

best of diplomacy. But, honourable senators, the rightness or the wrongness of great historic decisions is not to be judged by the diplomacy with which they were initiated or carried out.

I suggest that those who would be rather too critical at the moment resist the temptation to draw conclusions too early until they know the facts and all of them. Great enterprises in world affairs are usually judged by their success, and what has been accomplished on this occasion by the United Kingdom and others involved is still veiled in the mists of the future. But I am bold enough to predict that when the tale is told it will be found that the United Kingdom did what was right under these circumstances;—

Hon. Mr. Horner: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: —and, furthermore, when all the counters are on the table, that they followed the only course that was possible or wise under the circumstances.

I am rather tempted to quote at this point in my address from the Bard of Avon these words by Polonius in his advice to his son:

Beware of entrance to a quarrel; . . .

My thought is that the members of the United Kingdom cabinet thoroughly canvassed the facts before taking action. I think they did "beware of entrance to a quarrel", and did not enter upon their course lightly or without due consideration. However, I think the words which follow those I have quoted are perhaps more opportune and appropriate at the moment:

But being in, bear't, that th' opposed may beware of thee.

And now being in, as Great Britain is, and as all of us in the West are, I would say: "Bear it, that those opposed shall beware of thee. Do not weaken."

I may quote appropriately these words from the Book of Joshua:

Be thou strong and very courageous . . .

That is what we should be today.

Honourable senators, I am just about tired of the role that the West has been playing *vis-à-vis* Russia ever since the explosion of the first atomic bomb. We have been so intent on avoiding an atomic or a hydrogen war that we have been victims of blackmail on countless occasions. Now, God knows that I am no militarist and am far from being a Jingo. I abhor war and would go a long way to avoid it. But I am unable to consent to the principle of peace at any price.

I noticed an article in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of November 7 which from some

points of view expresses my sentiments on this matter. It reads:

A TIME FOR COURAGE

For eleven years now, the Western Powers have been paying moral and atomic blackmail. . . . Both kinds of blackmail had the same effect—to prevent the Western Powers from using force where and when force needed to be used. The moral blackmailers said to them that the use of force would be "aggression", that it would "shock world opinion" (meaning, New Delhi opinion), that the only right way to settle disputes was through the United Nations. The atomic blackmailers said to them that the use of force might start a war; that if a war started, the Russians or the Americans might get into it; and that if the Russians or the Americans got into it, they might use atomic weapons. Thus—we quote from 5,789,634 speeches inside and outside the UN—"bringing about the end of civilization as we know it".

So the Western Powers paid. And as with any other kind of blackmail, new and higher payments were constantly demanded. It got so that the most miserable banana republic, the scruffiest little dictator, could do anything he liked to the mighty Western Powers. He could steal their property, maltreat their nationals, tear up his agreements with them—anything. And they could not raise a finger to stop him—save in the UN, which could not raise a finger to stop him, either.

I think I am right in saying that I am about tired of that sort of thing.

I have another clipping, a news item from this morning's paper, headed:

Egypt Hints at War Unless the Invaders Go

And some adviser of the dictator of Egypt delivers himself in words like these:

Egypt has asked the UN Secretary General Hammarskjöld to fix a time limit for withdrawal of British-French-Israeli troops from Egypt.

He goes on to say:

If the invaders ignore the decisions of the UN, Egypt can take many steps, which we cannot divulge now, but I cannot guarantee that these steps will not lead to a world war.

That is to say, we are to do what Egypt tells us, or otherwise she threatens us with a world war.

Well, I must say that I am afraid of a world war. I do not want a world war, but I do think that the dictator of Egypt has much more to fear from a world war than we have. He should remember what happened to some other dictators on other occasions in the course of a world war. While I am ready to go a very long way to avoid military clashes of any kind, I am not prepared to be dictated to by a "scruffy" little dictator of that kind and have our policies formulated in Cairo on the veiled threat of a world war or of an attack by Russia, the threat being handed to us by somebody on Russia's behalf. On the other hand, I like the statement made by the Right Honourable R. A. Butler recently in the British House of Commons, when, in answer to a question, he