The Address-Mr. Churchill

of the minister in trying to link together the various parts of the commonwealth. I wish he would speak more frequently on the commonwealth in the House of Commons. I have examined the number of times the Secretary of State for External Affairs has dealt with the British Commonwealth of Nations in the House of Commons. He has been goaded into making statements by people mentioning the subject here or asking him questions; but he has not, certainly in recent years, himself made a speech on the British Commonwealth of Nations. I do recall when the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) made his great world tour. He received great acclaim and public recognition and gave an hourand-a-half travelogue in the House of Commons two or three years ago. He did not mention the British Commonwealth Nations.

Mr. Lapointe: How childish can you get?

Mr. Churchill: I suggest, in these circumstances, the British Commonwealth of Nations is not foremost in the mind of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and when he was on the horns of a dilemma—

Mr. Pearson: It is in my mind all the time.

Mr. Churchill: When he was on the horns of the dilemma at the United Nations he chose to abstain instead of choosing to remain beside Britain, Australia and New Zealand.

Mr. Brooks: He likes the new friends in the commonwealth better than the old ones.

Mr. Pearson: I like them all.

Mr. Brooks: He does not indicate it.

Mr. Churchill: I noticed yesterday when the Prime Minister was speaking-I regret he is not in his place tonight; I do not like to refer to his remarks when he is not present-and was asked to produce the message to Sir Anthony Eden which had been described in some circles as a scorching condemnation, or something to that effect, he denied that it was so; he did not produce it but he produced for our enlightenment the message that he had exchanged with Mr. Bulganin concerning the atrocities in Hungary. If this message to Sir Anthony Eden was not a message of condemnation, why could it not have been produced and read out to us? He mentioned his message to Mr. Bulganin on page 24 of Hansard. Well, he leads up to it on page 22. He said:

Events in the Middle East made it more difficult to marshal world opinion in unanimous and vigorous condemnation of what was taking place in Hungary at that very moment.

He was annoyed that the Middle East was in trouble when there was trouble elsewhere. There may be trouble elsewhere tomorrow, so he would have many more places to be annoyed about than the Middle East and Hungary. But that led him to reciting to us his letter to Mr. Bulganin, and he mentioned the profound shock that the government of Canada felt at the reports received of the action of that government in Hungary.

And then he says he wants that government to comply with the resolutions which had been passed by the United Nations and he uses these rather odd words:

. . . for a display even at this late date of moderation toward the unfortunate victims of these tragic events.

Moderation, when people are being murdered, run over by tanks, cut to pieces by machine guns and driven out of their country by the thousands. Moderation? Why not a complete cessation of such atrocities? But, oh no, he speaks of moderation toward the unfortunate victims of these tragic events. And then he went on to say:

It is not, however, my present purpose to attempt to pass judgment on the actions that have been taken, . . .

Et cetera.

Why not pass judgment on the actions taken by Russia in Hungary? Quite prepared to pass judgment on Britain and France but reserve judgment with regard to Hungary. It is like the United Nations passing a resolution asking for observers to be admitted into Hungary to find out what was going on when at that time 50,000 eyewitnesses had already left the country and could have told everybody everything about it. Well, the attitude of the government toward the British Commonwealth of Nations does not meet my requirements, anyway.

However, the Secretary of State for External Affairs can speak about the British Commonwealth of Nations elsewhere than here in the House of Commons. On April 30 of this year he spoke in London, England to the English-speaking union. These are fine words which he used and I want him to repeat them here in the House of Commons month after month putting them on Hansard. In fact, I will put them on Hansard for him:

Our commonwealth of nations-

He said.