

nations, Britain and France. It is a great shock to the world that they, of all countries, should have repudiated their obligations to the United Nations. It has created hatred in the hearts of the Arab people. We may not regard them as important, but they are human beings and in some number. Not only that, but it has caused distrust among hundreds of millions of people living in the Far East. A still more unfortunate result is the extreme danger of disunity in the Commonwealth. Mr. Pearson himself said in the House of Commons that there was an imminent danger of a breach between the member countries of the Commonwealth. A further result has been the very unfortunate rift between Britain and the United States.

My friend the Leader of the Opposition has said some rather unkind things about the United States. I have not always been in favour of the actions of that country; in fact, in this chamber I criticized very severely the conduct of Mr. Dulles, its Secretary of State, for certain actions which he took, and by which, he boasted, he brought his country to the brink of war, and then avoided it. I disapprove very strongly of such actions. But let us not forget the unalterable fact that Britain and France cannot afford to get along without the friendship and assistance of the United States.

I come to the last and most serious result of the action taken in the Middle East, namely, that through our actions we are playing directly into the hands of Russia. To offset all these unfavourable results there is no gain that I can see.

I detest war. As a matter of principle, I suppose everyone claims to detest war, but in practice many people do not follow that principle. Surely the last two wars have convinced us that no one wins a war, and that everyone loses.

Some years ago I attended a gathering of prominent men, among whom was a statesman well known to most of you. The Second World War was threatening at the time, and the discussion was with regard to Danzig, the Baltic German port, which was taken from Germany and ceded to Poland under the Treaty of Versailles. During the discussion this wise old statesman said, "Surely we are not going to war on account of Danzig". One of the younger and less wise men there said, "Oh, there are worse things than war". I asked him, "Just tell me one". I received no reply.

During the current debate there have been quotations from some philosophers. Believe it or not, in the past few weeks I have been reading the works of some of the great philosophers. I recently read with much

interest some of the writings of that outstanding Frenchman, Voltaire, and noted with special interest this observation:

War is the greatest of all crimes and yet there is no aggressor who does not colour his crime with the pretence of justice. It is forbidden to kill; therefore murderers are punished unless they kill in large numbers and to the sound of trumpets.

Honourable senators, my criticisms today may not be received favourably by all, but I am sincere in what I say. I rose to speak solely for the purpose of saying that Canada must adhere to its pledges in the United Nations, whose Charter we signed, and which is the one organization today that has any chance of bringing about peace. May we hope that the situation may yet be saved. It is no disgrace to admit a mistake; it may indeed be a noble thing to do.

The erring countries—and I use the word advisedly, because I think these nations were wrong in invading Egypt—have agreed to withdraw. I am glad of that. Let them as quickly as is reasonably possible retire from an untenable position, regain the respect and the good will of the world, and co-operate with the United Nations in pursuing the purposes for which it was established. When that is done, when the hot blood and the passions have cooled, I believe the matter of the Suez, together with the other difficulties of the Middle East, can be adjusted with justice to all.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. J. W. DeB. Farris: Honourable senators, I did not intend to speak in this debate. I arrived here only this afternoon after being up all night on a plane. I have been tied up with other work and so have had no opportunity to prepare notes on the subject under discussion; and it is something on which one should not speak without very thoughtful preparation. However, a remark of my honourable friend from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) has prompted me to go on record with just a word or two. There is a higher law even than that of unvarying loyalty to the United Nations, and that is the law of self-preservation. When nations like England and France take action in the honest belief that events are moving that will threaten their existence, and when Russia and certain other members of the United Nations voice their disapproval with tongue in cheek, I am not prepared to accept the suggestion that Britain and France have repudiated their obligations.

The motion for the Address was agreed to.

The Hon. the Speaker: Ordered that the said address be presented to His Excellency