

said that Britain would not be blackmailed by anybody. I hope he meant it, and I think he did.

In this connection of being blackmailed by the fear of Russia, may I recall that I was in Berlin in 1948, having gone into that city on the airlift. Honourable senators will remember that at that time the Soviet authorities had decided to push the Allies out of Berlin and to make of the former capital of Germany a Russian city. For that purpose they had blockaded the highways and railroads that ran between Berlin and the Western states. It will be remembered that the Allies responded—rather diplomatically, I thought—by organizing an airlift, and it became the duty of General Clay, who was then Chief of the General Staff of the Allied Powers in Germany, to tell the Russians that if they interfered with the airlift we would shoot our way through. Well, we didn't shoot our way through, because the Russians did not interfere with the airlift. They desisted, and the airlift remains today an historic element of pride to ourselves and the Western world.

I had an interview with General Clay at that time and I remember one of the sentiments which he expressed. It was a pearl of wisdom distilled from his own recent experience. He said, "The men in the Kremlin are good bluffers but they are not gamblers." I have thought of that remark many times since as the occasion has presented itself—that these men in the Kremlin are good bluffers but are not gamblers. It seems to me, my honourable colleagues, that if Russia is planning a world war with the Western Powers she will commence it in her own good time and that we will not be able to prevent it, certainly not by weakening ourselves or our position in the meantime as a result of fears on our part or by reason of threats on her part.

I say this because I would like to stress at the present moment the utter worthlessness of appeasement.

I follow that comment with this question: what do the Russians plan? Do they plan at this moment a global war in which we will all be involved? I do not believe it. I am not the least impressed, of course, with the Russian humbug about their love of peace, democracy and that sort of thing; but I do believe in their love of their own hides, and I judge that the men in the Kremlin have not forgotten what happened to Hitler. As General Clay said on that occasion, they are not gamblers. If it is true, as has been reported, that President Eisenhower has told the Russians that if they send "volunteers"

into the Middle East the United States will oppose them, then the Russians will not send "volunteers" into the Middle East.

I am not prepared to say—simply because I do not know enough of the facts and I cannot see far enough into the future—that Great Britain and France should remain in permanent control of the Suez Canal; but, if they should remain in control of it, I trust they will have courage to carry out their convictions. I will say, however, from well-considered knowledge of the situation, that Great Britain and France should not withdraw their troops from the Middle East until a satisfactory arrangement has been completed for the international operation and control of that highway vital to the shipping of the world. They should not withdraw their troops from the Middle East in its disturbed condition until the security of Israel has been assured and until there is a sufficient United Nations' force in the locality to assure that the guarantee is observed.

Perhaps my colleagues will bear with me if I comment on the many references to Israel as an aggressor in this recent Sinai campaign. Honourable senators will remember that I spent nearly a month in Israel just one year ago, studying that nation and its problems. Arab raids were going on while I was there, and I have the advantage of some little touch with the victims of those raids. I fancy there are few Canadians who have had the requisite experience to realize what it means to go to bed every night with the question unanswered as to whether you will be murdered before morning.

On November 29, 1947 the British withdrew from the responsibilities of their mandate in Palestine, and the new State of Israel was created and her borders defined by resolution of the United Nations. On May 15, 1948, less than 6 months after the passage of that resolution, five armies—in defiance of the United Nations' resolution, in defiance of a world mandate, and in defiance of world public opinion—five armies, from Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Iraq, marched across the established borders of Israel intent on conquest, plunder and murder. The invading armies were exceedingly well armed, while the local population was almost unarmed, yet by some miracle, which I have never been quite able to understand, a heroic citizenship in that little state defeated all five of those armies and drove them out. I am not wrong when I say that the feat was accomplished by some miracle, but it was accomplished, and is proven by the armistice agreements which were signed through the mediation and genius of Mr. Bunche of the United Nations.