

Hon. Mr. Horner: Yes. With all due respect, I say we are placed in a most humiliating position. I have great admiration for the British Government in the stand it has taken. I hope and believe that history will prove its decision was right. It had inside information of the build-up of arms which was taking place in Egypt.

Honourable senators, I hesitate at this time to say anything that might make conditions in the world more difficult.

So far as our giving aid to Hungary goes, I am all in favour of it. But surely it would be possible to make an arrangement whereby our representative and a staff might be allowed to stay in that country to assure an equitable distribution of the funds and clothes that are being sent in. According to the reports I hear, and they appear to be authentic, the Russians are taking over even the money and clothes that are being sent by the Red Cross. Of course, the Secretary General of the United Nations has asked for permission to enter Hungary to inspect conditions there, but the puppet government of that country, backed by Moscow, has refused to permit this.

Canada is perhaps able to and may give more than a million dollars. We are taking a calculated risk in making this contribution, but I am not complaining about it. I do not criticize the suggestion that we should waive medical examination of refugees from Hungary. It may well be that in the exodus from that country we shall get some undesirable persons. In the circumstances, we must take that chance.

Some Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Calvert C. Pratt: Honourable senators, I am glad to have the opportunity of saying a few words at this time. It is difficult to appraise the finer points of policy which are involved in the subject before us. Without an intimate knowledge of the facts from a close association with the problems, one cannot speak with full assurance on many aspects of the case.

However, in the overall problem we are united in one thought, namely, that the great need is to work towards world peace. There can be no division on that policy. More particularly is that true of today, when we cannot think in terms or methods of the past. We have to realize that nations have grown together, that geography is no longer important, that rapid transportation and communication have for all practical purposes eliminated distance, and we simply have to learn to get along with one another as best we can.

The complex situation in the Middle East has been built up by the rapid events which have taken place. Within a short time we have witnessed such disturbing happenings as Israel's invasion of Egypt, behind which there had been irreconcilable conflicts. We have seen the intervention of Great Britain and France, the resurgence of Arab nationalism, and the belligerence displayed by Nasser. A further complication was caused by the contribution of armaments by Russia and other supporting groups. This was followed by the seizure of the Suez Canal and the bombing of Egyptian air bases.

Arising out of these and other events there are bound to be conflicting views among nations which I would regard as nations of good judgment, peace and intelligence, and with a will to co-operate. We know who the great opponents are, and we know the general divisions in the world today. Knowing that, we shall make a serious mistake if in these days of emergency and stress our eyes are focused too closely on the issues between nations of good will.

Hon. Mr. Hugessen: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Pratt: That is a point, honourable senators, which we must keep in mind, and not allow ourselves to be carried away by matters of policy which in the overall picture are minor issues.

In the Middle East an actual war has been in progress. True, it has been localized, but it was fraught with the very great danger of spreading out into a world conflict.

The United Nations Police Force which was accepted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, I understand, without a dissenting vote—there were some abstentions, but not one vote against it—was certainly not to be a fighting force in the full military sense. It was introduced, however, as a contribution towards law and order and a token of the will and determination of nations to exert their influence and strength to maintain peace. And I think, honourable senators, we have every reason to be thankful and to appreciate the leadership which was given by Canada in the introduction of that policy in the United Nations.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Pratt: The immediate result of it is that four countries that were engaged in military operations have agreed to a cease-fire. They have not agreed to a cease-fire because of force, but because of this evidence, we might say, of earnest intervention, or earnest attempt to bring them together; and except for the leadership given by Canada