

*The Address—Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent*

out the responsibilities he was taking on, we should assist him in every way.

May I say here that he did not have to accept this responsibility. He has been working for the United Nations under pressure for quite a long time and did not have to accept this new responsibility, but he is not a man who has ever shirked anything put up to him as a duty that would be of service to his own countrymen and to the free nations of the world. He accepted the responsibility and we felt that we should do our best to see that he got everything required to enable him to discharge his responsibilities in the manner in which he felt they should be discharged.

The original resolution provided that there had to be consent of the government of the country where the United Nations force was going to operate. But that is all that requires the consent of the government of the country where the force is to operate. It is a United Nations operation. It is the United Nations that is going to determine the composition of the force going there. It is the United Nations that will determine where in that country the force will be stationed and when and how long it will be there.

Having accepted the condition in the resolution, it is our view, and I think the view of practically everyone at the United Nations, that the other modalities of the operation of this force are things to be determined, independently of Colonel Nasser or of anyone else in Egypt, by the United Nations on its responsibility to discharge the undertaking it has assumed in the interests of peace in the world.

The amendment before us reads in part as follows:

. . . this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers (1) have followed a course of gratuitous condemnation of the action of the United Kingdom and France which was designed to prevent a major war in the Suez area . . .

There has been no gratuitous condemnation of the action of the United Kingdom. On the first resolution that was introduced by the United States and supported by a very large number of members of the United Nations, the Canadian delegation abstained and declared it was abstaining because it was an insufficient resolution. It provided merely for a cease-fire and nothing more. That was not good enough, because just as soon as that might become spent we would be back in the same position we were in before. There was abstention by the Canadian delegation because there was applied there something which hon. gentlemen opposite have very violently resented when it was applied here in a very modified form. The United Nations

[Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East).]

assembly applied closure and determined that there would be three speakers supporting the resolution, three speakers opposing the resolution and that the vote would then be taken. As we were neither supporting nor opposing the resolution, we could not be one of those three; and there was no move to amend the resolution.

**Mr. Fulton:** That is six times more generous than your form of closure. There were at least six speakers.

**Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):** The hon. gentleman has a queer idea of what is proper and what is generous. I leave his idea to be appreciated by those to whom he speaks elsewhere than in this house.

On that resolution there was no gratuitous or other condemnation by Canada but there has been an expression of regret that certain members of the United Nations had felt it necessary to take the law into their own hands when the matter was before the security council; and there was an expression of regret that what took place in the Middle East was used as a screen to obscure the horrible actions, the horrible international crimes, that were being committed in mid-Europe at the same time. 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.

That is what we regretted. We feel that there can come out of this situation one that will be better than that which existed previously. It is our hope and it has been our objective to get all those in the western alliance to which my hon. friend referred working together toward the common objective of a settlement of the mid-Eastern situation that will be lasting and that will involve the recognition of the existence of Israel as a state set up by the United Nations and something which the United Nations is in honour bound to defend and to see maintained. It is our hope that there will be some kind of a lasting settlement—I will not say a permanent one because permanence is rarely found in any human activities or human achievements—though it is difficult to find with whom in all those Arab nations a settlement could be made that would take into account the real interests of the population of each of those countries. It is difficult to find anyone who can form the kind of a government which would take the over-all broad view of the interests of the whole population and not the interests of a small group of the population.

But difficult as it may be, we cannot expect that the North African nations or some