

The Address—Mr. Rowe

police force must be an effective force. An ineffective force might well only constitute an invitation to disaster to both its personnel and its purpose.

It now seems clear that Britain and France will not move all their troops out of this troubled area until they are sure such a police force is effective. Who, Mr. Speaker, should ask them to; and who should sit idly by representing Canada while the United States tells them to get out no matter whether or not there is a police force in there? These are issues, Mr. Speaker, that concern the lives and well-being of this country; these are matters on which Her Majesty's loyal opposition have chosen to take issue and to find out where we are coming from and where we are going. This government has not told us. Never have we seen such a complete example of smug complacency and almost humiliating silence as last Saturday night when we refused to vote.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is therefore a primary duty of this government, which sponsored a resolution at the United Nations, to demand that the police force sent to Egypt be in truth and in fact a police force that can maintain the peace. Anything less than that would be a repudiation of the basic principles upon which the United Nations was founded.

I have mentioned the dangers which the free world is facing in the Middle East through Soviet aggression there. I know I need not remind this house that Soviet activities in the Middle East are all part of a pattern with the tragic events which have been taking place in Hungary during the past few weeks. Soviet domination of all its satellite countries is maintained only by force. Those at the head of affairs in the Kremlin are following the practices of Stalin's regime to dominate and extend the Soviet empire. I do not think we need to have been in any doubt in regard to the seeming liberalization of the regime in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death. However, if we had vain hopes that the international cold war was coming to an end, we are cruelly reminded that nothing has changed.

We have joined with the great majority of members of the United Nations in condemning Soviet aggression in Hungary, and particularly the removal by Soviet troops of thousands of Hungarians who had dared to fight for the freedom and independence of their country from foreign rule. It may be that the expression of strong United Nations disapproval of Soviet acts in Hungary will produce an ameliorating effect on the men in the Kremlin, but so far the Soviet Union does not seem to have been much impressed by the United Nations condemnation of its actions.

No matter how strongly we have talked against them they have not even listened, and have only laughed at the suggestion.

I notice that our government has not been claiming very great credit for its role in helping Hungary through the United Nations. I do not know how it could. Having regard to the principles governing our security throughout the world in the past, surely we should realize that the interests of Canada in the Middle East and in Hungary are closely tied together. The attempt by the United Kingdom and France to limit Soviet expansion in the Middle East was crippled through what I believe to be the inept diplomacy of the United States in the role it played in the Suez canal crisis. Are we to expect that whenever some responsible nation such as the United Kingdom or France decides to make a move to protect a most vital sector of the western world from Soviet influence or aggression, it will run the risk of being condemned by the United States and probably Canada? Mr. Speaker, who are our friends? Whom do we trust? Whom do we doubt? This would mean that our action in the future will be limited to mere empty, loud protests, if you like, as in the case of the Hungarian tragedy, through the United Nations, leaving only the communist dictators free to act, ignoring entirely our counsel, advice and every covenant of the United Nations to which they so proudly claim the right to belong.

In the case of Hungary, we are being asked to contribute \$100,000 to the United Nations emergency fund for Hungarian refugees.

Mr. Harris: A million.

Mr. Rowe: One hundred million?

Mr. McCann: One million.

Mr. Lennard: It was \$100,000.

Mr. Rowe: I have it as \$1 million but I said \$100,000 by mistake. I certainly should not minimize it because at first it was intended to be \$100,000, and then the government made the magnanimous suggestion to make it \$1 million. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is still a paltry, shamefully low amount. In fact, if I had been the Minister of Finance I would have been afraid to discuss the difference between those two amounts because the Minister of Trade and Commerce has often said, "What's a million, anyway?" I would have hesitated. Are we to take it that this may be conscience money, in view of the amount being changed, paid by Canada because we seem to have failed to take any other real action of positive value in the crisis which has afflicted Hungary during the last few weeks?