning when the Leader of the Opposition began his speech. It was a good debating speech. He referred to the fact that the Secretary of State for External Affairs had quoted from various publications in the United Kingdom and elsewhere indicating the high regard in which current Canadian foreign policy was held by those who wrote those articles or who expressed those views.

[Mr. Martin.]

I can well understand why the Leader of the Opposition, having in mind his particular assignment, should do all that he could to find weaknesses in government policy, and to oppose them with all the vigor at his disposal. But in the matter of foreign policy, where the reputation of the country is at stake, where the good name of Canada is involved, and where the prestige of the nation is the subject of concern and attention, I should think the Leader of the Opposition would be almost the first man to rise in his place and join with the Secretary of State for External Affairs in applauding the tributes paid to the government—to the people of Canada.

**Mr. Diefenbaker:** The government of Canada.

**Mr. Martin:** Yes, to the government—

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

**Mr. Martin:**—and to the people of Canada and, if I may say, in particular to my colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

One would gather from what the Leader of the Opposition said this morning that Canada had developed a policy which had greatly contributed to the complications of the situation, when the fact is that from the 2nd day of November until recent days in the general assembly there has been no country—and I am sure on reflection my hon. friend will agree with me—which has been in such great demand in the role of mediator, in the role of collaborator with the officers of the United Nations, in association with other powers who are anxious to see peace restored in this troubled area, such as the United States and the United Kingdom.

I find it difficult to understand what my hon. friend can gain by deprecating the statements that had been made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs as to the role Canada has played at the United Nations in recent months. Why has Canada received these tributes? Why have our actions been applauded? It is because right from the first days when this problem initially arose we did apply a policy—the hon. gentleman may say a mistaken policy—which we honestly believed to be in the interests of all concerned and in the maintenance of peace.

That is why that policy was pursued, and that is the reason most nations in the United Nations look upon our efforts as intended—as the hon. member for Peace River said a few moments ago—for no other purpose than to ease international tension. It is