

Hon. Mr. Haig: —because Jordan and Egypt were preparing for war, and other adjacent countries were opposed to Israel. Self-defence has always been considered justifiable. The Israelis, knowing what was coming, moved in on the Egyptians, and the Egyptians simply faded out. No other expression describes it. They made practically no defence; some 54,000 men surrendered, with arms and munitions worth millions of dollars which had been supplied by Russia's satellites.

Previously Nasser had nationalized the Suez canal. There are differences of opinion as to whether he did so in pursuance of a legal right, since the company in possession has a contract which runs another eight or ten years. If the Egyptian Government had paid the operators in full there might have been some ground for the seizure. I am not going to argue the matter, because it does not enter into the subject of debate. But what followed? The canal was blocked with boats filled with cement and sunk by Egypt. That was no evidence of peaceful action; it indicated a determination to make it impossible for France or Britain or any other nation to use the waterway.

So Britain and France, faced with these conditions, and knowing that Russia was supplying arms and munitions to the Middle East—we now find that Syria is ready to ally herself with the communist states—took positive action. It may be that they should have notified the United Nations, Canada and other powers of their intentions. But let me remind honourable senators in this connection that, but for the absence of Russia from the Security Council meeting when the Korean situation was being considered, the United States would never have been allowed to enter Korea, because if Russia had been present she would have vetoed the resolution for United Nations action.

My next point is this. In recent months, before the Suez incident, Russia had made a deal with Poland which was carried through. Then, at the time when British and French troops moved into the canal zone, Russian troops took over Hungary. The United Nations voted condemnation of Russia, but what else have they done but pass pious resolutions? We are now about to provide a million dollars in aid of the Hungarians who have been driven from their native land, but the United Nations did nothing, and the United States did nothing.

I hold in my hand two editorials from New York newspapers. If anyone objects to my reading them I will not do so.

An Hon. Senator: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Haig: One is headed "Death"; the other, "Stalin Lives Again in Death". One appeared in the New York *Times*, the other in the New York *Herald Tribune*. I will read only a sentence or so:

"Help! Help! Help!"

These were the last words heard by a shocked world as Red barbarians strangled the last free voices in martyred Hungary.

What the writer is saying is simply this, that the United States ought to have moved in and defended Hungary, that it should not have been content with pious resolutions which could have no effect on Russia.

Hon. Mr. Horner: Do you mean the United Nations should have moved in?

Hon. Mr. Haig: No. I am not blaming nor praising the United Nations. The UN is an experiment which in my judgment can be a success only if every member is willing to do its part. The United Nations has no force to command at will. What could it have done in Hungary? The only nation which could have intervened effectively is the United States, and it did not do so. That there was an election pending at the time is not to the point. Probably the Russians counted on it as likely to prevent action. I do not know. But the United States is in fact the United Nations: there can be no question about it. Admittedly more than seventy other countries are represented in the United Nations, but if the United States will not act no other country can be counted upon to do so. Now Nasser has the audacity to demand that the canal which was blocked by his action should be cleared by the United Nations, and that if the British and French do not pay the cost, the United States should do so. It is things like that which make us wonder why people depend on the United Nations so much. I am not saying that it has no value, for it helps in the matter of negotiations, talks and interviews. It may help to keep the peace to some extent, but you cannot maintain peace between two great nations like Russia and the United States, if they finally come to grips, for those two countries are never going to sit down together until one of them is master of the world. You can take it or leave it. That is the truth, and nothing we can do will prevent this situation from developing. There is no use in saying that Russia is not going to allow this to happen. If she gains control of the Middle East as she now controls the eastern part of Europe, she will be in a position to control the world, and poor little Canada will say, "Yes, yes". That will be the end of it.

I return now to the editorial to which I was referring earlier. It says that the United