

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 56/36

SPECIAL SESSION - 22ND PARLIAMENT

Canadian Participation in the United Nations
Emergency Force in the Middle East and the
Situation in Hungary

Text of the Speech from the Throne and Excerpts
from Statements by the Prime Minister, the Hon-
ourable Louis St. Laurent, the Honourable W.
Earl Rowe, Mr. M.J. Coldwell and Mr. Solon Low,
in Parliament on Monday, November 26.

Speech from the Throne

Delivering the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Fourth (Special Session) of the 22nd Parliament, the Governor General said:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

You have been summoned at this time because of the serious international situation arising out of hostilities in the Middle East and the events in Hungary.

Members of the House of Commons:

You will be asked to provide expressly that the provision for defence expenditures in the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1956, be used for the purposes of Canada's participation in the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East in fulfilment of our country's obligations to the United Nations Organization under the Charter. You will also be requested to authorize the provision of relief for the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

May Divine Providence continue to protect this nation, and to guide the Parliament of Canada in all its deliberations.

The address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was made by Mr. Gérard Légaré (Rimouski) and seconded by Mr. A.B. Weselak (Springfield).

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Official Opposition)

I know that the people of this country and hon. members of this House, especially members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, were shocked over the last week end on two different counts. The first was the strange attitude taken by the United States of America in the United Nations when despite the rather vigorous attitude of Canada's representatives the week before we had the almost embarrassing silence on Saturday night in connection with the issue then before the United Nations. As has been mentioned by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Weselak), some of the British and French troops have been moved from the Near East, but I understood that when the cease-fire agreement was concluded the one main and fundamental condition of that agreement was that there was to be an effective police force in the Near East before the British and French troops would move. Yet now they are asked to move forthwith.

Right Hon. Mr. Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain, has said that the British-French invasion of Egypt has blocked a communist plot in the Middle East, a plot which would have led to "the loss of countless lives and more other evils than we can even estimate." The record of the last few years truly gives us more reason to trust the Prime Minister of Britain than President Nasser of Egypt.

We are of course committed now to the United Nations and all its wide areas of operation. While there are grave differences of opinion in the United Nations organization, nevertheless all who are honestly striving and struggling for world peace are earnestly hoping that the worthy intentions and aspirations of that organization may not be sacrificed by abandoning the basic principles behind its creation. The fundamental and most important of these principles to prevent aggression and preserve peace was the principle of collective action. The United Nations organization of today seems at times to be united in name only.

If our Canadian troops are to be used as part of UN police forces, it is our duty to see that they are given a possible function toward a sound objective. We must never ask them merely to clear a course and police a route for

Colonel Nasser and his Russian comrades to pursue quietly and cunningly toward the diabolical purpose they have so boldly emphasized.

During the last session of parliament repeated requests were made by the opposition for information on Canada's interest in the Mediterranean crisis.

At that date, as evidence that the government had certainly not given careful consideration to the policy to be followed if the Suez canal crisis increased, there is the statement made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) on August 3 in Vancouver:

This is primarily a European matter. It is not a matter which particularly concerns Canada. We have no oil there. We don't use the canal for shipping.

If our government had been following the course of events in the Middle East, as we would expect it to do, it would surely not have been as "distressed and dismayed" as the Secretary of State for External Affairs said it was when he gave his press conference on October 31. An ostrich raising its head from the sand might have felt the regret and shocked surprise which apparently rent our Cabinet. I do not think a well-informed government, conscious of the implications of Soviet strength in the Middle East, would have been so surprised.

Whatever the division of opinion within the Cabinet as a result of the British and French ultimatum to Egypt and Israel on October 30, the idea put forward by the opposition through the hon. member for Prince Albert ten months ago in this House was hastily revived at last in the proposal to send an international emergency force to the danger area, even though it was merely scoffed off ten months ago. I submit it might have been better to organize it ten months ago than to wait until after the trouble had occurred.

I believe there is no disagreement among us regarding the desirability of forming a UN police force to police the Suez canal area pending a final settlement both between Egypt and Israel and also concerning the international status of the Suez canal. This party has over and over again emphasized the importance of the underlying and fundamental principle of the League of Nations as well as the United Nations. We have been on record to that effect time and time again. In the United Nations we need more than platitudes or bluffing. We need more action.

When it was finally announced 10 days ago that Canada was sending an administrative staff to the United Nations force, there was considerable surprise throughout Canada. This surprise turned into anger and dismay when it became clear that

the United Nations, through its Secretary-General, was allowing the Egyptian president Nasser to dictate or at least to exercise a veto over the exact composition of the United Nations emergency force. Surely the realization that Colonel Nasser was specifying what we might or might not contribute to the United Nations must have brought a feeling of humiliation and embarrassment to the members of this government.

I believe it is the solemn duty of the opposition in this House to insist that the whole story of Canada's participation in the United Nations emergency force be told. Canada's pride has been wounded by pretense and evasion. Surely we have not stumbled and blundered into a position in which our contribution to the United Nations emergency force is no longer dependent upon our own generous instincts and desire to preserve peace in the world.

I have mentioned the dangers which the free world is facing in the Middle East through Soviet aggression there. I know I need not remind this House that Soviet activities in the Middle East are all part of a pattern with the tragic events which have been taking place in Hungary during the past few weeks. Soviet domination of all its satellite countries is maintained only by force. Those at the head of affairs in the Kremlin are following the practices of Stalin's regime to dominate and extend the Soviet empire.

We have joined with the great majority of members of the United Nations in condemning Soviet aggression in Hungary, and particularly the removal by Soviet troops of thousands of Hungarians who had dared to fight for the freedom and independence of their country from foreign rule. It may be that the expression of strong United Nations disapproval of Soviet acts in Hungary will produce an ameliorating effect on the men in the Kremlin, but so far the Soviet Union does not seem to have been much impressed by the United Nations condemnation of its actions. No matter how strongly we have talked against them they have not even listened, and have only laughed at the suggestion.

I notice that our government has not been claiming very great credit for its role in helping Hungary through the United Nations. I do not know how it could. Having regard to the principles governing our security throughout the world in the past, surely we should realize that the interests of Canada in the Middle East and in Hungary are closely tied together. The attempt by the United Kingdom and France to limit Soviet expansion in the Middle East was crippled through what I believe to be the inept diplomacy of the United States in the role it played in the Suez canal crisis.

I hope that voices will be raised in this House to urge the government to take a substantial bloc of refugees as our contribution toward the relief of the great sufferings of the Hungarian people in their noble struggle to free their

ancient country. Anything less than this would be an insult to the people of Hungary and an embarrassment to people all across this dominion, because people from that country have contributed greatly to the development of this young country of Canada.

Many thousands of these brave people are today flooding Austria, those who are not shot and chopped down by the Russian army along the border, no doubt emphasizing the tragedy in that district. All one has to do is read the papers, and the contents of those papers are too terrible to repeat here. It should be within the knowledge of everyone here.

It is not my intention to delay this debate by speaking at great length. I do not look upon this as an issue concerning which we can come to parliament and rush in and rush out for the convenience of the government. This is a vital issue which touches the heart of every Canadian. It concerns the lives and hopes of these people and their children and their children yet unborn. I do not look upon this as a political issue, but Canada is disturbed, Canada is alarmed and Canada is shocked at the vacillation and complacency of this government in relation to this as well as many other matters. It is useless to hide behind the great shield of the United Nations. The United Nations is no stronger than the countries it embraces. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. Canada has failed dismally in its representation at the United Nations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move on behalf of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green):

That the following be added to the address.

That 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;

(2) have meekly followed the unrealistic policies of the United States of America and have thereby encouraged a truculent and defiant attitude on the part of the Egyptian dictator;

(3) have placed Canada in the humiliating position of accepting dictation from President Nasser;

(4) have failed to take swift and adequate action to extend refuge to the patriots of Hungary and other lands under the cruel Russian yoke.

Prime Minister L.S. St. Laurent

There has been some suggestion that Canada has been humiliated by Colonel Nasser. Canada has had no dealings whatsoever with Colonel Nasser. Canada has dealt with the United Nations and the United Nations in this instance have been represented by the Secretary-General and by another gentleman who is a very distinguished Canadian in whose patriotism as well as in whose wisdom this government has practically unlimited confidence. I refer to General Burns.

Originally there was this motion proposed which has been construed, and I think rightly so, as placing some blame on the Israelis, some blame on the French and some blame on the British for having taken the law into their own hands when what had to be dealt with was already before the Security Council of the United Nations. These gentlemen who utter these high-flown phrases seem to forget that the nations of the world signed the Charter of the United Nations and thereby undertook to use peaceful means to settle possible disputes and not to resort to the use of force.

I have been scandalized more than once by the attitude of the larger powers, the big powers as we call them, who have all too frequently treated the Charter of the United Nations as an instrument with which to regiment smaller nations and as an instrument which did not have to be considered when their own so-called vital interests were at stake. I have been told, with respect to the veto, that if the Russians had not insisted upon it the United States and the United Kingdom would have insisted upon it, because they could not allow this crowd of smaller nations to deal decisively with questions which concerned their vital interests.

An Hon. Member: Why should they?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Because the members of the smaller nations are human beings just as are their people; because the era when the supermen of Europe could govern the whole world has and is coming pretty close to an end.

It has been said that Canada has been humiliated by the action of Colonel Nasser and has been made to submit to the requirements of Colonel Nasser. That is just one of those wild assertions for which there is absolutely no foundation in fact. The original resolution provided that the United Nations in its efforts to make peace in the world would not start their efforts to make peace by making war. It was going to introduce a police force to supervise the observance of the cessation of hostilities, but it was going to do that with the consent of the country in which those forces were going to operate. It was not going to fight its way into that country. That was the resolution which was adopted without any opposition, although with a certain number of abstentions.

At that time the Secretary-General of the United Nations gave us the chance to participate in this force, and gave it to those who were willing and anxious, as we have been willing and anxious since 1945, to have a United Nations force ready to deal with recalcitrants in the fulfilment of their obligations under the charter. The suggestion was made that each nation should supply something like a battalion or other self-contained unit.

We consider that every battalion in the Canadian forces would feel it an honour to be called upon to perform this duty, but there was one battalion which was next in line in the rotation of service in connection with the Canadian contingent to the NATO forces in Europe, and that was the Queen's Own. It seemed to us that all the other battalions would recognize that that battalion, having been groomed and being on the point of being called upon to replace another battalion in Europe, would naturally be the one which we would consider and which we would think of first to take on this new duty in pursuit of the objectives of the United Nations. That battalion happened to be the Queen's Own Rifles. It was suggested, I am told, although we were not present at the negotiations, that Colonel Nasser said that that would be regarded by the Egyptians as being a battalion of the Queen of England.

An Hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Green: What about the Queen of Canada?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): In my view nothing is wrong with it except it is the Queen of Canada's Own Rifles. No Colonel Nasser nor anything that is said here, unless it amounts to a successful vote of no confidence in this government, nor anything published in the papers which are trying to belittle the actions of Canada in this instance, is going to persuade us that we have no right to have that glorious battalion continue to be called the Queen's Own Rifles.

Now, we felt that the sending of a battalion over into the Sinai desert was not just the right thing to do for men who had the training and who were anxious to perform the service for which we were sending them there. We did not think we should dump 900 or 1,000 men into a desert and think they were going to be looked after properly and were going to be kept in fit condition to perform the services for which they were going there. So we decided at once that in readying the Queen's Own Rifles for that expedition there would be added supplementary forces that could ensure for them the establishment that would be necessary for them to carry out their functions properly and, to make assurance doubly sure, we said we would have the Magnificent loaded with provisions, that we would have a hospital unit on it and that it would serve as a floating base so our men would be sure that until proper army services were organized on a land base in Egypt there would be the possibility for them to get the right kind of treatment,

the treatment necessary in order to enable them to fulfil their mission. It was pretty effectively demonstrated, in spite of what has been said by hon. gentlemen in some parts of the House about a lot of money having been spent on our forces with nothing to show for it, that within a very short time we were able to move everything required to put a battalion in the field, and indeed, we could put several battalions in the field if it were necessary to do so.

Whether that turned out to be the ultimate requirement of the commander of the United Nations force, we felt that something of that kind would be just as effective and as good an exercise as some of these simulated exercises that are constantly taking place to keep men in readiness to take the field if the occasion should require, because in this case there was something real for which the need for activity was being undertaken.

During that time there were negotiations going on, and there was some suggestion with regard to the placing of infantrymen. This again is something we have by way of hearsay concerning Mr. Hammarskjold's discussion with the Egyptian authorities when he went over there to secure their consent to the operation of this police force in their territory. It was suggested that the only place infantrymen could go at that time would be to Port Said; that there they would be coming to a place where there were large numbers of United Kingdom troops wearing the same uniform worn by our men; that our men might be taken for reinforcements being brought in for the British troops there instead of a part of the police force of the United Nations, and that this might give rise to incidents which would, at the outset of this operation, be an unfortunate occurrence.

That was something that had to be considered by the Secretary-General and by the commander of the United Nations force, and when he arrived in New York we were immediately informed that he felt he did not have in Egypt a proper base to administer at once any considerably increased number of infantrymen, and that what would be most useful to him at first would be a group of 250 to 300 engineers and signallers whom he could use in organizing and establishing his base. He also said that another thing that was very urgently required was air transport. He had only three civilian planes chartered from Swiss owners, and they had thought they could make two round trips per day but had found they could only make one. He said that was holding up the organization of the effective force that should be and that will be on Egyptian territory. We did have the air transports.

Again I say that, even had the commanding officer not been a Canadian we might have said as others might have said, "Here is our contribution. Make the best possible use you can of it." But it so happens that the man who is going to have the responsibility of command, is of course a United

Nations officer but is nevertheless a Canadian, a great Canadian who is regarded as such by the majority of our people, and we felt that it was our moral duty, in addition to our general duty to the United Nations, not to let that great Canadian down. We felt that if there were requirements he was not getting from others and which he needed to put himself in a position where he felt he could carry 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 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 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.

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 of the Asiatic nations will achieve in a decade the kind of democracy that it took many centuries for the United Kingdom, France and the other western democracies to achieve. You cannot bring about in that short order that which has been the product of not always successful and wise efforts, but of a process of trial and error that went on over a long period of time and brought about an attitude that changed the form of administration of the European countries from medieval feudalism to popular democracy; and it is not going to be easy to bring that about in any short time, though we possibly now move faster, especially in moving from one physical place to another, than we ever moved previously.

The next paragraph of the amendment reads:

- have meekly followed the unrealistic policies of the United States of America and have thereby encouraged a truculent and defiant attitude on the part of the Egyptian dictator.

Well, on two occasions resolutions supported by the United States Delegation have failed to get our support. If that is meekly following the unrealistic policies of the United States, then my understanding of words is not the same as the understanding of those who wrote this paragraph of the amendment to the motion for an address in reply.

The third paragraph reads:

- have placed Canada in the humiliating position of accepting dictation from President Nasser.

I believe I have dealt sufficiently with that to show that this is not a statement founded on fact, and whether there has been dictation to anybody from President Nasser there certainly has been none to us and there will certainly be none to us. The representations that have been made to our diplomatic representative in Egypt, whether they be sincere representations or not, are that Colonel Nasser was most anxious to maintain good will with the Canadian Government and was most appreciative of the suggestions the Canadian Government had made to deal with this situation. Whether or not that be true I do not know, but that is what he has said to our representative, who is not quite as gullible as this laughter from the other side of the House when I mention it would indicate.

Hungary

The next paragraph reads:

- have failed to take swift and adequate action to extend refuge to the patriots of Hungary and other lands under the cruel Russian yoke.

I am now going to disclose some correspondence that was not confidential correspondence. When these events in Hungary were at their unfortunate height I asked to have the Russian Ambassador call upon me. I had a message conveyed to him that I thought it would be in the interests of his country as well as in the interests of this country that he come and see me. He did. I told him what I thought of what was going on. I said relations had been improving, you know, with your country. I had not met the two of your Ministers who were over here but I had met one of them and I got a very favourable impression of the kind of man that your Minister of Fisheries, who came over here to repay the visit by our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Sinclair), last year, happened to be. After all, I said, it is none of our business what kind of Government

you have in your country if that is the kind of Government your people want, and it is none of your business to determine what kind of Government there should be in any other country if that does not happen to be the kind of Government the people of that country want.

I said I would be glad if he would convey the following message from me to Mr. Bulganin. It was dated November 13, and I make it public at the present time because it was only yesterday that an answer came from Mr. Bulganin. You will hear the answer in a moment and you will see, with that kind of answer, there is no reason for me not to disclose the representations with which I had attempted to have him comply. This is dated Ottawa, November 13, 1956:

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I consider it my urgent duty to let you know that the people and the Government of Canada have been profoundly shocked by the reports we have received of the actions your Government has taken in Hungary during the last few weeks. We have made our attitude clear in the position taken by Canada in voting for the United Nations resolutions on this subject. I wish to add my plea not only for rapid compliance on the part of the Soviet Government with these resolutions, but for a display even at this late date of moderation towards the unfortunate victims of these tragic events.

I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I speak for the whole people of Canada in expressing our horror at the suffering of the Hungarian people as a result of their efforts to obtain the freedom to choose their own type of Government. It is not, however, my present purpose to attempt to pass judgment on the actions that have been taken but to ask you, in the name of humanity, to use your influence to alleviate the sufferings of the Hungarian people and to permit competent international agencies and organizations to help in the urgent work of distributing food and caring for the sick. In this humanitarian work the Canadian Government and people are already giving material support wherever it is within their power to do so.

The Government and people of Canada have no desire to influence the form of Government chosen by the peoples of eastern Europe. Our only aim is that they should be free to do so, and that the Governments so chosen should steer their own independent courses, respecting the equal rights of all their neighbours and bearing in mind only the needs and wishes of their own people in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) Louis S. St. Laurent.

Later I got this answer, dated November 24. This, of course, is a translation which, I am told, is an official translation.

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

I have received your letter of November 13. The contents of your letter and also of your recent statements and of speeches of Canadian officials about situation in Hungary show that the Canadian Government seem to have one-sided, tendentious and unobjective information about developments in Hungary and about position of Soviet Union on this question.

I would like to note that revolutionary workers peasants Government of Hungary have shown in their statements that reactionary forces inside Hungary with active support of certain circles outside tried to overturn peoples' democratic regime in the country and establish a Horthy-fascist regime. The inner patriotic forces of Hungary came out in defence of peoples' democratic regime asking for help of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Treaty.

As concerning position of the Soviet Government on question of relations of Soviet Union with Hungary this has been fully set forth in "Declaration of Soviet Government on foundation for development and further strengthening of friendship and co-operation between Soviet Union and other Socialist States", published on October 31, 1956.

In your letter Mr. Prime Minister you raise the question of Soviet Government giving assistance to international organizations to make it possible for them to render assistance and help to Hungarian people in food and medicine. This question is fully within competence of Hungarian Government. As far as we know Government of the Hungarian Peoples' Republic has already positively solved this question and Hungarian Government has formally informed Secretary-General of United Nations about this.

Yours sincerely,

N.A. Bulganin.

This last statement has been, I think, verified by representatives of the United Nations, who have recently informed us that representatives of the Red Cross would now be admitted within Hungary to distribute food and medical supplies to those in need of such food and medical supplies.

That answers this other matter raised by the hon. gentleman now leading the official opposition. He says that \$200,000 was a paltry sum and that we have raised it from

\$200,000 to \$1 million. The original recommendation was for \$1 million, of which \$100,000 was to go to the Red Cross and \$100,000 to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to be used in the alleviation of the sufferings of refugees once they became refugees outside of Hungary. But at that time we were not disposed to ask Parliament to appropriate any of the taxpayers' money to be placed in the hands and under the control of any communist controlled Hungarian government to be used for the support of whatever name they went by and whatever democratic qualifications they chose to give themselves. We have had some experience, but not much, in seeing how supplies from other countries have been used in communist countries as propaganda for the regime that was bringing about the misery that we and other free nations were seeking to alleviate. As soon as we heard that supplies could be distributed under proper auspices, we went back to the original sum of \$1 million. The estimate that has been distributed, and that is now before the House, is for \$1 million to be applied, subject to the decisions of Treasury Board, and that is so Treasury Board will be able to make absolutely sure that everything coming from the use of that \$800,000 -- because \$100,000 is going to the Red Cross for the use of refugees outside of Hungary and \$100,000 is going to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees -- will be expended either by the Red Cross or by a United Nations agency that will have our full confidence in its desire and its ability to see that the assistance goes to those who have really been the victims of the horrible crimes that have been perpetrated against that nation in the last few weeks, and to no others.

That is why the item reads:

To provide, subject to the approval of the Treasury Board, assistance to the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary, \$1 million.

Well, I have dealt at greater length with this matter than I expected and at greater length than either the hon. gentleman who spoke before I did or I expected would be appropriate on this occasion. But since we have found that it was not agreeable to some hon. members to proceed at once to have all this discussion on the estimates where questions could be put and answers given, well, it probably has to be at this time; but whether it be now, or whether it be on the estimates, I hope it will be a decision of which the majority of the people in Canada would say that those who took part in it were able to rise above political partisanship in dealing with this question which is one of interest not only to our own free people but to the people of the whole free world.

I expect that there will be criticism as to the manner we have felt, in our lack of wisdom, to be the best way to do these things; but I hope there will be agreement that it is proper that we should discharge this obligation to the United Nations by an appropriate participation in the United Nations

forces and that it is proper that we should do our best to see that the Canadian who has been chosen by the United Nations to be the commander of that force is not let down, if we can prevent him from being let down by supplying him with what he thinks he requires and that he is not apt to get from other contributors to this United Nations force.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Leader of the C.C.F. Party)

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all aware that Parliament is meeting today under the shadow of a great international crisis, perhaps a greater crisis than the world has witnessed since September, 1939. The issues involved today are of such a nature that they might bring about even a third world war and therefore one is constrained to ask oneself, what does the country expect of this Parliament at the present time?

I think the people of this country expect that we should give unanimous and speedy approval to the further supplementary estimates that have been introduced this afternoon, and that this shall be done in order to meet the needs of our armed forces which are proceeding overseas and to meet the dreadful situation from which the refugees from Soviet terror in Hungary have fled.

I do not think I have ever felt more sorrowful than I felt as I watched the events following the adventure in the Suez area. There was not only the question of African and Asian opinion, there was the danger to the Commonwealth. I was relieved when I read a few days ago that Nehru had refused in the Indian Parliament to agree to a proposal that India should leave the Commonwealth. I think it would have been a tragedy if India left the Commonwealth, or if Pakistan or Ceylon withdrew.

This action has undermined the United Nations. As I have said on a number of occasions, it was with the deepest regret that I saw this action being undertaken in the manner in which it was. Certainly there was provocation, but that provocation should have been taken to the United Nations and pressed there. It is true also that the United States has some responsibility. I am not going into that at any length tonight because there is not sufficient time to do so. The changing and tortuous policies of the United States certainly contributed to what has happened in the Middle East.

It will be said that the genesis of the recent moves on the part of Britain and France was the attacks made by Israel on Egypt. As one who has been interested in following the chain of circumstances in Israel over the last several years I for one can understand the position in which that country found itself on October 29. As we know, this was the culmination of a long dispute. Israel had suffered considerable provocation, as we all know. None the less I am sorry that the action was taken because it did bring about a situation that today is causing grave concern all over the world.

There are certain constructive suggestions that I think Canada should now be endeavouring to place before the United Nations in order that the Middle Eastern situation may be cleaned up once and for all, over a period of time, of course, and peace established in that area. If there is, as we have, a cease-fire and a United Nations force there, then we should endeavour to suggest ways and means to prevent an outbreak in the future.

In the first place, we feel that the unstable conditions which led to the outbreak of fighting between Egypt and Israel are not confined to that section on the borders of Israel. The dangers of a similar outbreak occurring can be found on the frontiers with Jordan, Syria and Lebanon. We believe that some action should be taken now by the United Nations to extend police force action to those areas to provide an effective guarantee against the violation of peace there while a general settlement of the outstanding problems of the area is being arrived at. Let us not again be in the position of sending in a police force to stop the fighting after it has started.

That is the weak position in which we are today. If we had had a United Nations Police Force as was envisaged under the Charter of the United Nations, that police force could have stepped in at any time there appeared to be the possibility of war in any area. We have not that force. We are building up a force now through the Assembly instead of through the Security Council because the Security Council failed to act.

But, we believe that this police force must be followed by some comprehensive economic settlement. A settlement must provide first of all for the recognition by the Arab States, including Egypt, of the state of Israel, and for the signing of a Peace Treaty with Israel under which Israel's borders will be guaranteed. The blockade of Israel should be lifted and free passage through the Canal, when passage is restored, should be available to Israeli shipping. We feel that no solution to the Suez Canal problem can be achieved unless this is done.

We also realize that there are a good many other aspects of the economic situation in the Middle East. Egypt herself, with a population which is underfed and under-privileged, requires help in the irrigation of that area. As a matter of fact, I believe that the United Nations might consider setting up an international authority in agreement with the countries involved such as the Sudan and right down through Ethiopia, Egypt and so on, comparable to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States, in order to use the waters of that area for watering the desert and feeding the people of Egypt and the adjacent countryside just in the same way as I believe that, once peace is attained among Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria, a similar authority might be set up to utilize the waters of the Jordan. Those of us

who have seen the waters of the Jordan and know how they could be utilized if only an agreement could be reached among the nations along the river know perfectly well that the waters could be used to bring food, prosperity and so on to the people of that general area. These are some of the things that need to be done.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Leader of the Social Credit Party)

Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be one of the most serious matters that has ever come before this Assembly. I look upon the present situation as one that is fraught with grave danger, not only to our own country but to the other countries of the world. Because of the fact that this is a most serious time, I approach the present assignment with some diffidence. I would not want anything that I say to complicate matters, either for our own country or for the United Nations in the tremendous task that faces it at the present time. Although there are many vexatious domestic problems that face our Canadian people, problems demanding early solution, yet uppermost in their minds is the Middle East problem; the rape of Hungary and the bestiality of Russia; the about-face that we have seen that country make in these last few weeks. The people in all parts of Canada expected Parliament, without delay, to get down to the business of taking action that is carefully calculated to bring peace to the Middle East, to provide the much-needed assistance to the oppressed and persecuted people of Hungary, and to do our utmost to relieve the suffering and uncertainties that have been heaped upon so many of these Hungarian patriots who have demonstrated that they love liberty more than they love life.

I contend that the eyes of the world are upon Canada today, and upon this Parliament. As the nation that took the lead in moving the resolution in the United Nations to set up an International Police Force, the actions of this Parliament are being watched with more than common interest and expectation. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me to have been better for this Parliament to show by actions, not by millions of meaningless words, that we do indeed want fast, effective action to provide a solid foundation for peace and security in the years ahead. I think this is no time for playing politics. This is a time for statesman-like soul searching and truth seeking of the most intensive kind. In my judgment we ought to be setting party politics aside in an effort to find the maximum of common ground for swift action in the interests of our own country and of all mankind.

My colleagues and I firmly believe that the only way out of the present confused, dangerous and complicated set of circumstances is to seek earnestly for God's guidance to enable us, the Parliament of Canada, to find what is right; and then to have the courage to do it when we find it. If ever there was a time in man's knowledge when vision and understanding have to be buttressed by faith and humility,

I think that time is now. So Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention at this session to carp or to be unduly critical or to strain to find fault. We want to be critical where that is required in the interests of good government and good business, but certainly we are not going to inject party political manoeuvring into these proceedings, because this is not the time for it.

Some criticism has been levelled at the Government regarding the calling of Parliament. My own judgment is that there can be little criticism levelled at the Government on the ground of not having called Parliament earlier than it did.

There are some criticisms that can be levelled at the Government in connection with their actions to date. I think it would be unwise for us to withhold them. As I said before, it is not political criticism that I want to level. I think it is a pity that the Government did not find it possible to provide Britain and France with moral backing when they intervened in the Middle East. I said so on the very day that Britain and France intervened.

Well, this afternoon the Prime Minister said that his Government was critical of Britain and France. I am not sure he used the word "critical", but at any rate it amounted to that. It amounted to criticism of Britain, France and Israel because, he said, they had signed the Charter of the United Nations agreeing not to take the law into their own hands. I think that is true. Is it not also true that the United Nations signatories pledged themselves to speedy intervention to stop aggression wherever it raised its head? Have they done it? When there seemed to be no hope whatever that they would do so or were equipped to do so, then under the circumstances the question arose what other alternative was left to Britain and France? I think we have to keep that in our minds as we proceed.

What has the United Nations done to clear away the problems and the provocations, indeed the aggressions, in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker? I remind the members of this Assembly that the United Nations did nothing until Britain and France moved to protect their interests and to keep Israel and Egypt apart. It seemed to take a shock to move the United Nations to take any action that was worth while. I would not brand Britain and France as aggressors, as many have done.

Rather than blame those countries I believe we should seek for the fundamental causes of deterioration in the world situation, and in the Middle Eastern situation that is our immediate concern now. in the weaknesses and the frailties of the United Nations. The Prime Minister said this afternoon that he believed what was happening in the Middle East was used as a shield by Russia to cover its horrible rape of Hungary. I remind the Prime Minister that the Russian turn-about from her decision to remove her troops from Hungary came only when

Western solidarity was shattered by the bitter and angry rebuke of Britain and France, first by the United States, followed by the United Nations. It was only when Russia saw that solidarity had broken down that she decided to move in and to take advantage of it. She has always done so.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has warned us time and again that that is exactly what Russia will do, and he has appealed to us, therefore, to work for the solidarity of the Western nations in the hope that through strength we could stop Russia's advance. That is the only thing she understands. But here Canada was rebuking Britain and France, placing ourselves on the side of Russia and following a very foolish United States when she was locked in the throes of an election, when she could not do anything effective. We allowed ourselves to help the U.S. shatter Western solidarity, the very thing we ought to have been buttressing and bolstering with all our strength.

I repeat, the weaknesses and the vacillations of the United Nations have caused the free world, step by step, year after year, to retreat steadily before a completely aggressive Russian imperialism, one that will not be stopped except by a show of solid force.

Well, where do we stand with regard to the proposal of the Government of Canada to provide a unit of approximately battalion strength to the emergency police force for the Middle East? I think, Mr. Speaker, it was the only alternative that could be found to action by individual nations, and I have to give the Secretary of State for External Affairs credit for having suggested that the United Nations set up a police force for emergency action in the Middle East.

That is the attitude we have toward the police force, but there is one thing I do want to say in regard to such a force. I would warn the Government of Canada never to part with the right to commit or to withdraw such forces, according to their discretion; never to grant to the United Nations the actual sovereignty over this force, and as long as you do that you are going to have our support.

We would like to see bolder action. We do not want to see this debate extended too long. We would like to see the thing done and get the force committed when the United Nations Commander wants to have them.

So far as Mr. Nasser is concerned, I want to warn the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his colleague the Minister of National Defence, that Mr. Nasser should not be allowed to dictate the terms, not by any means. I think Mr. Hammarskjold should be stiffened up in that regard. I am just a little bit afraid, from what I have read about his negotiations thus far, that he has been a little too timorously diffident about dealing with Mr. Nasser.

If the United Nations is going to set up a police force in Egypt, then they ought to set it up and get it in there at once. They should say "This is the way it is going to be handled", and it should be stationed along the entire length of the Canal. It should stay there until the difficulties over the Canal have been settled and some international supervision has been settled that will be satisfactory to the shipping nations of the world. Until such time as a right good start has been made on a complete solution of the outstanding problems between Israel and the Arab nations in the east, I say it should not be withdrawn.

But there is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we should be careful about. The United Nations should be prepared to allow Britain and France to retain their forces in Egypt until such time as the United Nations Police Force has been completely established there and put in full possession of the Canal Zone. Nothing else can possibly solve the difficulty. Whether or not Mr. Nasser likes it completely, we have to remember that about all the United Nations has done thus far has been to buttress Nasser's threatening position. That is about all, and he is coming off the victor and he is beginning to feel that he is the victor. Therefore let us be mighty careful about it. I am not satisfied that 6,000 men, as has been suggested, is a large enough force. My own feeling is that it would require not less than 18,000 or 20,000 men to do the job as it ought to be done, so let us not be thinking in terms of a mere 6,000.

May I suggest that Canada as a member of the United Nations must bear some responsibility for allowing the Middle East situation to drift along as it has, with no really serious effort being made to solve the outstanding problems between Israel and the Arab countries. May I remind the House, Mr. Speaker, that in 1947 Canada went along with an insistent United States leading a half reluctant United Nations. I use the word "reluctant" for the reason that about half of them were taking a stand against the establishment of Israel under the circumstances which then existed and half of them were more or less willing to go along. It was a difficult situation, I know, but Canada went along with an insistent United States in 1947 in establishing Israel without granting the people in that area the right to self-determination. I would also remind the House that the right to self-determination is the very cornerstone upon which the principles of the United Nations are based.

When Israel was established Canada went along with it and, of course, we angered the Arab states right then and there and they determined they were going to destroy Israel. When we did go along with the establishment of Israel I say it was the responsibility of the United Nations to see the thing through, and when I say that I mean this. When trouble arose between Israel and Egypt and the other Arab nations in

1948 and the war of extermination, from the point of view of the Arabs, was visited upon Israel, the United Nations left the problems hanging straight in the air, left them dangling. Nothing whatever was done to bring to a sensible conclusion the outstanding problems and points of dispute between those nations.

There were four main points of dispute, and I think they have been mentioned here today. You will remember that in 1947 Egypt took the position that Israel should never be allowed to have a vessel pass through the Suez Canal, and they never have since that time. That was a direct violation of the international convention of 1888. Although it was not right, nothing was done about it. What did the other nations do to see that Israel had a fair chance to use the Canal? They did nothing. This situation drifted from bad to worse.

What did they do concerning the question of the armistice lines? Some of the silliest lines were drawn by the armistice commission of that day, and they have just been allowed to stand there. For instance, armistice lines were drawn that divided the city of Jerusalem into two parts in such a fashion that the Jewish University on Mount Scopus was included in Jordan. I could name a score of other very foolish things that were done in connection with armistice lines, but nothing has been done to settle these outstanding problems and they have been a source of irritation since 1947.

What has been done about finding a solution to the refugee problem? Originally approximately 700,000 or 750,000 Arabs were either thrown out of Israel or went out because of fear, or were urged to go out because of propaganda. They found themselves in refugee camps on the site of the ancient city of Jericho and in the Gaza strip. They have just been sitting there demoralized for all these years. Nothing has been done to settle these people permanently.

Finally, what has been done about the necessary economic build-up of the Arab states where the standard of living is so low? What has been done about finding a solution to the Jordan waters problem? All these problems need to be given very careful consideration, and until they are settled there can be no hope for peace in the Middle East.

It was fortunate, in my judgment, that something happened to shock the United Nations into action at the time these events occurred, because since that time we have discovered a terrific Russian build-up in the area. We know what are her long-range ideas. Russia needs oil. Russia's vast industrialization programme makes her need imperative. She wants the oil in the Middle East. The oil in Baku and other areas accessible to her is not going to be sufficient for her needs. At the same time Russia wants to weaken NATO and destroy it if possible. One of the best ways to accomplish this is to cut off the oil supply from the Middle East.

I think there is no question about that at all.

It was fortunate in the extreme that the intelligence of Israel, Great Britain and France indicated the fact of the Russian build-up; and something has happened, it seems to me, which in the long run will be of great benefit to the world.

Let me say very quickly a few words about Hungary. I think we ought to be doing everything we possibly can to relieve the suffering of those Hungarian people who have been dislocated and driven from their homes, and who are suffering for want of food and medical supplies. I think Canada should open her doors wide to these people.

This is one thing -- and I address my remarks to the attention of the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration -- that could have been handled more effectively. I think we should have sent into the areas around the borders of Hungary receiving teams that could have quickly given help to any of these refugees who found their way across the borders of Hungary. They should have been brought into this country, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar mentioned, under a completely open-door policy. These people are patriots and in the eyes of the world they have given a demonstration such as few people in the world have given. We should move to their aid as quickly as we possibly can.

As has already been said, the million dollar appropriation for assistance to Hungary is a good start. I think we should be prepared to give much more when it is required.

In conclusion I would like to sum up how I view the situation at the present time and in doing so I cannot find better words than those which were used by Selwyn Lloyd. These are the words he used:

British American differences over the Middle East should not be taken too tragically.

I think that is right.

On the other hand, it would be equally wrong to minimize them and pretend that there is not a job to be done in restoring the intimacy of our alliance.

The crisis may have created a situation of great opportunity which may not recur again. A war has been rapidly stopped: an international force has been created: the Russian penetration has been unmasked. The situation can be turned to good account by the free world. Whatever may be the thought of the past let us, the United States and the countries of the Commonwealth, now press forward with firmness together and with resolution, to use that opportunity and to

preserve the gains. Thus our friendship and co-operation will once more prove the great hope of the world.

The history of Britain and France has been one of a long succession of demonstrations of sacrifice and noble ideals devoted to the achievement of justice and freedom in this world. I have not lost faith in those countries as yet, and I think we ought to be doing everything we can to bolster their determination once more to re-establish the solidarity of the free world wherever we possibly can.

S/C