

United States and in this country too—intervention by France and Britain was due first of all to the impotence of the United Nations, and, secondly, to the great indecision or indecisions of the United States, and the policy of that country, not to British policy.

It is to be noted that former United States Minister Cafferty had a lot to do with installing the Nasser regime; and further it has been revealed that the United States promised to supply oil to Britain and France if they would yield unconditionally to Nasser. I will not read all the material I have here, but there are one or two passages which I think I should put on record. It is headed: "We Bury Our Friends" and it has been printed in the *Washington Post*, the *New York Herald Tribune*, and the *New York Times*. It states:

We—

That is, the United States.

—pilloried our major allies for taking military measures to halt Moscow's domination of Egypt and through Egypt of the whole Middle East. We prevented the downfall of Nasser, which so obviously would have been a boon to peace. We helped cancel out the military advantage gained by Anglo-French initiative, undermined the prestige and authority of these two nations and lent our weight in the crippling of their economic vitality. Yet now we concede in effect that the prospect of Soviet hegemony over the Middle East is terrifying enough to justify unilateral employment of Western power. Having deepened the vacuum into which Soviet influence now flows more alarmingly than before, we add insult to injury by claiming for ourselves alone—

That is, the United States.

—the right to act what we denied to England and France. How paradoxical can one government become without losing the respect of foes along with the confidence of friends? . . . Having almost mortally wounded our best friends, we seem to be preparing to bury them.

True, there is a face-saving clause. It is asserted that the United States, unlike Britain and France, will use force only with the "consent" of the nations endangered by Soviet aggression. But this is palpably diplomatic double-talk. Soviet aggression is most unlikely to take the form of overt military attack. The Kremlin has found infiltration and subversion—of the order now on display in Syria—more to its taste and its talents. . . .

It was to forestall the covert, non-violent and more deadly sort of aggression that London and Paris acted in November, only to be slapped down and deeply weakened for their daring. Now the United States, which led the condemnation proceedings while Nasser cheered and Moscow jeered, declares that it will do what Britain and France did, if and when necessary.

I shall have one or two things to say regarding the Soviets. Although I did not attend the special session in the fall, I was particularly pleased with the strong statement of the honourable senator from Alma (Hon. Mr. Molson) about keeping the Russians out of this country, and I compliment him on it. I have said many such things about Russia and her rulers. I noticed that the other evening a member of Parliament complained that he was still

getting literature from the Soviet Embassy. If any honourable members are receiving this material and want to get rid of it, I will tell them how they can do so. You will remember that at the regular session last year I put a question on the Order Paper as to whether our Embassy in Moscow had the right to do what is being done by the Soviet Embassy in Ottawa in the matter of distributing literature. Immediately my question was drawn to the attention of Soviet officials—which was next day—they cut me off their mailing list, and I have received nothing since. I asked a friend, "Are you still getting some of this propaganda, as I call it, from the Soviet?" He said, "Oh, yes". I remarked, "Well, if you don't want it, just do as I do, and act as they act." Why should we not do so? I think we have been a nation of fools to put out the red mat for them in this country. We did so in my city. I refused to attend any of the official functions tendered to these visitors. Both delegations which came out there had the same story. The delegation representing the fishing industry were going to buy fishing boats from us: later, when two men from Moscow toured our lumber camps, they announced that they proposed to buy Canadian machinery for lumbering. Neither delegation had the intention of buying anything. Since they went home not a word has been heard from them by either the builders of fishing boats or the manufacturers of machinery.

I wonder when our people are going to wake up. Of course the Soviet wants peace, though many may not believe it. In my opinion she will not launch a war so long as she is gaining so much by the methods she is pursuing, and by which she is now penetrating the Middle East. No one can tell just what is going to happen there.

It will take two minutes or so, honourable senators, to read what I believe is a salutary message both for members of the Senate and for the people of Canada generally. This is from an article by Bruce Hutchison, one of Canada's ablest writers, published in the *Financial Post*. It states in part:

Russia is using her production mainly to create power while we use most of ours to create an easier life. We produce far more steel, for instance, but we put it mainly into consumer goods. The Russians put steel into weapons or new industries and starve the consumer. They buy power. We buy a new car. In terms of common sense we are doing the right thing but in terms of power in a crazy world the Russians are moving, comparatively, faster than we are.

I am skipping part of the article, and so will read only one or two more paragraphs.

But these boys, for all their smiles, have never lost sight of their target. Stalin approached it