

CANADA'S POSITION IN WORLD CRISIS

(Continued from P. 2)

I have spoken at length about the momentous events in the Middle East, but I must refer also to the grave and tragic events which have led to turmoil and bloodshed in Eastern Europe. For the first time since the end of the war a real hope appeared, in the last two weeks, that some at least of the countries which have contributed so much to the civilization of the world might secure some measure of independence from Moscow.

In Poland, a form of national communism has been established which appears determined to demand as a minimum the right to develop along its own lines, and not according to a Moscow pattern. Not least encouraging was the release of the Roman Catholic Primate of Poland.

We were also encouraged by a statement from Moscow which said that the Soviet leaders were prepared to re-negotiate their relations with Eastern Europe on the basis of equality and non-interference in their neighbours' internal affairs.

Even before this announcement, the brave Hungarian people had risen to demand the freedom so long denied them. The Hungarian revolution was a passionate and significant outburst of national feeling, both strongly anti-Russian and anti-Communist. We rejoiced in the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and other religious leaders and we shared the hopes, as well as the anxiety, of our fellowcountrymen of Hungarian origin.

Today, these hopes seem to have been shattered. Soviet action has made a mockery of Soviet statements. According to the latest reports, Soviet armed might is being applied against the gallant and practically unarmed people of Hungary. Moscow has announced that it will crush the Hungarian revolt and re-impose its will on Hungary by brute force.

Last night, in an emergency session, the Security Council met in response to an appeal from the Hungarian Government and considered a U.S. resolution condemning Soviet military interference in the internal affairs of Hungary. The resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union. The matter was then referred to a special session of the General Assembly which is now meeting and which provides the opportunity of condemning in the most forthright terms the callous disregard by the Soviet Union of the elementary rights of the Hungarian people.

Our aim is that the people of Eastern Europe should be free to choose their own form of government, a basic human right they have not enjoyed for years. The Soviet Union's resort to military force against a neighbouring nation is a most serious threat to the peace which we have solemnly pledged ourselves to preserve and defend in signing the Charter of the United Nations.

The one encouraging aspect of the events of the last few days has been the almost unanimous action of the nations of the world in endeavouring to implement their obligations under that Charter.

And, in conclusion, I wish to assure my listeners that all the members of their Government have been in full agreement at all times as to what should be done and what could be said and when it should be done and when it could be said. And I am sure that, if and when any action of ours requires, according to our practices, the approval by Parliament, that approval will be given in no uncertain terms.

Let us all hope that this approach to unanimity of men of good will of so many nations may help to realize that part of our daily prayer to a Power greater than any here below: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven".

On November 2, at the first emergency special session ever held by the General Assembly of the United Nations, Mr. Pearson explained Canada's stand on a resolution calling for a cease-fire in Egypt, and expressed this country's regret that the resolution had not provided for definite action to bring about a lasting solution to the Middle East problem. Text of this statement follows:

I rise not to take part in this debate, because the debate is over. The vote has been taken. But I do wish to explain the abstention of my delegation on that vote.

It is never easy to explain an abstention, and in this case it is particularly difficult because we are in favour of some parts of this resolution, and also because this resolution deals with such a complicated question.

Because we are in favour of some parts of the resolution, we could not vote against it, especially as, in our opinion, it is a moderate proposal couched in reasonable and objective terms, without unfair or unbalanced condemnation; and also, by referring to violations by both sides to the armistice agreements, it puts, I think, recent action by the United Kingdom and France--and rightly--against the background of those repeated violations and provocations.

We support the effort being made to bring the fighting to an end. We support it, among other reasons, because we regret that force was used in the circumstances that face us at this time. As my delegation sees it, however, this resolution which the General Assembly has thus adopted in its present form--and there was very little chance to alter that form--is inadequate to achieve the purposes which we have in mind at this Assembly. Those purposes are defined in that resolution of the United Nations under which we are meeting--resolution 377(V), uniting for peace--and peace is far more than ceasing to fire, although it certainly must include that essential factor.