

of the United Nations shall be approved; whether Canada shall observe its pledge as a faithful member of the United Nations. To me it is just as simple as that. We, together with others, must support the United Nations or it will die, and with it will perish the one chance of maintaining peace. To me that seems important, for once we condone the action of any country or countries which, in violation of their pledge, proceed on their own to begin hostilities and establish the very vicious principle of preventive war, the United Nations will die; for this is war, although, quite unconvincingly to me, it is called a police action. The United Nations can play no favourites. If powerful nations can repudiate the vital principles which they are pledged to observe as members, yes, as leading members in the organization of the United Nations, then in the future any one of the 79 member nations can attack any other country for grievances, real or imaginary, and the whole purpose of the United Nations will be defeated. Then the UN will die, as the League of Nations died after it refused to intervene when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia.

To my mind it would be a crime if Canada were to assist in the destruction of the only organization that has at least a prospect of avoiding a world war. I disagree entirely and emphatically with the defeatist and depressing prophecy of my friend the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) that there must be, as I think he called it, a show-down or a war between Russia and the United States, and that either the one or the other will control the world. I do not like that thought.

Hon. Mr. Haig: May I ask the honourable member a question?

Hon. Mr. Euler: Certainly.

Hon. Mr. Haig: What action has the United Nations taken against Russia's attack on Hungary?

Hon. Mr. Euler: I have not commented on that.

Hon. Mr. Haig: Both countries are members of the United Nations.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Quite so. I am not saying the United Nations is perfect, but I maintain that it is the only organization from which we can gather any hope of preserving the peace of the world. That in itself is ample reason for preserving the United Nations.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Euler: I am sure there is not a member of this chamber so pessimistic in his outlook as to believe that inevitably Russia

and the United States will go to war, and that as a result one or other will rule the world.

May I say, with respect to attacks on smaller nations, that the day of so-called gunboat diplomacy is gone, and the more powerful nations must realize that threats against smaller countries will no longer be effective, provided the United Nations observes the principles upon which it is founded.

My friend the Leader of the Opposition made some reference to Mr. Chamberlain, one-time Prime Minister of Great Britain, and his trip to Munich to make an agreement with Hitler. My friend was not very complimentary to Mr. Chamberlain; he even used the expression "Don't be a Chamberlain". I would remind my friend that at the time of Mr. Chamberlain's return from Munich to London the people of Great Britain and Canada and, indeed, the world at large, rejoiced at what he had done. The experiment, as my friend called it, was unsuccessful. Unfortunately, that is so, but it is easy to be wise after the event. At that time the world thought Mr. Chamberlain had done a wonderful thing in ensuring "peace in our time".

In passing I might mention the fact that Mr. Eden, as he then was, was Foreign Secretary in Mr. Chamberlain's cabinet.

Hon. Mr. Haig: And he resigned.

Hon. Mr. Euler: Yes, he resigned in protest against what he called the appeasement of Hitler. Well, Mr. Eden, now Sir Anthony, has tried another experiment: along with France and Israel, Britain has invaded Egypt. I am very sure that if something were not being done to modify the results of their action, that experiment might have proved more disastrous than Mr. Chamberlain's negotiations with Hitler.

What have been the results of this adventure against Egypt? It has brought about the very things which the attackers professed they wished to avoid. One of the reasons advanced was that they wanted to preserve the Suez Canal. But they did not preserve it: it is now out of use for six months and perhaps longer. The pipe lines through Syria have been partially destroyed. Not only are Britain and France deprived of the use of necessary oil, but all the nations of Western Europe are in the same position, and may continue to be for a long time.

Let us look at some other very undesirable results of the action. There is the slaughter of thousands of people in the attack made on Port Said and elsewhere. It has resulted, I regret to say, in the humiliation of two proud