

*The Address—Mr. Dufresne*

held for differences of opinion I will give my honourable friend the benefit of my personal opinion in the matter.

Britain and France decided to intervene after Israel had invaded Egyptian territory. Some people consider that action as an aggression because, they contend, it is contrary to the principles of the United Nations charter, which condemns aggression against any nation by one or several countries, whatever be the purpose of that violation. On that point, and if it is truly an aggression, personally I therefore find it impossible to approve the action of Britain and France. On the other hand, however, events have shown that the intervention of Britain and of France in that conflict,—an intervention which I would call preventive,—aimed at preserving and protecting the vital interests, not only of the two great powers concerned, but also of all the nations of the western hemisphere.

By now, we all know something that we did not know at the time of the Anglo-French intervention. The Russians had already built up in Egypt a very considerable amount of war material, ready for use as soon as Soviet troops could be rushed to the scene to take over the control of Suez, thus dealing a mortal blow to the economic life of all the nations of the western hemisphere.

We are now aware of the true situation, and it is obvious that if England and France had not taken action, all this vital area would by now have fallen into the hands of the Russians, aided and abetted by their faithful servant, president Nasser of Egypt.

One by one, all the Arab states would have had no choice but to submit to the infernal dictatorship of the Kremlin. My statements are surely borne out by this morning's news. As the United Nations could not tolerate such an invasion and, knowing that Moscow is bent on world domination and wishes to enslave people by resorting to the most despicable means,—the facts are there to prove it,—we would have had to face a third world war, even more dreadful than the first two, a war which not only would have caused untold destruction but would have doubtless annihilated mankind.

If on the one hand I cannot approve the violation of a pact which forbids all form of aggression, on the other hand, being acquainted with the facts and aware of the fatal results which would have inevitably followed without this intervention, I will refrain from berating or even criticizing the action taken by England and France, in the Middle East, in such circumstances.

I would have liked, however, to have access to the sources of information available to the government through the United Nations. I

[Mr. Dufresne.]

would have hastened to warn the United Nations, whose noble task it is to preserve world peace, and I would have used all my influence, as a member of that important world organization, to prevent any aggression from either side.

In conclusion, I will simply add this: I leave to the future and to history the task of passing judgment on the countries concerned.

Reverting to the matter I was discussing yesterday just before adjournment, I said I was glad that the parliament of Canada had been called into a special session to discuss the situation in Hungary and to offer a generous contribution to help that valiant nation.

The amount of one million dollars which we are being asked to vote for this purpose is certainly not exaggerated. It seems far more appropriate than the amount originally suggested.

There is no one here, I am quite sure, who will refuse to help this courageous people. While it will not benefit those who laid down their lives for liberty, we must not forget that, because of their sacrifice, widows and orphans are left behind, and that Christian charity, no less than a simple sense of duty, makes it imperative that we extend a helping hand to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) informed us yesterday of the terms of a letter which he had written to premier Bulganin, of Russia. I am not sure whether he did this in his own name or in that of the government which he heads. It would seem to me to be far more important, in the present circumstances, now that the house is gathered together to discuss this most difficult and serious matter, for us to adopt a resolution to condemn the barbarous conduct of the Russians, in Budapest more particularly.

Last week, at the Palace of Chaillot, in Paris, the fifteen member nations of NATO unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the inhuman treatment meted out by the Russians to the unfortunate Hungarian people. I would like to acquaint the house with this resolution.

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have asserted their determination "to safeguard the freedom of their peoples, their common heritage and their civilization, based on principles of democracy, individual freedom and the rule of law"; and

Whereas the events which occurred in Hungary in the course of the last few weeks have demonstrated conclusively that the Soviet union will not hesitate to use force to crush human liberty;

By this resolution, the second Conference of Parliamentarians of the member states of NATO:

1. Express their profound indignation at the use of brutal force against the Hungarian people who sought to govern itself according to the best traditions of human liberty;