

The Address—Mr. Rowe

Mr. Rowe: Hon. Selwyn Lloyd—I am getting great names confused—"forthwith" perhaps did not mean forthwith.

Conditions of course are very critical. Conditions during the last few years have changed a great deal. In the past number of years our security has more or less depended on firm alliances. For many years the most intimate alliance so far as we are concerned has been that of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth. That more or less recognized unwritten unity has, I believe, often prevented trouble. Such alliances have been based on mutual trust. They were limited to clear objectives and no one distrusted the other in carrying out those objectives. It would have been unheard of in years past for one ally to make a public statement against the action taken by another for its own security. It would indeed have been unheard of for a Canadian prime minister or Canadian cabinet minister to repudiate the British in public for action taken which in this instance has now been generally justified and has in reality meant perhaps the saving for the time being of the Middle East.

Right Hon. Mr. Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain, has said that the British-French invasion of Egypt has blocked a communist plot in the Middle East, a plot which would have led to "the loss of countless lives and more other evils than we can even estimate." The record of the last few years truly gives us more reason to trust the Prime Minister of Britain than President Nasser of Egypt.

We are of course committed now to the United Nations and all its wide areas of operation. While there are grave differences of opinion in the United Nations organization, nevertheless all who are honestly striving and struggling for world peace are earnestly hoping that the worthy intentions and aspirations of that organization may not be sacrificed by abandoning the basic principles behind its creation. The fundamental and most important of these principles to prevent aggression and preserve peace was the principle of collective action. The United Nations organization of today seems at times to be united in name only.

Events are happening in Poland and Hungary that give us cause to believe that the Soviet domination of their huge empire is going to be maintained by force. The retreat from Stalinism so much advertised lately has been merely a farce and a fraud. Russia is back again to the regime of Stalin. She is also an important member of the United Nations, ever ready to veto any move that may restrain her devious plans.

[Mr. Rowe.]

This makes us wonder just what the United States and Canada are doing at the United Nations to enable us to maintain our security against aggression. Let it be understood at the beginning that this problem, of course, is universal. The other day when the British Prime Minister was repudiated by our Canadian Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and by our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) this thought occurred to me. What sort of situation are we going to drift into if the organization we are asking to do something will not actually do it and if some nation such as Britain or France takes a move to protect a vital sector of our economy, an important zone in the area of dispute, and is going to be repudiated by its closest friends? It would mean that we very soon would have no action at all except action by the enemy dictators.

We talk, Mr. Speaker, about the Middle East reverting to a normal situation in the next six months. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is not true at all. The problem is far wider than that. We are forgetting Soviet Russia's plans. What more profitable place is there for Russia to strike than in the Middle East? She would be able to play a double role. She would have the commanding power over a vital resource and she could strengthen her popularity, position, influence and so forth in the Arab world.

We know now that the supplies she sent to Egypt were much greater than Egypt needed, and while they were for Egypt they were really serving Russia's devious plan. We are faced with a form of treachery that has never before confronted us and the hand that directs that treachery votes in the same way that Canada does in the United Nations as one of the so-called peacemakers of the world.

Surely we are not going to make any distinction between troops going from Russia as part of the Russian army and troops going as volunteers. Playing along with such cunning devices simply enables Russia step by step to make a mockery of the United Nations. Who volunteers in Russia or does anything there unless they are told to by the Russian dictators?

What is the present situation as of today? The Prime Minister has said that our troops are going to the Middle East to maintain an armistice between the Israelis and the Arabs and also between the Russians and the French and the British. This raises some interesting questions. If Britain and France refuse to take out their troops, what is the position of our government and our troops? We do not know at the moment how this police force will function. We do not even know where it is going and how long it is going