

Nasser and criticize what the British Government was doing. It quoted a number of authorities to show that in the eyes of responsible political leaders in Britain the seizure of the canal by Colonel Nasser was a very unfriendly act towards Britain and was very much resented. It quoted Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition; it quoted Mr. Herbert Morrison, another great labour leader, who claimed that Nasser had acted contrary to the law of nations and contrary to international good faith. Mr. Morrison was very severe against those people in Britain who, having spent many years in denouncing jingoism, imperialism and excessive nationalism in respect of Britain, and having enjoyed the advantages of living in Britain, were now spending their spare time in praising countries like Egypt. The *Times* was very censorious of the persons trying to sanctify Makarios, who was exiled from Cyprus, and of those seeking to get people to believe that British soldiers when endeavouring to preserve law and order in a turbulent area are cruel and oppressive. The newspaper went on to say that colonialism in the minds of some people was all a matter of water. If Russia, China or any other continental power overran, captured, dictated to or even destroyed a neighbouring country, apparently everything was well. In such a case the most elementary freedoms could be exterminated and the most outrageous excesses committed and there would be silence. This was written before the rape of Hungary by the Soviet Union troops. But, said the *Times*, if Britain seeks to keep law and order in some territory that she is bringing along to self-government, where she is trying to teach the people to walk before they can run, a great cry of colonialism goes up.

Honourable senators, let me quote further from this same article, to show what I call the indirect pressure that was exerted on the Prime Minister of Britain and his Government, and which no doubt influenced them in their decision to join up with France and send troops to Egypt. This is what the *Times* said:

All this is part of a deplorable flight from responsibility which has sapped so much of the effectiveness both of our national life and our international position.

And further:

Public opinion, despite what the dissidents angrily say, is remarkably firm. Of course, it wants to avoid the use of force. So does everyone and we hope no one does more than the British Government. But

—there always seemed to be a “but” —

—that is a far cry from saying that because there seems little we can do about it the best thing is to find excuses for, and forget, the whole business.

And note this sentence:

Nations live by the vigorous defence of their interests. Even Mr. Nehru, who so conscientiously sermonizes the rest of the world, does not let a trick go in Kashmir.

And, applying indirect pressure on the Government by reference to days gone by, the editorial concludes by saying:

As G. M. Trevelyan reminded us many years ago, the sun of Venice set because of the double event of the Turkish blocking of the caravan routes and the discovery of the Cape route and America.

Doubtless it is good to have a flourishing tourist trade and to win Test matches. But nations do not live by circuses alone. The people, in their silent way, know this better than the critics. They still want Britain great.

That was the *London Times*. I have a fairly large file of clippings from other papers here, many of them along much the same line. Is it surprising that when the great *London Times*, known for many years as “The Thunderer”, told the Government that the people still want Britain great, Sir Anthony Eden wondered if he was fulfilling his duty in not preparing Britain to take some action in Egypt if the United Nations did not quickly do so?

I am not saying that Sir Anthony Eden, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and others did the right thing. I am saying, however, that they did what I think the majority of the press and the people of Britain expected them to do. When the British air forces started to bomb Egyptian airports, there was, naturally, a great protest—a protest in many British papers as well as in the papers of other countries. But that feeling is not nearly so vociferous in Britain today. Many papers there were saying that what the Government did was contrary to the wishes of the people. However, the latest public opinion poll shows, according to a Reuter's dispatch of November 15, that 53 per cent of the people of Britain now support what Sir Anthony Eden and his Government did.

Honourable senators, I am sorry to have spoken so long. I had no intention of doing so when I started to prepare my remarks. But as I progressed I felt that I should try to explain that in my opinion the action of Sir Anthony Eden and his Government was not a sudden, impetuous, imperialistic action, but one to which much serious thought had been given and one which, inferentially at any rate, appeared to have the backing of responsible public opinion. The action took the world by surprise. People were bewildered and wondered if this was the start of another world war. Even some members of the British House of Commons were bewildered. There are about three million Liberal voters in Britain today, but their opinion is represented by only six members