

What I want to discuss mainly at this time however is the Middle East situation. I am free to confess that for a brief period I was bewildered by it. I was very doubtful of the wisdom of the action taken by Britain and France, although I was convinced that it was not taken with any imperialistic designs upon Egypt, but rather in what they fully believed to be the interests of peace. They were trying to stop the fighting between Israel and Egypt and to save the Suez Canal from serious damage.

I had to remind myself that Sir Anthony Eden was an experienced and level-headed statesman, that he had had a long and distinguished diplomatic career, including many years as Foreign Secretary of Great Britain. I also reminded myself that he had been chosen by the people of Britain to succeed the great Sir Winston Churchill as their Prime Minister, and that, in a general election, he had been endorsed by the nation and given a majority of some 60 seats in the House of Commons. Furthermore, honourable senators, I reminded myself that Sir Anthony Eden was a Knight of the Garter, that great English Order of Chivalry whose carefully selected members are generally expected to be more pure in their motives, more valiant in their actions and more humane in their conduct than ordinary men. I had to remind myself too that Britain's present Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, with whom I had a delightful chat at the Rideau Club reception last spring, is a brother Welshman who also has a distinguished career. In his position as Recorder of the old Roman City of Chester he had for some years been making important judicial decisions. These two men and their cabinet colleagues are not hot-headed, impetuous, unreliable men. They are great statesmen, and I am sure they did not forget for one moment that any action which they might take should be very carefully weighed and considered.

I recollected that since the seizure of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser and the apparent failure of the United Nations to take any quick and decisive action on the matter, Sir Anthony Eden and his Government had been faced with great problems. They had had little sympathetic consideration from the United States, which is hardly to be wondered at in view of the then pending presidential election.

Now, let me say at once that I am fully in accord with the attitude which Canada has taken in the United Nations. I am 100 per cent in favour of a peaceful solution of this great world crisis if one can be achieved. We must do everything in our power to bring about such a solution. As the Leader of the

Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) told us yesterday, if we do not bring about a peaceful solution we might be facing the end of the world. I am strongly in favour of the United Nations Police Force and am proud that Canada was responsible for its formation. I am also proud that it is being headed by a Canadian general. I will say something about an international police force a little later.

Before I do that, however, I would like to say something about the pressure that was being put upon the British Government and the quiet but, nevertheless, unmistakable inferences in some newspapers to the effect that the people of Great Britain expected Sir Anthony Eden and his Government to look after their interests, come what may.

It is perhaps fair to say that Britain and France did stretch clause 52 of the United Nations Charter when they sent armed forces into Egypt. In view of the seizure of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser, however, and the possibility of injury to the canal if a major war broke out between Israel and Egypt, France and Britain might have felt that they were acting in defence of their own rights to some extent. It is a moot question, on which arguments have been presented by both sides in the British press. We must not forget, however, that the Suez Canal is of much more importance to Great Britain and France than it is to either Canada or the United States; therefore their thinking is no doubt somewhat different.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** May I ask the honourable gentleman one question at this point? Could he, from his knowledge of affairs in England, give any information about the Suez Canal Company and the financial control of it since 1888?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** The Suez Canal Company's head office is in Paris. There has been considerable discussion in the press about the company, and perhaps there has been a good deal of difficulty in connection with the administration of the canal. While I was in Great Britain I read in one newspaper a statement that the profits of the canal amounted last year to 255 per cent, and that the company was not spending as much as it should in improving the canal, including possibly the widening of it. I am afraid that is about all I can say about the company.

When I was in Britain, in August and September of this year, I read most of the important newspapers every day; and, being myself a newspaper man, and familiar with all the more influential British papers, I am perhaps better able than most people may be to assess editorial opinion at its proper value.