



Canada

# Debates of the Senate

OFFICIAL REPORT  
(HANSARD)

---

THE HONOURABLE WISHART McLEA ROBERTSON, P.C.,  
SPEAKER

---

1956-57

FOURTH (SPECIAL) SESSION,  
TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT  
5 ELIZABETH II

---

*The Session was opened on November 26, 1956  
and was prorogued on January 8, 1957*

---

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.  
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1957

## THE MINISTRY

According to Precedence

JANUARY 8, 1957

- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LOUIS STEPHEN  
ST. LAURENT, M.P. .... Prime Minister and President of the  
Privy Council.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE CLARENCE  
DECATUR HOWE, M.P. .... Minister of Trade and Commerce and  
Minister of Defence Production.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE JAMES  
GARFIELD GARDINER, M.P. .... Minister of Agriculture.
- THE HONOURABLE PAUL JOSEPH JAMES  
MARTIN, M.P. .... Minister of National Health and  
Welfare.
- THE HONOURABLE JAMES J. McCANN,  
M.P. .... Minister of National Revenue.
- THE HONOURABLE MILTON FOWLER  
GREGG, M.P. .... Minister of Labour.
- THE HONOURABLE LESTER BOWLES  
PEARSON, M.P. .... Secretary of State for External  
Affairs.
- THE HONOURABLE STUART SINCLAIR  
GARSON, M.P. .... Minister of Justice and Attorney  
General.
- THE HONOURABLE ROBERT HENRY  
WINTERS, M.P. .... Minister of Public Works.
- THE HONOURABLE HUGUES LAPOINTE,  
M.P. .... Minister of Veterans Affairs and  
Postmaster General.
- THE HONOURABLE WALTER EDWARD  
HARRIS, M.P. .... Minister of Finance and Receiver  
General.
- THE HONOURABLE GEORGE PRUDHAM,  
M.P. .... Minister of Mines and Technical  
Surveys.
- THE HONOURABLE JAMES SINCLAIR, M.P. Minister of Fisheries.
- THE HONOURABLE RALPH OSBORNE  
CAMPNEY, M.P. .... Minister of National Defence.

SENATOR THE HONOURABLE WILLIAM ROSS MACDONALD .....	Solicitor General and Leader of the Government in the Senate.
THE HONOURABLE JOHN WHITNEY PICKERSGILL, M.P. ....	Minister of Citizenship and Immigration.
THE HONOURABLE JEAN LESAGE, M.P. ..	Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources.
THE HONOURABLE GEORGE CARLYLE MARLER, M.P. ....	Minister of Transport.
THE HONOURABLE ROCH PINARD, M.P. ..	Secretary of State.

---

#### PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

ROBERT McCUBBIN, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Agriculture.
J. WATSON MACNAUGHT, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Fisheries.
J. A. BLANCHETTE, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Labour.
W. M. BENIDICKSON, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Finance.
L. LANGLOIS, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Transport.
J. H. DICKEY, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Defence Production.
W. G. WEIR, M.P. ....	to the Prime Minister.
C. E. BENNETT, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Veterans Affairs.
F. G. ROBERTSON, M.P. ....	to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.
MAURICE BOURGET, M.P. ....	to the Minister of Public Works.
T. A. M. KIRK, M.P. ....	to the Postmaster General.
LUCIEN CARDIN, M.P. ....	to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.
PAUL HELLYER, M.P. ....	to the Minister of National Defence.

---

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICERS OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL

R. B. BRYCE .....	Clerk of the Privy Council and Secre- tary to the Cabinet.
A. M. HILL .....	Assistant Clerk of the Privy Council.

# SENATORS OF CANADA

ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

JANUARY 8, 1957

THE HONOURABLE WISHART McLEA ROBERTSON, P.C., SPEAKER

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
ARTHUR C. HARDY, P.C.....	Leeds.....	Brockville, Ont.
WILLIAM H. McGUIRE.....	East York.....	Toronto, Ont.
DONAT RAYMOND.....	De la Vallière.....	Montreal, Que.
CAIRINE R. WILSON.....	Rockcliffe.....	Ottawa, Ont.
ARTHUR MARCOTTE.....	Ponteix.....	Ponteix, Sask.
RALPH BYRON HORNER.....	Blaine Lake.....	Blaine Lake, Sask.
WALTER MORLEY ASELTINE.....	Rosetown.....	Rosetown, Sask.
FELIX P. QUINN.....	Bedford-Halifax.....	Bedford, N.S.
JOHN T. HAIG.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg, Man.
JOHN WALLACE DE B. FARRIS.....	Vancouver South.....	Vancouver, B.C.
ADRIAN K. HUGESSEN.....	Inkerman.....	Montreal, Que.
NORMAN P. LAMBERT.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa, Ont.
ARTHUR LUCIEN BEAUBIEN.....	Provencher.....	St. Jean Baptiste, Man.
ARISTIDE BLAIS.....	St. Albert.....	Edmonton, Alta.
CHARLES BENJAMIN HOWARD.....	Wellington.....	Sherbrooke, Que.
SALTER ADRIAN HAYDEN.....	Toronto.....	Toronto, Ont.
NORMAN McLEOD PATERSON.....	Thunder Bay.....	Fort William, Ont.
JOSEPH JAMES DUFFUS.....	Peterborough West.....	Peterborough, Ont.
WILLIAM DAUM EULER, P.C.....	Waterloo.....	Kitchener, Ont.
LÉON MERCIER GOUIN.....	De Salaberry.....	Montreal, Que.

## SENATORS—ACCORDING TO SENIORITY

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THOMAS VIEN, P.C.....	De Lorimier.....	Outremont, Que.
WILLIAM RUPERT DAVIES.....	Kingston.....	Kingston, Ont.
JAMES PETER MCINTYRE.....	Mount Stewart.....	Mount Stewart, P.E.I.
GORDON PETER CAMPBELL.....	Toronto.....	Toronto, Ont.
WISHART McLEA ROBERTSON, P.C. (Speaker) ..	Shelburne.....	Truro, N.S.
TÉLÉSPHORE DAMIEN BOUCHARD.....	The Laurentides.....	St. Hyacinthe, Que.
ARMAND DAIGLE.....	Mille Isles.....	Montreal, Que.
CYRILLE VAILLANCOURT.....	Kennebec.....	Lévis, Que.
JACOB NICOL.....	Bedford.....	Sherbrooke, Que.
THOMAS ALEXANDER CRERAR, P.C.....	Churchill.....	Winnipeg, Man.
WILLIAM HORACE TAYLOR.....	Norfolk.....	R. R. 3, Brantford, Ont.
FRED WILLIAM GERSHAW.....	Medicine Hat.....	Medicine Hat, Alta.
JOHN POWER HOWDEN.....	St. Boniface.....	Norwood Grove, Man.
VINCENT DUPUIS.....	Rigaud.....	Montreal, Que.
CHARLES L. BISHOP.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa, Ont.
JOHN JAMES KINLEY.....	Queens-Lunenburg.....	Lunenburg, N.S.
CLARENCE JOSEPH VENIOT.....	Gloucester.....	Bathurst, N.B.
ARTHUR WENTWORTH ROEBUCK.....	Toronto-Trinity.....	Toronto, Ont.
JOHN ALEXANDER McDONALD.....	Kings.....	Halifax, N.S.
ALEXANDER NEIL McLEAN.....	Southern New Brunswick..	Saint John, N.B.
GEORGE PERCIVAL BURCHILL.....	Northumberland-Miramichi	South Nelson, N.B.
JEAN MARIE DESSUREAULT.....	Stadacona.....	Quebec, Que.
PAUL HENRI BOUFFARD.....	Grandville.....	Quebec, Que.
JAMES GRAY TURGEON.....	Cariboo.....	Vancouver, B.C.
STANLEY STEWART McKEEN.....	Vancouver.....	Vancouver, B.C.
THOMAS FARQUHAR.....	Algoma.....	Little Current, Ont.
JOSEPH WILLIE COMEAU.....	Clare.....	Comeauville, N.S.
THOMAS H. WOOD.....	Regina.....	Regina, Sask.
JAMES ANGUS MacKINNON, P.C.....	Edmonton.....	Edmonton, Alta.
THOMAS VINCENT GRANT.....	Montague.....	Montague, P.E.I.
WILLIAM ALEXANDER FRASER.....	Trenton.....	Trenton, Ont.
WILLIAM HENRY GOLDING.....	Huron-Perth.....	Seaforth, Ont.

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
GEORGE H. BARBOUR.....	Prince.....	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
ALEXANDER BOYD BAIRD.....	St. John's.....	St. John's, Nfld.
RAY PETTEN.....	Bonavista.....	St. John's, Nfld..
THOMAS REID.....	New Westminster.....	New Westminster, B.C.
J. WESLEY STAMBAUGH.....	Bruce.....	Bruce, Alta.
GORDON B. ISNOR.....	Halifax-Dartmouth.....	Halifax, N.S.
CHARLES G. HAWKINS.....	Milford-Hants.....	Milford Station, N.S.
CALVERT C. PRATT.....	St. John's West.....	St. John's, Nfld.
MICHAEL G. BASHA.....	West Coast.....	Curling, Nfld.
MARIANA BEAUCHAMP JODOIN.....	Sorel.....	Montreal, Que.
MURIEL McQUEEN FERGUSSON.....	Fredericton.....	Fredericton, N.B.
ALLAN L. WOODROW.....	Toronto-Centre.....	Toronto, Ont.
FREDERICK GORDON BRADLEY, P.C.....	Bonavista-Twillingate.....	Bonavista, Nfld.
WILLIAM ROSS MACDONALD, P.C.....	Brantford.....	Brantford, Ont.
JOSEPH ARTHUR BRADETTE.....	Cochrane.....	Cochrane, Ont.
LEONARD DAVID SWEZEY TREMBLAY.....	Lauzon.....	St. Malachie, Que.
SARTO FOURNIER.....	De Lanaudière.....	Montreal, Que.
AUREL D. LÉGER.....	Kent.....	Grande Digue, N.B.
JOHN J. CONNOLLY.....	Ottawa West.....	Ottawa, Ont.
NANCY HODGES.....	Victoria.....	Victoria, B.C.
DONALD CAMERON.....	Banff.....	Edmonton, Alta.
WILLIAM M. WALL.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg, Man.
DAVID A. CROLL.....	Toronto-Spadina.....	Toronto, Ont.
THOMAS D'ARCY LEONARD.....	Toronto-Rosedale.....	Toronto, Ont.
FRED A. McGRAND.....	Sunbury.....	Fredericton Junction, N.B.
CALIXTE F. SAVOIE.....	L'Acadie.....	Moncton, N.B.
DONALD SMITH.....	Queens-Shelburne.....	Liverpool, N.S.
HAROLD CONNOLLY.....	Halifax North.....	Halifax, N.S.
FLORENCE ELSIE INMAN.....	Murray Harbour.....	Montague, P.E.I.
HARTLAND DE MONTARVILLE MOLSON.....	Alma.....	Montreal, Que.
CHARLES GAVAN POWER, P.C.....	Gulf.....	St. Pacome, Que.
JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT.....	De la Durantaye.....	Rivière du Loup, Que.
SYDNEY JOHN SMITH.....	Kamloops.....	Kamloops, B.C.
AUSTIN CLAUDE TAYLOR.....	Westmorland.....	Salisbury, N. B.
WILLIAM ALBERT BOUCHER.....	Prince Albert.....	Prince Albert, Sask.
HENRI CHARLES BOIS.....	Montarville.....	St. Bruno, Que.

# SENATORS OF CANADA

## ALPHABETICAL LIST

JANUARY 8, 1957

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
ASELTINE, W. M.....	Rosetown.....	Rosetown, Sask.
BAIRD, A. B.....	St. John's.....	St. John's, Nfld.
BARBOUR, GEORGE H.....	Prince.....	Charlottetown, P.E.I.
BASHA, MICHAEL G.....	West Coast.....	Curling, Nfld.
BEAUBIEN, ARTHUR L.....	Provencher.....	St. Jean Baptiste, Man.
BISHOP, CHARLES L.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa, Ont.
BLAIS, ARISTIDE.....	St. Albert.....	Edmonton, Alta.
BOIS, HENRI C.....	Montarville.....	St. Bruno, Que.
BOUCHARD, T. D.....	The Laurentides.....	St. Hyacinthe, Que.
BOUCHER, WILLIAM A.....	Prince Albert.....	Prince Albert, Sask.
BOUFFARD, PAUL H.....	Grandville.....	Quebec, Que.
BRADETTE, JOSEPH A.....	Cochrane.....	Cochrane, Ont.
BRADLEY, F. GORDON, P.C.....	Bonavista-Twillingate.....	Bonavista, Nfld.
BURCHILL, G. PERCIVAL.....	Northumberland-Miramichi.....	South Nelson, N.B.
CAMERON, DONALD.....	Banff.....	Edmonton, Alta.
CAMPBELL, G. PETER.....	Toronto.....	Toronto, Ont.
COMEAU, J. W.....	Clare.....	Comeauville, N.S.
CONNOLLY, HAROLD.....	Halifax North.....	Halifax, N.S.
CONNOLLY, JOHN J.....	Ottawa West.....	Ottawa, Ont.
CRERAR, T. A., P.C.....	Churchill.....	Winnipeg, Man.
CROLL, DAVID A.....	Toronto-Spadina.....	Toronto, Ont.
DAIGLE, ARMAND.....	Mille Isles.....	Montreal, Que.
DAVIES, W. RUPERT.....	Kingston.....	Kingston, Ont.
DESSUREAULT, J. M.....	Stadacona.....	Quebec, Que.
DUFFUS, J. J.....	Peterborough West.....	Peterborough, Ont.

## SENATORS—ALPHABETICAL LIST

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
DUPUIS, VINCENT.....	Rigaud.....	Montreal, Que.
EULER, W. D., P.C.....	Waterloo.....	Kitchener, Ont.
FARQUHAR, THOMAS.....	Algoma.....	Little Current, Ont.
FARRIS, J. W. DE B.....	Vancouver South.....	Vancouver, B.C.
FERGUSSON, MURIEL MCQ.....	Fredericton.....	Fredericton, N.B.
FOURNIER, SARTO.....	De Lanaudière.....	Montreal, Que.
FRASER, WILLIAM A.....	Trenton.....	Trenton, Ont.
GERSHAW, F. W.....	Medicine Hat.....	Medicine Hat, Alta.
GOLDING, WILLIAM H.....	Huron-Perth.....	Seaforth, Ont.
GOUIN, L. M.....	De Salaberry.....	Montreal, Que.
GRANT, THOMAS V.....	Montague.....	Montague, P.E.I.
HAIG, JOHN T.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg, Man.
HARDY, ARTHUR C., P.C.....	Leeds.....	Brockville, Ont.
HAWKINS, CHARLES G.....	Milford-Hants.....	Milford Station, N.S.
HAYDEN, SALTER A.....	Toronto.....	Toronto, Ont.
HODGES, NANCY.....	Victoria.....	Victoria, B.C.
HORNER, R. B.....	Blaine Lake.....	Blaine Lake, Sask.
HOWARD, CHARLES B.....	Wellington.....	Sherbrooke, Que.
HOWDEN, JOHN P.....	St. Boniface.....	Norwood Grove, Man.
HUGESSEN, A. K.....	Inkerman.....	Montreal, Que.
INMAN, F. ELSIE.....	Murray Harbour.....	Montague, P.E.I.
ISNOR, GORDON B.....	Halifax-Dartmouth.....	Halifax, N.S.
JODOIN, MARIANA B.....	Sorel.....	Montreal, Que.
KINLEY, JOHN J.....	Queens-Lunenburg.....	Lunenburg, N.S.
LAMBERT, NORMAN P.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa, Ont.
LÉGER, AUREL D.....	Kent.....	Grande Digue, N.B.
LEONARD, T. D'ARCY.....	Toronto-Rosedale.....	Toronto, Ont.
MACDONALD, W. ROSS, P.C.....	Brantford.....	Brantford, Ont.
MACKINNON, JAMES A., P.C.....	Edmonton.....	Edmonton, Alta.
MARCOITTE, ARTHUR.....	Ponteix.....	Ponteix, Sask.
MCDONALD, JOHN A.....	Kings.....	Halifax, N.S.
MCGRAND, FRED A.....	Sunbury.....	Fredericton Junction, N.B.
MCGUIRE, WILLIAM H.....	East York.....	Toronto, Ont.
MCINTYRE, JAMES P.....	Mount Stewart.....	Mount Stewart, P.E.I.
MCKEEN, STANLEY S.....	Vancouver.....	Vancouver, B.C.
MCLEAN, A. NEIL.....	Southern New Brunswick..	Saint John, N.B.
MOLSON, H. DE M.....	Alma.....	Montreal, Que.

SENATORS—ALPHABETICAL LIST

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
NICOL, JACOB.....	Bedford.....	Sherbrooke, Que.
PATERSON, NORMAN MCL.....	Thunder Bay.....	Fort William, Ont.
PETTEN, RAY.....	Bonavista.....	St. John's, Nfld.
POULIOT, JEAN-FRANÇOIS.....	De la Durantaye.....	Rivière du Loup, Que.
POWER, C. G., P.C.....	Gulf.....	St. Pacome, Que.
PRATT, CALVERT C.....	St. John's West.....	St. John's, Nfld.
QUINN, FELIX P.....	Bedford-Halifax.....	Bedford, N.S.
RAYMOND, DONAT.....	De la Vallière.....	Montreal, Que.
REID, THOMAS.....	New Westminster.....	New Westminster, B.C.
ROBERTSON, WISHART McLEA, P.C. (Speaker).	Shelburne.....	Truro, N.S.
ROEBUCK, ARTHUR W.....	Toronto-Trinity.....	Toronto, Ont.
SAVOIE, CALIXTE F.....	L'Acadie.....	Moncton, N.B.
SMITH, DONALD.....	Queens-Shelburne.....	Liverpool, N.S.
SMITH, SYDNEY J.....	Kamloops.....	Kamloops, B.C.
STAMBAUGH, J. WESLEY.....	Bruce.....	Bruce, Alta.
TAYLOR, AUSTIN C.....	Westmorland.....	Salisbury, N.B.
TAYLOR, WILLIAM H.....	Norfolk.....	R. R. 3, Brantford, Ont.
TREMBLAY, LEONARD.....	Lauzon.....	St. Malachie, Que.
TURGEON, GRAY.....	Cariboo.....	Vancouver, B.C.
VAILLANCOURT, CYRILLE.....	Kennebec.....	Lévis, Que.
VENIOT, CLARENCE J.....	Gloucester.....	Bathurst, N.B.
VIEN, THOMAS, P.C.....	De Lorimier.....	Outremont, Que.
WALL, WILLIAM M.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg, Man.
WILSON, CAIRINE R.....	Rockcliffe.....	Ottawa, Ont.
WOOD, THOMAS H.....	Regina.....	Regina, Sask.
WOODROW, ALLAN L.....	Toronto-Centre.....	Toronto, Ont.

# SENATORS OF CANADA

BY PROVINCES

JANUARY 8, 1957

## ONTARIO—24

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
1 ARTHUR C. HARDY, P.C.....	Leeds.....	Brockville.
2 WILLIAM H. MCGUIRE.....	East York.....	Toronto.
3 CAIRINE R. WILSON.....	Rockcliffe.....	Ottawa.
4 NORMAN P. LAMBERT.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa.
5 SALTER ADRIAN HAYDEN.....	Toronto.....	Toronto.
6 NORMAN MCLEOD PATERSON.....	Thunder Bay.....	Fort William.
7 JOSEPH JAMES DUFFUS.....	Peterborough West....	Peterborough.
8 WILLIAM DAUM EULER, P.C.....	Waterloo.....	Kitchener.
9 WILLIAM RUPERT DAVIES.....	Kingston.....	Kingston.
10 GORDON PETER CAMPBELL.....	Toronto.....	Toronto.
11 WILLIAM HORACE TAYLOR.....	Norfolk.....	R. R. 3, Brantford.
12 CHARLES L. BISHOP.....	Ottawa.....	Ottawa.
13 ARTHUR WENTWORTH ROEBUCK.....	Toronto-Trinity.....	Toronto.
14 THOMAS FARQUHAR.....	Algoma.....	Little Current.
15 WILLIAM ALEXANDER FRASER.....	Trenton.....	Trenton.
16 WILLIAM HENRY GOLDING.....	Huron-Perth.....	Seaforth.
17 ALLAN L. WOODROW.....	Toronto-Centre.....	Toronto.
18 WILLIAM ROSS MACDONALD, P.C.....	Brantford.....	Brantford.
19 JOSEPH ARTHUR BRADETTE.....	Cochrane.....	Cochrane.
20 JOHN J. CONNOLLY.....	Ottawa West.....	Ottawa.
21 DAVID A. CROLL.....	Toronto-Spadina.....	Toronto.
22 THOMAS D'ARCY LEONARD.....	Toronto-Rosedale.....	Toronto.
23 .....	.....	.....
24 .....	.....	.....

---



---

**QUEBEC—24**


---



---

SENATORS	ELECTORAL DIVISION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
<b>THE HONOURABLE</b>		
1 DONAT RAYMOND.....	De la Vallière.....	Montreal.
2 ADRIAN K. HUGESSEN.....	Inkerman.....	Montreal.
3 CHARLES BENJAMIN HOWARD.....	Wellington.....	Sherbrooke.
4 LÉON MERCIER GOUIN.....	De Salaberry.....	Montreal.
5 THOMAS VIEN, P.C.....	De Lorimier.....	Outremont.
6 TÉLESPHORE DAMIEN BOUCHARD.....	The Laurentides.....	St. Hyacinthe.
7 ARMAND DAIGLE.....	Mille Isles.....	Montreal.
8 CYRILLE VAILLANCOURT.....	Kennebec.....	Lévis.
9 JACOB NICOL.....	Bedford.....	Sherbrooke.
10 VINCENT DUPUIS.....	Rigaud.....	Montreal.
11 JEAN MARIE DESSUREAULT.....	Stadacona.....	Quebec.
12 PAUL HENRI BOUFFARD.....	Grandville.....	Quebec.
13 MARIANA BEAUCHAMP JODOIN.....	Sorel.....	Montreal.
14 LEONARD DAVID SWEEZEY TREMBLAY.....	Lauzon.....	St. Malachie.
15 SARTE FOURNIER.....	De Lanaudière.....	Montreal.
16 HARTLAND DE MONTARVILLE MOLSON.....	Alma.....	Montreal.
17 CHARLES GAVAN POWER, P.C.....	Gulf.....	St. Pacome.
18 JEAN-FRANÇOIS POULIOT.....	De la Durantaye.....	Rivière du Loup.
19 HENRI CHARLES BOIS.....	Montarville.....	St. Bruno.
20.....	.....	.....
21.....	.....	.....
22.....	.....	.....
23.....	.....	.....
24.....	.....	.....

NOVA SCOTIA—10

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
1 FELIX P. QUINN.....	Bedford-Halifax.....	Bedford.
2 WISHART MCLEA ROBERTSON, P.C. (Speaker).....	Shelburne.....	Truro.
3 JOHN JAMES KINLEY.....	Queens-Lunenburg.....	Lunenburg.
4 JOHN ALEXANDER McDONALD.....	Kings.....	Halifax.
5 JOSEPH WILLIE COMEAU.....	Clare.....	Comeauville.
6 GORDON B. ISNOR.....	Halifax-Dartmouth.....	Halifax.
7 CHARLES G. HAWKINS.....	Milford-Hants.....	Milford Station.
8 DONALD SMITH.....	Queens-Shelburne.....	Liverpool.
9 HAROLD CONNOLLY.....	Halifax North.....	Halifax.
10 .....	.....	.....

NEW BRUNSWICK—10

THE HONOURABLE		
1 CLARENCE JOSEPH VENIOT.....	Gloucester.....	Bathurst.
2 ALEXANDER NEIL McLEAN.....	Southern New Brunswick.....	Saint John.
3 GEORGE PERCIVAL BURCHILL.....	Northumberland- Miramichi.....	South Nelson.
4 MURIEL McQUEEN FERGUSSON.....	Fredericton.....	Fredericton.
5 AUREL D. LÉGER.....	Kent.....	Grande Digue.
6 FRED A. McGRAND.....	Sunbury.....	Fredericton Junction.
7 CALIXTE F. SAVOIE.....	L'Acadie.....	Moncton.
8 AUSTIN CLAUDE TAYLOR.....	Westmorland.....	Salisbury.
9 .....	.....	.....
10 .....	.....	.....

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—4

THE HONOURABLE		
1 JAMES PETER McINTYRE.....	Mount Stewart.....	Mount Stewart.
2 THOMAS VINCENT GRANT.....	Montague.....	Montague.
3 GEORGE H. BARBOUR.....	Prince.....	Charlottetown.
4 FLORENCE ELSIE INMAN.....	Murray Harbour.....	Montague.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—6

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
1 JOHN WALLACE DE B. FARRIS.....	Vancouver South.....	Vancouver.
2 JAMES GRAY TURGEON.....	Cariboo.....	Vancouver.
3 STANLEY STEWART MCKEEN.....	Vancouver.....	Vancouver.
4 THOMAS REID.....	New Westminster.....	New Westminster.
5 NANCY HODGES.....	Victoria.....	Victoria.
6 SYDNEY JOHN SMITH.....	Kamloops.....	Kamloops.

MANITOBA—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 JOHN T. HAIG.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg.
2 ARTHUR L. BEAUBIEN.....	Provencher.....	St. Jean Baptiste.
3 THOMAS ALEXANDER CRERAR, P.C.....	Churchill.....	Winnipeg.
4 JOHN POWER HOWDEN.....	St. Boniface.....	Norwood Grove.
5 WILLIAM M. WALL.....	Winnipeg.....	Winnipeg.
6 .....	.....	.....

SASKATCHEWAN—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 ARTHUR MARCOTTE.....	Ponteix.....	Ponteix.
2 RALPH BYRON HORNER.....	Blaine Lake.....	Blaine Lake.
3 WALTER M. ASELTINE.....	Rosetown.....	Rosetown.
4 THOMAS H. WOOD.....	Regina.....	Regina.
5 WILLIAM ALBERT BOUCHER.....	Prince Albert.....	Prince Albert.
6 .....	.....	.....

ALBERTA—6

THE HONOURABLE		
1 ARISTIDE BLAIS.....	St. Albert.....	Edmonton.
2 FRED WILLIAM GERSHAW.....	Medicine Hat.....	Medicine Hat.
3 JAMES ANGUS MACKINNON, P.C.....	Edmonton.....	Edmonton.
4 J. WESLEY STAMBAUGH.....	Bruce.....	Bruce.
5 DONALD CAMERON.....	Banff.....	Edmonton.
6 .....	.....	.....

**NEWFOUNDLAND—6**

SENATORS	DESIGNATION	POST OFFICE ADDRESS
THE HONOURABLE		
1 ALEXANDER BOYD BAIRD.....	St. John's.....	St. John's.
2 RAY PETTEN.....	Bonavista.....	St. John's.
3 CALVERT C. PRATT.....	St. John's West.....	St. John's.
4 MICHAEL G. BASHA.....	West Coast.....	Curling.
5 FREDERICK GORDON BRADLEY, P.C.....	Bonavista-Twillingate.	Bonavista.
6 .....	.....	.....

## THE SENATE

### Officers and Chiefs of Principal Branches

John F. MacNeill, Q.C., B.A., LL.B., Clerk of the Senate and Clerk of the Parliaments.

E. Russell Hopkins, B.A., LL.B., Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel.

Rodolphe Larose, E.D., First Clerk Assistant.

Major C. R. Lamoureux, D.S.O., Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

Harvey Armstrong, Chief Clerk of Committees.

H. D. Gilman, Chief Treasury Officer and Assistant to the Clerk of the Parliaments.

B. P. Lake, Editor of Debates and Chief of Reporting Branch.

Miss I. M. Hutton, Chief of Minutes and Journals (English).

Paul LaRocque, Chief of Minutes and Journals (French).

R. J. Dallaire, Acting Postmaster.

Miss N. Foley, Supervisor of Stenographic Service.

R. E. C. Lay, Chief of Stationery Branch.

W. R. Gray, Chief of Joint Distribution Office.

W. D. Foran, Chief of Protective Service.

W. Pentecost, Manager of Parliamentary Restaurant.

---

### PARLIAMENTARY REPORTERS (SENATE)

(English) Graydon Hagen, P. H. Shelton, T. S. Hubbard, Jr., F. C. K. Crockett,  
F. S. Lawrence.

(French) Victor Lemire, M.B.E.

---

### BUREAU FOR TRANSLATIONS

Henriot Mayer, Chief of Debates Division.

---

### LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

F. A. Hardy, Parliamentary Librarian.

Guy Sylvestre, Associate Parliamentary Librarian.

## CANADA

# Debates of the Senate

OFFICIAL REPORT

### THE SENATE

Monday, November 26, 1956

#### OPENING OF SPECIAL SESSION TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

Parliament having been summoned by Proclamation of the Governor General to meet this day for the dispatch of business:

The Senate met at 11 a.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I have received the following communication:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE  
OTTAWA

November 20th, 1956

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will arrive at the main entrance of the Houses of Parliament at 2.30 p.m., on Monday, the 26th of November, and, when it has been signified that all is in readiness, will proceed to the Senate Chamber to open the Special Session of the Twenty-Second Parliament of Canada, which has been called for that date.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

LIONEL MASSEY,

Secretary to the Governor General.

The Honourable  
The Speaker of the Senate,  
Ottawa.

#### BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, first let me say how pleased I am to see so many honourable senators in attendance today and looking in the best of health and spirits. We did not expect to return to Ottawa before the regular session in January, but international affairs have made it necessary that we meet at this time to consider certain legislation affecting world events. We shall hear more of this when the Speech from the Throne is read this afternoon.

The Senate is assembling this morning in accordance with its custom of meeting before the formal opening of Parliament in order to

dispose of routine proceedings. We shall reassemble at 2.15 this afternoon, and in the meantime the doors will be open and the public will be admitted to the gallery.

I have had a discussion with the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig); and the tentative plan for the business of the house is as follows. At 2.30, as we have heard from the Honourable the Speaker, the Governor General will read the Speech from the Throne. Thereafter there will be the usual business of the house—the presenting of a *pro forma* bill, and motions.

Honourable senators will recall that unfortunately during the period of prorogation we have lost five of our members. We feel that our first order of business should be a reference to these members; and the Leader of the Opposition and I are suggesting that that should take place this afternoon, after the Speech from the Throne has been read and a decision has been made as to when the debate on the speech shall be proceeded with.

It is not the intention—although this is merely a tentative arrangement—to proceed this afternoon with consideration of the Speech from the Throne. The Leader of the Opposition and I thought that it would be better to postpone this until tomorrow. So the arrangement for today is that, after the reference to our deceased members, we shall adjourn, to meet tomorrow afternoon, probably at 3 o'clock, to proceed with consideration of the Speech from the Throne.

I therefore propose that we now rise, to reassemble at the call of the bell, at approximately 2.15 this afternoon.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

The Senate met at 2.15 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

#### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

At 2.30 p.m. His Excellency the Governor General proceeded to the Senate chamber and took his seat upon the Throne. His Excellency was pleased to command the attendance of the House of Commons, and, that House being come, with their Speaker, His Excellency was pleased to open the Fourth (Special)

Session of the Twenty-Second Parliament of Canada with the following speech:

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 House of Commons withdrew.

His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

### RAILWAYS BILL

#### FIRST READING

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen (for Hon. Mr. Macdonald)**, presented Bill A, an Act relating to railways.

The bill was read the first time.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### CONSIDERATION TOMORROW

On motion of Hon. Mr. Hugessen (for Hon. Mr. Macdonald), it was ordered that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General be taken into consideration tomorrow.

### HUNGARY

#### FIGHT FOR FREEDOM

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** Honourable senators, I am going to ask honourable members to do something, the like of which has not, I think, been done before in the history of this house. The occasion for it arises out of the reference made in the Speech from the Throne to that unhappy country, Hungary. I am going to ask every member of the Senate to rise and stand with me for a minute of silent prayer for those brave Hungarians who have died in the last few weeks fighting for the freedom of their country against a foul and brutal tyranny.

*Honourable senators thereupon stood in silence.*

### COMMITTEE ON ORDERS AND PRIVILEGES

#### APPOINTMENT

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen (for Hon. Mr. Macdonald)**, with leave of the Senate, moved:

That all the senators present during this session be appointed a Committee to consider the Orders and Customs of the Senate and Privileges of Parliament, and that the said committee have leave to meet in the Senate chamber when and as often as they please.

The motion was agreed to.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATION

#### APPOINTMENT

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen (for Hon. Mr. Macdonald)** moved, with leave of the Senate:

That a Special Committee of the Senate be appointed to examine into any legislation or other matter which may be referred to it, and that the said committee be composed of:

The Honourable Senators Asetline, Baird, Beaubien, Bouffard, Burchill, Campbell, Connolly (Ottawa West), Crerar, Croll, Davies, Dessureaut, Euler, Farris, Gershaw, Golding, Gouin, Haig, Hardy, Hawkins, Hayden, Horner, Howard, Howden, Hugessen, Isnor, Kinley, Lambert, Leonard, Macdonald, MacKinnon, McDonald, McGuire, McIntyre, McKeen, McLean, Paterson, Pouliot, Power, Pratt, Quinn, Reid, Roebuck, Taylor, Turgeon, Vaillancourt, Vien, Wilson, Wood and Woodrow.

He said: Honourable senators this resolution needs a word of explanation. It arises out of the special conditions under which this special session of Parliament has been summoned. A similar motion was moved and adopted during the special session of 1950.

As honourable senators know, in a normal session one of the first orders of business is the appointment of a Committee of Selection, which nominates the standing committees of this house, of which there are nineteen. Under the special circumstances of this session it is not likely that the standing committees, or at least the majority of them, will need to be organized. On the other hand, it may be that within the first day or so of the session the Senate will require to have in action a committee to deal with and consider special legislation. In accordance with the procedure of the 1950 special session, this motion is submitted for the consideration of the house.

The membership set out in the motion which I have just read is the same as that of the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce at the last session, except for the names of Honourable Senators Hackett and Pirie, who have passed away. In the naming of the senators for this special committee the precedent that was adopted at the special session of 1950 has been followed.

The motion was agreed to.

## DECEASED SENATORS

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATORS HACKETT, GODBOUT, STEVENSON, ROSS AND PIRIE

On the Orders of the Day:

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, since we last met in this chamber five of our colleagues have been called to the Great Beyond. Some of them had been in the Senate for many years, others for much shorter periods. In fact, one had been a senator just slightly longer than one year. The senators who passed away were not our oldest members, nor were they the youngest; they were of various ages.

Senator John Thomas Hackett died on the 15th of September, at the age of 72.

Senator Joseph Adélarde Godbout died on the 18th of September, at the age of 63.

Senator John James Stevenson died on the 21st of September, at the age of 84.

From the dates which I have mentioned you will notice that three of our colleagues died within one week.

Senator John Henry Ross died on the 26th of September, at the age of 78.

Senator Frederick William Pirie died on the 3rd of October, at the age of 63.

We lost five senators in less than three weeks' time. Some of them had been in comparatively good health immediately prior to their death, while at least one had been in failing health for some time; all of which goes to show that:

God moves in a mysterious way  
His wonders to perform;  
He plants His footsteps in the sea  
And rides upon the storm.

May I refer to our deceased honourable colleagues in the order in which they passed away?

The Honourable John Thomas Hackett, who died on the 15th September, was born on June 12, 1884, at Stanstead, in the province of Quebec, the son of Mr. Justice M. F. Hackett and Florence Knight Hackett. Senator Hackett, you will recall, appeared to be in excellent health and in exceedingly high spirits when Parliament was prorogued, in the middle of August; in fact I recall that the last day he was here he said that the year he had spent in the Senate had been one of the happiest years of his life. He seemed to enjoy greatly his work here; and I know that we all enjoyed having him as one of our colleagues.

Senator Hackett was educated at St. Charles Seminary, Sherbrooke, Quebec; at Loyola College, Montreal, where he received the degree of Bachelor of Laws, and at McGill University, where he obtained the degree of Bachelor of Civil Law. He received many

honours which were the mingled expression of respect and affection. Among these honours was the degree of LL.D. *honoris causa* from McGill University, the University of Montreal and St. Francis Xavier University. As you all know, he was an eminent lawyer who acted as counsel in many of the most important and difficult cases which came before the courts. Shortly after being called to the bar his young associates of that day elected him President of the Junior Bar Association. This was in 1919. Approximately twenty-eight years later, in 1947, his associates of that day elected him President of the Canadian Bar Association. In the year immediately previous to his election to that important appointment he had held the high honour of Batonnier of the Bar of Montreal. Subsequently he was made an honorary member of the American Bar Association, the International Bar Association, the American Judicature Society, and the American Society of International Law.

Senator Hackett was a member and officer from time to time of many welfare societies and organizations which were set up to recognize and encourage the cultural aspect of Canadian life.

In politics he was a Conservative but he had many friends of the opposite political faith, amongst whom was our present Prime Minister, who along with himself had enjoyed a distinguished career in law. Senator Hackett contested the general election in Stanstead County in 1925, but was unsuccessful. Nevertheless, he was successful in 1930 and he sat in the House of Commons as the member for Stanstead from 1930 to 1935. In 1945 he was again elected in the County of Stanstead and sat in the House of Commons until 1949.

It is interesting to note that in pre-Confederation days his grandfather, Albert Knight, represented Stanstead, and that the senator's father, the Honourable Mr. Justice M. F. Hackett, was elected for the same constituency on three occasions.

Senator Hackett was summoned to the Senate of Canada on July 28, 1955, and was therefore with us as a colleague for just a little more than one year. He took a great interest in all the work of the Senate, and seemed to enjoy his work here amidst new surroundings. We enjoyed having him with us. In his passing we have lost one of our outstanding members, and Canada has lost a distinguished lawyer and politician who, in almost half a century of public life, became one of Canada's foremost advocates of racial tolerance. But the greatest loss will be that suffered by his widow, his son and two daughters, to whom we extend our deep sympathy.

May I now refer to the Honourable Joseph Adélar Godbout. He was born on September 24, 1892, at St. Eloi, Quebec, the son of Eugène Godbout, who was a member of the Legislature for Témiscouata from 1919 until 1923. Senator Godbout was in comparatively good health when we last saw him in August, and he passed away very suddenly.

Our late colleague had taken the course in classics at Rimouski Seminary in his early days but his great interest was in agriculture. He was truly a cultured Canadian. He attended the Agricultural College at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, and took further courses in agriculture at the Agricultural Colleges of Massachusetts and of Cornell, and finally at Cornell University.

In 1929 he was first elected to the Legislature of Quebec for the County of L'Islet, and in 1930 he entered the Government of Premier Alexander Taschereau as Minister of Agriculture. He held this portfolio until 1936, when he succeeded Mr. Taschereau as Premier of the province. At the ensuing elections in the same year his Government was defeated, but he retained his seat in the county. In the provincial elections of 1939 his Government was again returned to office, and once again he became Prime Minister. Not only did he carry on the onerous duties of Premier, but he also held the portfolios of Agriculture and of Colonization. In 1944 his Government was once again defeated, but he continued as Leader of the Opposition until the elections of 1948. At that time he was not returned for his constituency. He was appointed to the Senate on June 25, 1949.

Senator Godbout was honoured by a great number of scientific institutions. In 1929 he was President of the Association of Canadian Agronomists; in 1933, President of the Association of Agricultural Technicians of Canada; and also commandeur de l'Ordre du Mérite agricole de la province de Québec, commandeur de l'Ordre du Mérite agricole de France; Docteur ès sciences agricoles des universités Laval et de Montréal; Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa*, McGill University, Bishop's College, and Massachusetts State College; Doctor of Veterinary Science, *honoris causa*, University of Montreal, and honorary professor at the Faculty of Agriculture of Laval University.

During his term of office as Premier of Quebec the Honourable Adélar Godbout was responsible for enacting many important bills, probably one of the most important being the statute which gave the vote to women in the province. Legislation was also passed giving free education and text books in public schools. When his Government was in office the Montreal Light, Heat and Power Company

came under public ownership, and in 1944 an important piece of legislation was passed, namely, the Labour Relations Act.

Senator Godbout is survived by his widow, two sons and three daughters. In expressing our sympathy to them, I thought I might do so in his native tongue, for although Senator Godbout was one of Canada's greatest orators in both English and French, I am told that he excelled himself in French. May I therefore close my tribute to him in the following words.

(Translation):

In the person of Senator Godbout, I have lost a personal friend, a very dear colleague and a fellow citizen for whom I had the greatest esteem and admiration. Mr. Godbout's reputation as a gentleman was well deserved; his courtesy and moderation were well known. Equally well deserved was the reputation he had earned generally of being an ardent defender of national unity. At all times he was essentially a man of principle, a man of duty, and he did not hesitate, in the most difficult hours of his public life, to place the interests of his country above personal, local or party considerations.

I have already expressed my deep sympathy to Mr. Godbout's family, and I feel sure that my colleagues in this chamber would wish to join with me in paying this public tribute to his memory.

(Text):

I refer next to the Honourable John James Stevenson, who was born on May 11, 1872, at Russell, Ontario, of Scottish and Irish parentage, and received his education at Russell and Ottawa.

Senator Stevenson spent the first 21 years of his life in Ottawa, with the Edwards Lumber Company, but in the early 1900's he left Ottawa and went to western Canada, where he established his own lumber firm, at Tyvan. Arriving at Tyvan, he immediately took a great interest in the community life of the district, and shortly thereafter was elected to the Legislature of the Province of Saskatchewan for Francis constituency. He then left Tyvan and moved to Eston, Saskatchewan. He took a great interest in that community also, and after living there for a short time he was elected once again to the Legislature of Saskatchewan. Some years later he moved to Regina, where he took up residence. In 1940 he was appointed to the Senate, and since then he spent most of his time in Ottawa, while still maintaining a residence in Saskatchewan.

Senator Stevenson was indeed one of our western pioneers. He had an extensive knowledge of farming, business and social

conditions in western Canada. He had heeded the advice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier: "Go west, young man, go west." He went west, and made good, and although he lived for the last 25 years in Ottawa he never lost interest in western Canada, and spent a part of each of those years out there. He had a host of friends in the west, and he was admired and respected by them all. He was indeed a friend in need, and I am told that during the 1930's he lent a helping hand to many of his old friends who needed help during those difficult days.

Senator Stevenson took a great interest in the work of the Senate, more particularly in that of the Divorce Committee, of which he was long a most faithful member, until illness prevented him from continuing his activities.

Senator Stevenson's wife predeceased him in 1955. He leaves to mourn his loss one daughter, three sons and seven grandchildren, to all of whom we extend our very deep sympathy.

Honourable senators, I now refer to the Honourable George Henry Ross, who died on September 26 last at the age of 78 years.

Senator Ross was born on the 13th day of June, 1878, at Bedeque, in the province of Prince Edward Island. He was educated at the University of Michigan, where he received the degree of LL.B. While a young man he also heeded the advice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and went west. He went to western Canada for the purpose of earning enough money to study law. In his early days there he was employed as a cowboy. He rode the ranches of the west, and I am told he was one of the most skillful cowboys of his day.

Senator Ross later became a barrister and solicitor, and had an eminently successful career in his chosen profession. He was created a King's Counsel in 1913, and had, therefore, at the time of his death held that distinction for 43 years. He was also recognized by members of his profession by being elected and re-elected on several occasions a Bencher of the Law Society of Alberta, and on more than one occasion he was President of the Law Society of the city of Calgary. Throughout his life he took a great interest in the welfare and training of our youth, and for a number of years was a member of the Senate of the University of Alberta.

In 1913, while still a young man, Senator Ross offered himself as a candidate for the Legislature of Alberta, but was unsuccessful; nevertheless, 27 years later, in 1940, he was elected to the House of Commons for the constituency of Calgary North. With one exception, he was the only Liberal who has ever been elected in that constituency since it was created, in 1903.

Our late colleague was summoned to the Senate on December 1, 1948, and in the years since then he took a keen interest in all the work which came before this body. He faithfully attended most of the committees, and was a very valuable member of the Standing Committee on Divorce, of which, I am informed, he headed a subcommittee.

Senator Ross was married in 1911, and is survived by his widow and two daughters, to whom we extend our very deep sympathy.

The last of our members to pass away during the recess was the Honourable Frederick William Pirie, who died on October 3, at the age of 63 years. He was born in 1893, at Red Rapids, Victoria County, New Brunswick. He attended the Grand Falls public schools and Mount Allison University, where he received the honorary degree of LL.D.

Senator Pirie took a great interest in the development of his province, in which he had many business interests. He was a director of the Maritime Trust Company, the Maritime Insurance Company and the Canada Cement Company. At the time of his death he was President of his own company, the F. W. Pirie Company Limited, Grand Falls, and also of the Atlantic Chemical Company. I think it can be said that he was one of the most successful businessmen in the Maritime provinces, and a consistent advocate of Maritime rights. He assisted in the development of trade with the West Indies, the United States and other parts of the world, particularly in agricultural products.

Senator Pirie throughout his life had been keenly interested in politics, and was elected to the Legislature of his native province in four consecutive elections, namely, 1930, 1935, 1939 and 1944. After the 1935 election he entered the Dysart government as Minister of Lands and Mines. In 1945 he was summoned to the Senate, and he took an active part in the work of this assembly.

Senator Pirie leaves to mourn his loss his widow and four children, to whom we extend our deepest sympathy.

Honourable senators, I have referred briefly to our five colleagues who have passed away. Every one of them was faithful to his task on this earth, to his country, his family and his church. I am sure each has now heard the words:

Well done, thou good and faithful servant . . .  
Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable senators, I may not refer to our departed colleagues in the order which my friend the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has

followed. However, I would thank him on behalf of all of us for the able and complete reference he has made to these gentlemen whom we all knew so well.

I am reminded, as always at a time such as this, that it is a little more difficult for the Opposition leader who is the second speaker to make full reference to those who have passed on, because the historical facts have already been enumerated. And there are many notable things to be said about our departed colleagues, all of whom have had outstanding lives. One reason why we think so much of the Senate is that it is made up of men and women of wide ability and experience, which they bring to the work of this chamber. The members of this house represent a breadth of knowledge and experience not possessed by any other body in this country. That was particularly true of the men whom we are speaking about this afternoon.

I first want to say a word or two about Senator Hackett. Naturally I liked John Hackett. Soon after he came here he and I had quite a discussion upstairs about our names. I mentioned that I did not like my second name and he said, "That is an insult to me." I asked, "How do you make that out?" He replied, "That is my second name". I then said, "Well, let me have your first name, and I will give you my second name in return, so we will be fifty-fifty."

John Hackett was the type of man whom Canadians admire. They will always remember him for the great contribution that he made to the progress of this country. In this chamber we are always happy when a man of his ability and experience thinks enough of his country to devote his time and service to public affairs. I might say that the hardest problem which a democratic country has is that of getting men and women of experience and ability to devote themselves to the public service—and that is easily understood, for in doing so they make a very great sacrifice. I have been in this chamber for quite a number of years and I speak from experience in this matter. I know, as I think everyone here does, that regardless of the salary or indemnity that we receive as members of this house, if the same energy and industry that we apply here were applied to one's own business the return would be far greater. All of us are delighted when a man of the ability and character of the late Senator Hackett consents to devote his talents and ability and his heart to the life and progress of our country.

Senator Hackett was a native son of the province of Quebec, an English-speaking son who could speak French as a Frenchman

speaks it. He interpreted the English-speaking people to the French-speaking people of Quebec as nobody else could, and he interpreted the English-speaking people of Quebec to the people of the other provinces.

I say to his widow—I knew her well—and to his children, two of whom I met and knew, that we miss his going, but we congratulate them on having had a husband and father who made such an immense contribution to the life of his country.

I came to know the late Senator Godbout after he entered this house. I knew his record and I liked Senator Godbout. I could go over to his desk, wherever he happened to be sitting, which latterly was just across the aisle from where I am, and ask him about something and he would promise to attend to it. No letter from him was needed to confirm that promise: I knew he would carry it out to the letter, in an even better way than I could suggest. He was a scientific agriculturist, a practical farmer who had gained in the course of his life great agricultural experience, which he shared widely, not only with his own province but with the rest of Canada. The farmers of our country are greatly indebted to him for the contribution he made to the agricultural progress of Canada. I did not know his family, but I say to them that they are honoured in having a husband and father who has left such a heritage to his country, for scientific agriculture is the essence of agricultural development in Canada.

I would now like to say a few words about the late Senator Stevenson. Honourable senators, I served on the Divorce Committee for many years with John Stevenson, and I think that if he had had his way there would not have been a single divorce granted by Parliament, provided he could get the man and wife together and convince them to go on living together and be happy. The question of divorce worried him more than it did most of us. I could name some other members who did not seem to worry a bit about it, but it did worry him. His own family life had been so happy so delightful, that he felt very keenly that other people should be happy too.

Senator Stevenson was a great personal help to me when I came down here. I liked him very much. His was a name that was loved in Saskatchewan, so much so that whenever criticism was levelled at the Senate and some disparaging remarks made, the people of Saskatchewan would only retort that the Senate must be a mighty fine place so long as John Stevenson was a member

of it. As a senator from western Canada it was delightful for me to have an associate of that kind with me.

I knew Senator Ross, and also his wife. She is the granddaughter of the Reverend Dr. McDougall, the first Methodist minister who went to western Canada to do missionary work among the Indians. Her grandfather had a distinguished career and in United Church circles today his name is greatly honoured. In the early pioneering days of western Canada the Reverend Dr. McDougall was very welcome wherever he went. I remember women who had lived on western farms telling me, after they got older and had moved into the city of Winnipeg or Brandon, "My, it was wonderful to have the Reverend Dr. McDougall come and spend the night with us and talk to my husband and me." Similar remarks were heard about the Reverend Dr. Robertson, a Presbyterian minister of pioneer days, who used to visit the outposts and tell them about the world outside. Senator Ross' wife was brought up in that environment and she always exhibited the kindly traits of her forebears. She is a noble woman. You know, honourable senators, I may be a pesky old rascal but when I meet a senator I like to know if he is married. If he is I like to meet his wife, for then I will soon know pretty well what kind of a senator he is. A man can fool other men but it is very difficult for him to fool his wife. You can learn a lot about a man from the way his wife speaks of him. Sometimes I did not like George Ross very much. I did not hold any personal grudge against him, but he made some speeches with which I did not agree; I thought he was a little wrong. Then I would meet Mrs. Ross upstairs, and any resentment I felt disappeared out of the window: by the time I left the room I thought Ross was the greatest man in Canada.

In truth I liked George Ross. He was a real westerner. He started life as a cowboy; then he became a lawyer, then a member of Parliament, and afterwards, a senator. I do not know whether everybody thinks that that is a good road to travel, but to my way of thinking it is a pretty fine way to go through life. I pay my greatest respects to Mrs. Ross and the family, and say to them that their husband and father was a pioneer of western Canada and that we from the west are proud that such men as he form part of our Canadian life.

I did not know the late Senator Pirie as well as I know many of my colleagues. On weekends, when we westerners and some easterners have to stay in town, he, like some members from Quebec and Ontario, was

usually away. So our little group who remained here did not have an opportunity of getting to know him and exchanging our family secrets. However, we knew him as an outstanding citizen and one of the ablest businessmen in New Brunswick, one who will be sorely missed in that province.

Like the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), I am glad to have been here to meet these men and to have been associated with them. They have left with us memories which will last as long as our lives. They have left Canada a heritage which this country will never forget. We may not know why the spirit of our country is expressed in this way or the other, but men such as these have made an abiding impress on the national life. In years to come, even those who criticize the Senate on various grounds will acknowledge that many fine people, such as our departed colleagues, have been members of this body, and that the reputation of Canada has been greatly enhanced by their lives and conduct.

**Hon. W. M. Aseltine:** Honourable senators, I wish to associate myself with everything that the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) have said with regard to these departed members of our chamber. It was a great shock to me, as it must have been to us all, that so many men whom we had known intimately and long departed this life within so short a time.

I do not intend to speak at length about any of them, but I thought I should say something about the late Senator Stevenson. He came from Saskatchewan. I knew Jack Stevenson as long as, if not longer than, any member of this chamber. I remember that many years ago—longer than I care to recall—he came to my office to ask me to draw up a contract for him in connection with the breaking up of 640 acres of new prairie land which he had just started to farm. I think I did a good job for him, and he mentioned that fact many times after he came down here. Of course, at that time neither of us ever thought we would be members of the Senate of Canada. It was too long ago for us to have entertained such thoughts. Jack Stevenson was a fine fellow, a real western pioneer who started farming in our country before there was any railroad or method of communication, a time when farmers had to haul their wheat thirty or forty miles to market. He made a real success of it and was highly respected by everyone in that part of Saskatchewan. I could tell honourable senators many things he accomplished. He had a great influence with the powers that

be in Ottawa. When we were thinking of establishing a Prince Albert National Park in the northern part of Saskatchewan he was one of the chief advocates of that project and it was to his credit that the park was established. Today it is one of Canada's finest national parks.

Before moving to Saskatchewan Jack Stevenson was a pioneer in the lumber business in eastern Canada. He spent one whole summer and winter investigating the timber and pulpwood possibilities in the Hamilton River district of Labrador. He gave me a stirring account of the many hardships that he experienced in that part of the country.

I was, of course, intimately acquainted with Senator Stevenson during the time he was a member of the Standing Committee on Divorce, of which I was chairman for a number of years. You could always depend on Jack Stevenson, and although he did not know much law he was blessed with more than the average amount of good, solid, common sense. Whenever he heard a case you could always depend on him to arrive at a fair and reasonable conclusion.

I should like to repeat that he was a splendid man in every respect. His passing is a big loss to this chamber, to the people of Saskatchewan and indeed to the whole of Canada. I personally miss him very much and I extend to his children my deepest sympathy.

I also want to say something about that distinguished westerner, Senator George Ross, who was another very faithful member of our Divorce Committee. As my leader (Hon. Mr. Haig) has said, Senator Ross was first a cowboy, then a lawyer, then a member of the House of Commons, and finally a senator. My leader intimated he also had followed that same career, but I never knew that he was once a cowboy. I also followed that same career, except that instead of being a cowboy I was a farmer.

George Ross was a fine man and a good friend. He had a wonderful wife to guide him through life and he made a grand contribution to the public welfare of this country. I extend to Mrs. Ross and her family my deepest sympathy.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, I thoroughly appreciate what the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) has done in the eloquent statements he has just made about our departed colleagues. It was a sad task well performed. I thoroughly agree with him in what he has said about my late deskmate, Senator Pirie, about Senator Godbout, whom I knew very well and admired; and about Senator Hackett, who was indeed an eminent member of this chamber

and an eminent member of the Law Society of Canada. However, my chief reason for rising at the moment is that, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Divorce, I think the members of that committee would like me to acknowledge the services given to it by the Honourable Senators Stevenson and Ross.

On many occasions Senator Stevenson acted on the subcommittee of which I was chairman, and I had an opportunity of knowing him in that capacity far better than in any other. One perhaps can judge what real interest a person has in public service by what he or she does in the committees of this house where no publicity is possible, and where few see the work that is actually done. In the chamber it is easy for someone to make a big play or to perform some prominent service that wins acclaim; but in our committees, and particularly in the Divorce Committee, there is no glamour attached to the work. There everything is quiet, unobserved and motivated solely by a high desire for public service. That was particularly the case with our departed colleague and friend Senator Stevenson. He was, as the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) has said, and as the member for Rosetown (Hon. Mr. Aseltine) has so eloquently expressed it, a sound man with good judgment. He had something more than a knowledge of law or other professional knowledge: he had a knowledge of life and a heart behind that knowledge. We shall all miss Senator Stevenson in the Divorce Committee, and I am sure the members of that committee join with me in an expression of sympathy for his family and a warm tribute to his memory.

With regard to Senator Ross, words fail me to express the regret we all feel in his passing. During these last few years he was not in good health, and yet—sometimes perhaps unduly—he gave of himself to the work of the Divorce Committee. He was chairman of a subcommittee whenever he served during my time, and he performed his task with skill, knowledge and heart. I agreed with him in his judgments. I did not have occasion, as the Leader of the Opposition has said he had, to disagree with him at any time to any extent. I felt grateful to him for the way in which he gave of himself: even when he was not feeling well he carried on with the work of the committee.

Senator Ross came to the House of Commons in 1940, the same year that I did. He was then a veteran lawyer, having been called to the bar as long ago as 1911, and, as the Leader of the Government said, he was created a King's Counsel in 1913. I preceded Senator Ross to the Senate, in 1945; he came here in 1948, but he became a member

of the Senate Divorce Committee before I did, and he was a member when I assumed the chairmanship. At that time he was not in good health, but nevertheless he was a faithful, highly educated, and most valuable member of that committee.

I am sure that my colleagues who are members of the Divorce Committee will all join with me most heartily in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Ross and the other members of his family, our regret at his passing, and our grateful tribute to him as a notable public servant.

**Hon. William H. Golding:** Honourable senators, I am sure we were all shocked since the last session to hear that some of our most valued and worthy members had passed away. On this occasion I want to endorse the fine tributes which have been paid by our leader (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and others who have spoken. I will not take up the time of the house by repeating those fine tributes, but I wish to take this opportunity of saying a word or two in connection with my late room-mate and colleague Senator Ross. When I came over to the Senate I had an invitation from Senator Farquhar to occupy a third desk in the room which he shared with Senator Ross; that was in 1949, and since then we had all shared that room together. Senator Ross was an interesting character. It was mentioned earlier that he had once been a cowboy. In the many interesting talks we had together he rarely spoke about himself, but he did tell us of the work he did as a sheep shearer and as a railroad man. I am sure he performed those duties efficiently and well. Senator Ross was a quiet man, and he would tell us stories of his experiences in a simple, quiet and impressive way.

The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) spoke of Mrs. Ross. I want to say that both Senator Farquhar and I are going to miss Mrs. Ross a great deal, for she is a woman of a very fine type. Indeed, she and her husband were a splendid couple, for whom one could not help but have the highest admiration.

Honourable senators, I do not want to labour this point at all. I know that we all feel keenly the loss of our five colleagues, and I join with the leader and others who have already spoken in expressing deep sympathy to the bereaved families and friends.

*(Translation):*

**Hon. Mariana Beauchamp Jodoin:** Honourable senators, in the name of my women colleagues and especially in the name of the women of the province of Quebec, may I be allowed to express also the deep sorrow which the death of the honourable Adélarde Godbout

has caused us. We had the greatest esteem for him and wish to pay him our most sincere tribute.

His sudden death filled us with grief and we all regret his absence in the Senate.

An honest, sincere and trustworthy man, a distinguished agriculturist, a forceful and convincing speaker, the Honourable Adélarde Godbout became Premier of the province of Quebec under very trying circumstances. But he never failed in his duties nor did he shun any of his responsibilities. He loved his province with the deepest devotion and defended it until his death.

An irreproachable father, he understood the important role played by women in the nation's life, and he gave official recognition to this role in granting the right to vote to the women of the province of Quebec.

We, the women of Quebec, express our gratitude to him for this action and wish to pay him the tribute of our admiration and of our prayers.

We also wish to extend to Madame Godbout and to the members of his family our deepest condolences.

*(Text):*

**Hon. J. M. Dessureault:** Honourable senators, I should like to join with the honourable senators who have preceded me in the very appropriate and eloquent tributes paid to the members of this chamber who have passed away since the last session. I had great admiration for them all, but coming as I do from Quebec I desire to add a few words to extend my sympathy to Senator Adélarde Godbout's family especially. I had known Senator Godbout for a great many years, and always considered him a personal friend. He was on two occasions Premier of the province of Quebec, and his accomplishments during his distinguished career are far too numerous for me to relate, but to sum up it can be truthfully said that he was a great Canadian and a true lover of his province. His passing has removed from the scene of his activities a man of great ability who served faithfully and well, not only his province but the whole of Canada.

*(Translation):*

As I have already said in English, I had known the Honourable Senator Godbout for a great many years and always regarded him as a personal friend. A gifted speaker with a charming personality, he was loved and respected by all. He was a great Canadian, a perfect gentleman, an excellent Christian and a staunch Catholic. His fellow citizens, especially those of Quebec, have lost in him a good friend, as well as a devoted and faithful servant.

To Madame Godbout and to the members of his family, I wish to express once more my sincere condolences.

(Text):

**Hon. James A. MacKinnon:** Honourable senators, after the very able tributes that have been paid to our departed colleagues, I feel there is little I can add; however, I do wish to say a word or two about my late colleague from Alberta, the Honourable George Ross.

I knew George Ross since before Alberta became a province. He was very highly regarded not only in the city of Calgary, where he spent most of his time, but throughout the province. He was a man of high principles and outstanding ability, but I think the quality for which he will be remembered longest was his kindness.

George Ross was a leader in legal and educational circles in Alberta, and enjoyed a wide range of friends. It was my special privilege to recommend his name to the then Prime Minister for appointment to a seat in this chamber, and I take pride in the excellent record he has left as a representative of the province of Alberta.

George Ross married into the McDougall family, one of the truly pioneer families of Alberta, and one which left its mark in many ways and in many places in that province. For example, the McDougall United Church, the largest of its denomination in the city of Edmonton, bears the family name.

I know that all honourable senators who have already expressed their sympathy to the bereaved members of Senator Ross' family, will renew the expression of it at this time.

**Hon. F. Elsie Inman:** Honourable senators, I too would like to add a word of tribute to the memory of those senators who have passed away since we last met in this chamber. The Senate has lost much by the passing of these gentlemen. We all feel sad as we look at the vacant chairs. I should like especially to mention the former occupant of the seat in front of me, the late Senator Hackett.

I came into this chamber the same morning on which Senator Hackett was sworn in. Throughout my acquaintance with him I found him to be broadminded and generous in word, thought and deed, ever willing to help and advise to the best of his ability. In saying this I pay my respects to a brilliant mind and a great gentleman.

As a Prince Edward Islander I feel, as do all other Islanders, a great pride in Senator Ross and what he accomplished in his day.

To the families of these gentlemen, and to the other families who have been bereaved by the death of other senators, I express my very deepest sympathy.

(Translation):

**Hon. Paul Henri Bouffard:** Honourable senators, it is unfortunate, as we meet for this special session, that we should have to note the demise of several distinguished colleagues. May I be allowed, as a representative of the province of Quebec, to mention especially the loss of our eminent colleague Senator Adélarde Godbout.

His intellectual gifts and high moral standards influenced the political life of Quebec; his culture, his logical mind, his great eloquence, his adaptability and his modesty, his respect for freedom, his philosophy of life all contributed to his playing a leading part in Quebec's political life and helped him to achieve a brilliant career in a difficult period. It was during the depression and during the Second World War that he was in power.

A recital of the many progressive measures which were voted in the Quebec Legislature under his Government would take up too much time; I will mention only compulsory school attendance, free school manuals, free primary education and the right of women to vote in provincial elections. He also served agriculture which was so dear to him; indeed he has been called "the apostle of agriculture."

In one of its editorials, a Quebec newspaper paid him a truthful tribute in the following terms:

Premier Godbout's contribution to Canada in wartime represented not only the only policy which could possibly save the internal peace of Quebec and its future, but the only policy worthy of the French Canadians' loyalty to their country.

Canada has lost in him a great citizen and craftsman of national unity; Quebec, a real builder of society; and all of us, a loyal and devoted friend.

The name and achievements of this man will place on the record a lesson of kindness, of courage and of constant devotion to duty which makes for strong nations.

I would like to offer to his worthy and courageous widow and to his children my deepest sympathy.

A word now of Senator Hackett, whom I had occasion to know when he was President of the Canadian Bar Association and I was Batonnier of the province of Quebec. I learned to appreciate his qualities in those days when we worked together. He was free of prejudice and could make friends in all Canadian groups, irrespective of race or religion. He was always among the first to share my joy or my sorrow.

His departure deprives us of a sincere and dear friend. May I be permitted to express to his wife my very deep sorrow.

(Text):

**Hon. L. M. Gouin:** Honourable senators, the Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), as well as all other honourable senators who have spoken, have paid high tribute to the memory of our five colleagues who departed this life since our last prorogation.

I regard it a personal duty to express my sympathy to the family of Senator Pirie, who was an outstanding businessman in the Maritime provinces; and to express sympathy also to the family of Senator Ross, who was indeed a grand old man. Senator Ross won my heart from the first day I met him, and I shall never forget the friendship which he showed to me: his kindly smile was for me always a great encouragement.

As to Senator Stevenson, he was my neighbour when I was appointed to this chamber and we became, in this way, intimate friends. We were always glad to meet each other, and I shall always retain a good memory of his many kindnesses.

I come now to Senator Godbout, under whom I served in many political campaigns when he was Premier of Quebec and later Leader of the Opposition in the province. He was a man of courage, a man of duty, a man of honour, but what principally characterized him for me was his sincere and deep love for the land, particularly for his own farm. I met him for the first time, oh, perhaps 30 years ago. He had not yet entered politics. He was addressing a meeting of my students in our Faculty of Commerce of the Université de Montréal, and I said to myself, "This young man will surely do something great, this young man has a grand future". I felt that way because, although I was born in the city and had no experience at all in agricultural matters, I had never heard our good old land of the province of Quebec praised in such a way. It was not alone the words he used that impressed me so greatly, but the manner in which he expressed his deep, deep love for the land of good old Quebec.

And now I come to speak of the senator with whom I was even more closely associated than the others, my very dear friend John Hackett. We did not belong to the same political faith, but I knew him for, I think, more than forty years, and never for one minute, never for one second, did I have any reason to complain of John Hackett, in

politics, in cases we were arguing against each other at the bar, or in our business relations. He was a champion of what I would call religious and racial harmony in his native province, and on this point he was in a different camp serving the same cause as was Adélard Godbout. At the end of his life Adélard Godbout also lived in the eastern townships.

John Hackett was a good Christian, a good Quebecer and a good Canadian. He loved his country, and he loved in particular his own Stanstead which was his home village and for which he had indeed the greatest devotion.

He was proud of his own part of the province of Quebec, he was proud of the beautiful mountains which surround the area from which he came, and it was with very deep regret that we went up to Mount Saint Mary Cemetery, where he was laid to rest in a beautiful landscaped setting. He was a great friend of mine, and I am made very sorry by his death.

**Hon. Cairine R. Wilson:** Honourable senators, I rise to endorse what has been so well expressed here today by my own leader (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) and the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), as well as by the others who preceded me. Senator Jodoin paid a very eloquent tribute to the late Senator Adélard Godbout, and as she was speaking I realized that I, an English-speaking native of the province of Quebec, should add a few words of tribute also. I was already a member of the Senate when my husband first received voting papers with respect to property which I owned in that province, so I do have some appreciation of the difficulties which women in Quebec had to contend with.

The Leader of the Opposition said that Senator Godbout's word was as good as his bond, and I well know that to be a fact. He promised the vote to the women of the province of Quebec, and he was prepared to go to the limit to fulfil that promise. He said that his honour was at stake. We all owe him a great debt, and I personally feel that his passing is a severe loss to our chamber.

**Hon. Muriel McO. Fergusson:** Honourable senators, I too would like to join in the tributes that have been paid to our deceased colleagues. I certainly can add very little to what has been said so very eloquently already. Senator Ross and Senator Stevenson I came to know in the Divorce Committee, and I admired very much their attitude toward the work there.

I feel I knew Senator Hackett fairly well, because he sat so close to my deskmate and me and was so very kind to us on all occasions.

Senator Godbout I admired very much. His career before he came to this house was an inspiration, and he showed his experience and ability when he substituted many times for our leader.

Coming from New Brunswick, however, I feel that some special words should be said about the late Senator Pirie, who was one of New Brunswick's very outstanding sons. I do not know if all of you realize that his death was extremely sudden.

On the morning he died he started off for his office, but before leaving he mentioned to his wife that he thought he would fly down to see the World Series baseball games. On that day she herself had planned a trip to Campbellton; there was no thought of the senator's being ill at all. Honourable members will be interested to know that in his younger days Senator Pirie had been extremely interested in baseball. He had played in the minor leagues which are formed of teams located close to the border between New Brunswick and Maine, which activities make for a very good feeling between the people of the province and state. Sports of that kind between people on both sides of the border are very much worth while.

As to Senator Pirie's industrial activities, he was of course an outstanding grower and shipper of potatoes, and through that enterprise created a great business and brought much employment and money into the Upper St. John River valley. I have some special knowledge of this, because for a number of years my husband and I lived in the same town as Senator Pirie, and he and my husband were great friends. At that time we had a law firm, which did all of the Pirie business.

The late senator's business ability and integrity were recognized by everyone with whom he dealt to be of the very highest. I understood this even more clearly than before when my husband and I accompanied Mr. and Mrs. Pirie and two other couples to Cuba, where we met a great many people with whom the senator had commercial relations, and realized that he had built up a reputation for Canadian businessmen of which all of us can be proud.

From 1935 on Senator Pirie was, for some years, Minister of Lands and Mines in the provincial cabinet, and he was regarded as one of the ablest men who have held that portfolio. Because, owing to the demands of his own very large business, it was difficult

for him to spend sufficient time in Fredericton, our capital city, he purchased his own pontoon-equipped plane with which he commuted back and forth between the St. John River in Fredericton and the same river at Grand Falls, a distance of about 135 miles, to enable him to have sufficient time to look after both his main interests.

To Mrs. Pirie and Senator Pirie's son, his three daughters, and his sisters, I offer my very sincere sympathy at this time.

(Translation):

**Hon. Cyrille Vaillancourt:** Honourable senators, according to a French proverb, what is well understood can be clearly expressed, in words that are easily found. But that is not always so. There are sometimes great joys or great sorrows which one can neither express, describe, or even hide. One can only look on, suffer, weep or love. That is somewhat my position at this moment when I recall one who had always been my friend, Senator Godbout.

A while ago Senator Gouin claimed that he had known Senator Godbout for thirty years; I knew him when I was a youngster.

We were practically brought up together. We lectured together at Ste. Anne de la Pocatière. I had a share in all his joys, his sorrows and his disappointments.

He entered politics in a tragic moment, and attained the crest of success at the beginning of the Second World War. Whenever he took any action he always said that he did so for the good and for the unity of his country, so that Canadians, whether they came from Quebec, from Ontario or from other provinces, in other words, Canadians whose first allegiance is to Canada, might work together to attain national unity and to save Christendom. In so doing, he knew full well that his actions would be misunderstood; but he knew, with his sincerity, his magnanimity and his humanitarianism, that he had done his duty, from which no one was ever able to make him deviate.

The best tribute to him that I ever heard came from the lips of a farmer—and how he loved the farmers!—who told me a few weeks ago how humane he was. He was kindly with his family, in his home, at large meetings with important or unimportant people; his kindness was always the same. His kind feelings for his fellow citizens, his country, his family and everybody showed in his words, for he never entertained any hatred against anybody.

He liked to discuss things freely and afforded the same privilege to others. He repeated to me one day the words of a well-known author: "I am ready to fight to the end so that my opponent may have the

right to say what he wants and to criticize me as he is entitled to". That is a fundamental principle of liberty. And he supported it wholeheartedly, with all the fire of his youth; indeed he was not an old man when he died. One sometimes imagines that at sixty years of age one is an old man, but when does one become old? A great many young people are already old men at twenty, because they are sceptical and despairing; but there are some who at seventy and

eighty remain young because their hearts retain faith, hope and love of neighbour. The spirit of youth, of beauty and of greatness remained with Mr. Godbout. In him our country has lost one of its greatest, its most sincere and loyal servants.

I wish to pay to my friend the tribute of the truest possible friendship and to extend to his family my most sincere condolences.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 3 p.m.

---

## THE SENATE

Tuesday, November 27, 1956

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

Routine proceedings.

### LEGISLATION

#### REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen**, Acting Chairman of the Special Committee appointed to examine into any legislation or other matter which may be referred to it, presented the committee's first report.

The report was read by the Clerk Assistant as follows:

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced to nine members.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, when shall this report be taken into consideration?

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** With leave, I move that the report be concurred in now.

The motion was agreed to.

### PUBLIC BILLS

#### SUSPENSION OF RULES

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald** moved, pursuant to notice:

That during the present session of Parliament Rules 23, 24 and 63 be suspended in so far as they relate to public bills.

The motion was agreed to.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

#### MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY— DEBATE ADJOURNED

The Senate proceeded to consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session.

**Hon. William M. Wall** moved:

That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Vincent Massey, Member of the Order of the Companions of Honour, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada. May it Please Your Excellency:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Senate of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of Parliament.

He said:

Honourable senators, may I be permitted to express my thanks to the Government and to the Leader of the Government in the

Senate (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) for the honour that has been accorded to me in inviting me to move the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, a privileged responsibility which I undertake for the first time.

Both houses of Parliament have been assembled for this special session "because of the serious international situation arising out of hostilities in the Middle East and the events in Hungary".

We meet at a time of aggravated tensions in the external relationships between nations and groups of nations. Democratic governmental leadership solemnly warns us that this is a period of near-crisis, which could well precipitate another world conflict. As we search for causative clues and for possible solutions, none of us is likely to minimize the gravity of the present situation, especially in the critical Middle East.

It is in this perspective that we must assess the widely-acclaimed leadership efforts of the Canadian Government to implement its belief that the permanent solution of Israel's relations with its neighbours—and the future of the Suez Canal—should be reached by peaceful negotiations under the aegis of the United Nations.

Events well known to you have moved swiftly and the United Nations General Assembly has accepted Mr. Pearson's original suggestion that the Secretary General make arrangements for a United Nations force to secure and to supervise cease-fire arrangements. This is a new and untried concept at the United Nations, demanding the working out of terms of reference for the United Nations force which would be acceptable and functional. This is no easy task, and it is at present being attempted by an Advisory Committee, of which Canada is a member.

It is hoped that this police force will contribute to peace in the area while a political settlement is being worked out, through the United Nations. To this end, it is hoped that the United Nations will consider the future of the Suez Canal and the future of Israel's relations with its neighbours.

The continued development and practical realization of this United Nations' intervention for peace in the Middle East will naturally demand sacrifices from all concerned; and I am convinced that the Canadian people will willingly meet these commitments, displaying the same calibre of thoughtful leadership and concern for peace which were demonstrated, in our name, when the Canadian delegation first advanced its proposals at the current session of the General Assembly.

Taking into consideration the inherent difficulties of accurately foretelling the exact extent and specificity of the demands which

a constantly shifting international arena would make on Canada—and we did make a very honest attempt to fulfil our country's obligation to our Charter Covenant by meeting necessary but often unanticipated United Nations requirements in a spirit of loyalty difficult to equal—I do believe that we recognize the fine record of public stewardship which has characterized the Government's efforts during the present critical situation, as it has been unfolding. I respectfully submit that the Government has acted with wisdom and with requisite but judicious dispatch, and that the necessary parliamentary approval required for the continued implementation of its policies in this regard should be favourably considered by this legislative body.

Let us turn briefly to the recent tragic events in Hungary. What can one do but register shocked disapproval and condemnation of the horror of Hungary's martyrdom, which is still so fresh on our nerves and conscience? We are confronted with what appears to be a collapse of the beginnings of some little measure of rationalization and moderation of the communist system of government, and the reimposition of communist minority rule in all its classical brutality. The hypocritical promises—that Soviet leaders were prepared to re-negotiate their relations with Eastern Europe on the basis of equality and non-interference in their neighbours' internal affairs—were dashed into shambled disillusionment and eventual shocked realization that the Kremlin masquerade of moderation was a temporary ruse, to be followed by the application of Soviet armed might to crush what indeed was a spontaneous, passionate, and significant outburst of national feeling. Moscow's will has been reimposed on Hungary by brute force, obviously for strategic and indeed other reasons. One has a right to wonder whether this tough crack-down policy within Hungary will be a permanent phenomenon, and whether the Soviet Union is unable to devise any alternatives to prevent the dissolution of its colonial empire when many other submerged nationalities are pressing for a liberalization of the communist system or for national separation and independence.

The eloquent statement of the distinguished representative of Ireland at the current United Nations Assembly session reflects very accurately the thoughts of all freedom-loving peoples. I quote:

For us in Ireland, and I venture to think that for the people of many other of the smaller nations represented here, any mention in the future of national independence or anti-colonialism or the right of self-determination by any spokesman of the Soviet Union, will always evoke in our minds a single name, a name on which the courage and endurance of a very gallant people have shed a great and undying glory, the name of Hungary.

In the Speech from the Throne we noted this sentence:

You will also be requested to authorize the provision of relief for the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary.

To implement the Government's commitment in the light of the needs as they can presently be assessed, the Prime Minister announced that the total sum of \$1 million is to be appropriated for Hungarian relief purposes. This action on the part of the Government will meet with the generous approval of the Canadian citizens, in view of the dynamics released by an unprecedented upsurge of outraged feelings and spontaneous sympathy and a desire to help, which the Hungarian affair has generated among our people. We do realize that this sum is not unduly onerous on us, as it amounts to less than 10 cents *per capita*. However, compared to the announced contributions of other countries, ours is a bold and generous offer, which promises us a rich reward of international good will and national satisfaction. Granted that this is not the first cry for help that has reached us out of the chilling night of totalitarian darkness, but it is one of the most dramatic; and we do not want it to re-echo, in the years that lie ahead, as a challenging reproof to our values of humanity and Christian brotherhood.

I respectfully suggest that the same spirit of generosity should mark our action in resettling and rehabilitating Hungarian refugees here in Canada. It is a source of gratification to all of us to learn that the cabinet, on Friday last, gave the go-ahead signal for completing arrangements to airlift refugees directly to Canada. I suspect that other transportation arrangements are also being made, and my suspicion is confirmed by the statement made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration in the House of Commons. I, for one, hope that our entrance-into-Canada processing will be characterized by wisdom and fairness—but by generous flexibility and speed—so that a large number of freedom-seeking refugees will be enabled to reach this democratic and Christian haven.

Honourable senators, permit me to make these additional observations upon the problem areas in which I have indicated my general approval of present governmental policies.

Certainly it is abundantly clear that the Canadian Government has committed itself to the United Nations way of resolving pressing international problems. As I understand it, in the name of our democratic and peace-loving people, and in harmonious continuity with our policies since we became a member of the United Nations, the Canadian Government has committed us to a hopeful reliance

that the United Nations may be strengthened into a useful supranational authority to maintain peace. This is in line with our historic commitment to generous and wholehearted co-operation in solving, through the United Nations, other grave international problems: disarmament, technical and economic assistance to underdeveloped countries, atomic radiation, atomic power for peaceful uses, and others.

The Prime Minister, in his historic and important broadcast to the Canadian people on November 4, underscored this commitment:

We realize, however, that a permanent settlement between Israel and its neighbours arranged by the United Nations was the only way in which peace could be preserved in the long run.

And later in the same address:

We have advocated that a settlement of the issues relating to the Canal which directly affected so many countries should be achieved under the auspices of the United Nations and that there should be no resort to force.

Now, although our reliance upon the United Nations is honest, sincere and indeed courageous, and although our support of the United Nations is deliberate, open and conscientious, we are realistically alive to the calculated risks we must take in working through the United Nations. These risks the Canadian people must know, and must accept in a realistic manner.

For example, the effectiveness of the UN Security Council can be immobilized by the right of veto. The historic UN Security Council intervention in Korea was possible only because the USSR had absented itself and was not present to exercise its veto prerogative. This immobilization can and probably will happen again unless a Charter amendment were to remove the veto principle, which is not likely.

To by-pass a stalemated Security Council, a two-thirds vote is needed in the General Assembly. One can foresee the Assembly rendered impotent by some coalition of nations, even on the present Suez issue.

Further, any nation may deliberately choose not to accept a majority decision of the Assembly on some issue. For example, the USSR and Hungary have refused, so far, even to permit the UN to investigate conditions in Hungary, on the pretext or reason that what happened there is a domestic affair.

During the last parliamentary session I raised an over-arching calculated risk always present when one considers the progress that can be made by a federation of the now 79 national governments, namely, that

the reconciliation and harmonizing of multitudinous shades of opinions and expectations is a slow and time-consuming business.

Knowing these risks, and predicating our answer on past history and on events which have lately taken place in the Middle East, we do face this pertinent question:

With all its weaknesses and imperfections, is not the United Nations the only international vehicle which may yet be able to forestall further aggressive intervention, get the Canal opened, secure the withdrawal of the armed forces from the Suez area, assure the future observance of the spirit and the letter of international law and the sequential international freedom of the Canal without endangering the security and sovereignty rights of the Egyptian people and without further antagonizing the Arab world?

What other international authority can conceivably be upraised to a level that can attract and hold the allegiance of all the Middle East contestants, and thereby eventually bring peace to a very troubled area?

I may be accused of belabouring this point; but truthfully, what is the realistic and logical alternative to this near-universal forum for multilateral discussion and negotiative settlement? In parentheses, are we guessing correctly that nations or even groups of nations will hardly risk being opposed to an organized, international United Nations mandate, if it is bulwarked by the determined support of the peace-loving nations of the world?

It is imperative, too, that Canadians understand the cardinal importance of the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the maintenance of international peace and security. As we all know, this organization functions as a 15-member agency for collective defence and as a further instrument for the deterrence of aggression.

It may be well to quote two significant summarizing statements from the address of General Charles Foulkes, Chairman, Chiefs of Staff, at the annual dinner of the Canadian Industrial Preparedness Association:

. . . NATO has achieved the defensive aim it set out to do. It has succeeded in deterring aggression in the NATO area, and the fact that the Soviet Union is now busy doing an end-run around NATO confirms the success that the alliance has accomplished in deterring aggression in the NATO area . . .

. . . there are many advantages in belonging to this kind of alliance; we believe that the best way of defending Canada is as a member of NATO.

The revived Soviet tough, cold-war tactics and the Soviet threats of intervention appear to have jolted the West into renewed preparedness, giving to NATO a new feeling of purposive urgency. This renewed urgency may enable the nations concerned to focus

increased attention on the strengthening of the political, economic and social ties which are needed to make this alliance more effective. Grave problems must be faced as we attempt to work out the answers within the NATO grouping, yet something must be done and all must be prepared to give and take.

Canadians must keep in constant focus an additional unique arrangement within NATO, which is so important to Canada. I am thinking of the Canada-United States regional grouping for the defence of North America, a mutual arrangement for defence collaboration, which originated 16 years ago in the historic Ogdensburg Agreement in 1940.

May I suggest that international security is not only buttressed by international organizations and the availability of adequate forces to sanction right which may be violated; it requires also a moral and spiritual foundation.

In this connection I should like to refer to what I consider to be a significant statement of principle in the radio address of the Prime Minister on November 4:

Our aim is that the people of Eastern Europe should be free to choose their own form of government, a basic human right they have not enjoyed for many years.

Thoughtful Canadians welcome this reaffirmation of our basic moral and democratic integrity, as it relates to our efforts to see to it that justice and liberty are accorded to all presently-enslaved peoples.

We have witnessed a spontaneous and encouraging interest on the part of our people in the current struggle of Poland and Hungary for national freedom and a larger measure of justice. That is as it should be. I hope that this interest remains alive, and that we continue to examine the ways and means by which this interest can be translated into purposive, effective, though peaceful, international action.

May I remind honourable senators of the equally significant, less dramatic perhaps, but infinitely more lengthy and equally determined struggle for a large measure of international freedom and justice on the part of those peoples who have been aptly termed the "submerged nations" within the USSR. It seems hardly necessary to remind ourselves that in Soviet Russia, which is a huge multinational empire, the constituent minorities have been oppressed longer and therefore sublimated, decimated, and Russified more effectively. Perhaps that is one of the reasons why we hear less about them. I am not speaking in a sense of recrimination; but when the Western world expressed deep sympathy for the severe curtailment and active persecution of religious freedom in Poland and Hungary, the shocking martyrdom and

destruction of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches engendered far less sustained interest or indignant reaction. Nor is this the occasion for documenting the record of communist Russia's colonial exploitation and suppression of national and human rights, but this record does exist and it is indeed a tragic story.

Now, when we consider the continued plight of all these peoples and minorities, how indeed do we interpret our moral obligation to bring closer the day when the people of Eastern Europe might be free to choose their own form of government, a basic human right they have not enjoyed for years? Is it realistic that we may, on the international arena, continue to discuss the shocking reality of the colonial subjugation of the many individuals, minorities and nations within the Soviet Empire, firmly challenging the Soviet authorities to continued rationalization and liberalization of the communist system of minority government—and reiterating our belief that a free vote be taken to assess what in fact are the real wishes of these submerged and effectively-muzzled peoples? Many thoughtful observers believe that this is the challenge which the Soviet leaders are not prepared to accept, and one of our recurrent themes might well be an expression of our hope that the professed stability of the communist structure be subjected to the free existence of opposition parties and the free expression of the considered will of its peoples.

Honourable senators, I commend to your attention the last paragraph of the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Bulganin, dated November 13, dealing with the Hungarian situation:

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 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.

Surely, too, our people must understand and remember that we have no validated evidence to disprove our conviction that Soviet objectives continue to remain the same; their simple and unaltered aim—eventual communist world domination. True, Soviet tactics do zigzag, but these manoeuvres depend on what the powerful state mechanism with its present oligarchical leadership regards to be the most fruitful approach in effectuating its premeditated calculus of conquest, which envisages the destruction and the communizing of the so-called capitalist Western democracies.

Generally, and until recent developments in Hungary, communist tactics were directed to removing our fears—to constantly emphasizing the recurrent theme of peaceful or competitive co-existence—and, significantly enough, never resigning from emphatical statements that no co-existence was possible between democratic and communist ideologies. Banking on our alleged lack of internal discipline and staying power, Soviet leaders continue to mount ever greater highly-disciplined efforts to outstrip the Western democratic world, especially in military and industrial strength. With what motives, pray?

Honourable senators, I recognize that my analysis of some of the problem areas I have discussed is inadequate. However, I respectfully submit that all these things we Canadians must be mindful of, as we bend our efforts to strengthen our democratic social structure—guided, as we must be, by the principles of distributive justice operating within the national and the international framework of liberty, unity and human brotherhood.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Sarto Fournier:** Honourable senators, I received with a great deal of pleasure and accepted with a deep feeling of gratitude the invitation to second the motion so ably presented by the honourable senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Wall) for an Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

As this is the first time that I have risen to speak in this honourable chamber, honourable senators must appreciate the necessity for me to call upon your generosity and your most sympathetic attention at the outset of the few remarks that I shall have the pleasure to make.

Honourable senators, yesterday we had the opportunity of listening to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, so we are now in a position to know exactly why Parliament has been called into special session. We have been summoned here in order to make a decision so important that it will certainly have a direct bearing on the immediate future of the world. A similar proposition is being brought to the attention of the governments of eighteen other nations, in order to bring us together in a joint and common action to prevent war and to secure peace among those nations which have so imprudently and, I think, so wrongly taken it upon themselves to settle their economic difficulties by resorting to war in the Middle East.

We are also to be asked to vote a certain amount of money, a million dollars, as Canada's share to help the Hungarian people,

who are actually flung into the worst national tragedy of our time. We shall be glad to vote this money, for the sake of our country's honour.

I listened, as you did, honourable senators, with a great deal of pleasure and interest to the speech just made by the honourable senator from Winnipeg. For his elevation of thought, his deep knowledge of the facts, and his high intelligence of significance, we owe him more than felicitations or congratulations. Indeed, I think it is our duty to thank him sincerely for the brilliant and most useful contribution he has made at the outset of this debate.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Fournier:** In order to follow a well-established, and, I think, a rather good tradition, and because of the fact that the French language seems to be a little less difficult for me, I hope honourable senators will gracefully permit me to proceed now in the language of my mother tongue for the remainder of the remarks that I intend to make.

*(Translation):*

A few weeks ago, when the peoples of the world learned of Israel's attack upon Egypt, we all went through the whole gamut of emotions, from surprise and anxiety to astonishment and even terror. Several days later, Great Britain and France took the same action notwithstanding the most solemn commitments recorded in the United Nations Charter. The reaction was both spontaneous and universal. The eyes of the whole world turned towards the United Nations, in which, after the war, it had placed its hope and faith.

As soon as the problem was laid before it, the United Nations opened discussions in New York. Speeches, accusations and criticism were made by each representative. It looked very much like a panic, and instead of rushing to put out the fire the UN put the incendiaries on trial. And then it was Canada's turn to express an opinion. It is not the first time that our country has been called upon to take part in this kind of discussion, where the future of the human race is at stake. Because of its contribution during the war, Canada was entitled to voice its opinion and at San Francisco, Canada's point of view, as set forth by our representatives, had already begun to create a deep and reassuring impression upon the other nations. Once the United Nations Organization was set up and after the world realized the duplicity and bad faith of Moscow's representatives, which could have plunged the world into another deadlock, Canada again raised its voice and suggested NATO which, to this day, remains the

greatest co-operative for peace the world has ever known.

Therefore, the prestige and authority of Canada's voice are recognized and established the world over. And this time it was our representative again who saved the situation, by suggesting the cease-fire and recommending the setting up of a United Nations force composed of soldiers from certain member nations.

Canada played a tremendous part. We made it quite clear that nowadays good faith and moral authority are not enough. The United Nations must have at its disposal physical and mobile forces strong enough to bring to order the nations who see fit to stray away. The United Nations military force has been organized and some regiments have already arrived in Egypt where the people greeted them so enthusiastically and so cordially we have reason to believe that the Egyptians, like all the other peoples of the world, desire nothing but peace.

The part our country played in this affair is already a matter of history and it will be both the present Government's and the Canadian people's glory to have had representatives capable of evolving and submitting at the psychological moment the proper formula to save the world from another conflagration.

We well remembered that the former League of Nations' greatest weakness came from its lack of physical strength. Let us hope that this time we will remember our lesson and that, mindful of the good results of the use of this formula in Egypt, all the nations will unanimously recognize that if the United Nations Organization is to survive it must remain armed. As long as there are peoples whose governments are composed of predacious men whose ambition is to bring into subjection the weaker nations and whose every thought and deed are motivated by unjust and unreasonable economic or political ambitions, the peace of the world will be in jeopardy.

It is not up to us to solve the enormous problem which has set up the Middle East against two great Western peoples. History alone, as the perspective lengthens, will be able to assess responsibilities. The problem, with its religious, political and economic implications is extremely complicated. Since the opening of the Suez canal, this waterway has been the jugular vein of the Western peoples' economic life. It is little wonder that, faced with such an important economic fact, the peoples whose interests are concerned may not always act as wisely as they should. In the present case, we firmly believe that the nations concerned owed it to themselves and to the world to refer the matter to United Nations arbitration. Israel, Great

Britain and France who, like all the other signatories of the United Nations Charter, had signed the collective and solemn agreement not to resort to war, undeniably violated their word. Canada, today, cannot understand such behaviour and cannot refrain from severe criticism. It is undoubtedly with deep regret and some bitterness, when we recall the historic bonds of friendship which bind us particularly to France and Great Britain.

Justice should have and in fact has but one measure: what is right for one should equally be right for the other, and what is wrong for one should equally be wrong for the other.

What human conscience and the most elementary honesty cannot allow us to condone in the case of Russia or Communist China, we must also disapprove of, even if the governments concerned are friendly governments.

We admit readily that Egypt may have had and in fact had her faults. It is common knowledge that she was unfair and sometimes uncompromising and that her "flirtation" with Moscow continues to cause anxiety among us, but even so, that was not a sufficient reason to warrant invasion. We are living in tragic times. It seems obvious that the very existence of the United Nations Organization is at stake, but we have every reason to believe that this adventure will have a happy ending and that if the UN agrees to maintain an armed force, security and liberty seem to be assured to the world.

In the series of events that followed one another so swiftly, there was one that for some may have seemed of minor or even negligible importance, but which for Canadians is nevertheless very significant: it is the remark made by Colonel Nasser about the flag of the Canadian Regiment sent to join the soldiers of eighteen other nations in Egypt. We cannot pass upon the colonel's intentions and motives, for the simple reason that we know nothing about them; the fact remains, however, that the flag of our regiment leads to a certain confusion and we may be mistaken for others. It is a smarting lesson that we have received and we, as Canadians, are placed in an embarrassing, not to say a humiliating, position. When one sees all the nations of the world, even the least civilized tribes on earth, unfold a standard or a flag of their own, we in Canada have nothing to unfurl but a flag showing in its fold at the most honourable quarter the flag in miniature of another nation. I want to stress all the respect in which we hold the British flag. It is the symbol of a great nation and of a great civilization, but it is

nevertheless their own flag and not ours. Inasmuch as we are concerned, it is a disguise that causes us to be taken for someone else. It is a vestige of misplaced colonialism. It is an identification mark which does not identify us. For the last twenty years Canada has grown and has carved peacefully for herself a place in the world; we have commercial relations with one hundred and fifty countries; we maintain embassies, legations, consulates, offices; in a word we are everywhere. However, the flag that we fly is no indication of that fact, because we may be mistaken for someone else.

I understand very well the difficult position in which this problem places the Government of Canada, and all Canadians realize that the time may not yet have come to give our country a totally distinctive flag, because there are still among us certain reactionary groups who have not yet been able to rid themselves of an unfortunate complex of colonialism. It is quite evident that a national flag cannot come from one group or section of the country. It is just as evident that the imposition of a flag which would be flown in some places and reviled in others would, *ipso facto*, constitute a menace to national unity. Such disastrous results would be worse than obtaining the totally distinctive flag, that most Canadians seem to want. As long as there remains any possible danger of national disunity, the adoption of a national flag would seem a dangerous and practically impossible measure. Racial quarrelling would only adjourn the problem for another fifty years.

Our friends of the Conservative party who, toward mid-December, will meet in a national convention to choose a successor to their chief who was forced to retire because of ill health, could surely, if they saw fit, take steps which would definitely make it possible for Canadians to have their own distinctive flag. If their resolutions committee adopted the principle of a national flag at the convention and managed to have it accepted by the general assembly, unanimous agreement on this question would be achieved and the question of obtaining in short order our own flag would be only a matter of routine. Far be it from me to interfere in the internal affairs of the Conservative party, but I deem it my duty to advise them that in rallying frankly and loyally to this principle they would certainly make it possible for our nation to enjoy this definite and final symbol of national sovereignty and pride.

Our present flag recalls what we have been; what we need is a standard which will tell the world what we are at present. I firmly believe that no standard would be more respectfully or sympathetically received by the

nations of the world where we have many friends. Let us fervently hope, when the time comes to choose its design and general appearance, that white will predominate among the colours of our banner, because the history of Canada is spotless.

Honourable senators, almost every day we are the anxious witnesses to some shocking and desolating spectacle in this world of ours. The greatest cause for sadness of our present century, you will all agree, is the existence of the communist world and the knowledge of the countless abominations and crimes perpetrated by its leaders. Without a doubt, the application of its diabolical principles will remain in the annals of history the greatest subject of humiliation for the human mind. If communism were to spread to the whole world, I really wonder if life would be worth living. When I see that entire nations—formerly accustomed to freedom and dignity and now living under Moscow's yoke in the most abject conditions—prefer death and exile to the sort of life imposed upon them, I do not think so.

We have the great satisfaction and joy of seeing, on the other hand, the existence and advantages of another civilization which originated twenty centuries ago and to which we have the good fortune to belong, our Christian civilization.

The second reason for which we have been called and are actually gathered in session in the Canadian Parliament is to allow the people of Canada, through their representatives in the House of Commons and in the Senate, to take a step which, in truth, does honour to mankind. The ancient civilizations of Egypt, Greece or Rome, however brilliant they may have been, remained impervious to any charitable motive. Today, the Christian world has given free rein to its emotion and to its tangible compassion before the terrible trials of Hungary and the sight of this nation in agony. Along with other countries, we shall be able to help this nation, because there are today certain governments whose thoughts and decisions are inspired by the Gospel.

Canada is accustomed to helping the unfortunate, wherever they may be. In some circles our Government has, I know, been severely blamed for its generosity towards other poor and unhappy countries, suffering from want in far away lands.

Honourable senators, I would like to remind you that the benevolence of Canadians has not made them any the poorer. Indeed, Canada now stands third among the trading powers of the world. Canada entertains commercial exchanges with other countries and among our population of barely 16 million, more than 5½ million labourers earn an honourable living in our Canadian in-

dustries which are constantly progressing and expanding. Our national revenue will soon reach the astronomic figure of 30 billion dollars. We are at present enjoying a period of prosperity which was not even dreamed of in the most optimistic forecasts of twenty years ago. We have the good fortune to be governed by a group of men having as their leader one the greatest statesmen of the day, recognized as such everywhere, the Prime Minister of Canada, the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent. In the whole world our country has become a subject of admiration, of gratitude and of respect. It would seem that our prosperity, our material sufficiency and comfortable way of life are Heaven's reward to Canada for the works of mercy it is pursuing all over the world. Today, we want to help our Hungarian brothers. It is with the deepest satisfaction that we come to their help, and if there is anything more we can do let them rest assured that we will do it most willingly. We regard them as we do our neighbour. In the Lord's Prayer, which is said by all the Christians of Canada and which we recite every day in the House of Commons and in the Senate, we are reminded that all men are our brothers.

In all its activities, whether internal or external, Canada has never sought anything but the establishment of a just and durable peace in the world. Our most ardent wish is that all the peoples of the world may in a few weeks, when Christmas is here, join us in proclaiming: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of good will."

(Text):

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable members, I do not intend to continue the debate this afternoon, but I would like to say a few words in order that there may be no misunderstanding when I speak tomorrow.

Usually when honourable senators, especially members of the Opposition, enter the discussion on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne they talk about any subject they choose. On two previous occasions during my membership in this house Parliament was called in special session. I was a member of the Opposition party here in 1939 when Parliament was called and declared war against Germany. At that time the Leader of the Opposition confined his remarks to the issue of the day. In August of 1950 I had the honour of being the Leader of the Opposition in this chamber when Parliament was called into special session to deal primarily with the railway strike. On that occasion, when taking part in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech

from the Throne, I limited my remarks to the subjects outlined in the Speech. In taking part in the present debate I intend to follow the same course.

I would like to refer to a few of the subjects which ordinarily I would have dealt with but which I am going to refrain from discussing on this occasion. I am doing this in case somebody might later ask, and quite properly, "Why didn't the Leader of the Opposition deal with such and such a subject?"

Honourable senators, if this were not a special session the first subject with which I would deal would be Canada's financial situation as it affects our governments at dominion, provincial, municipal and school board levels.

Another subject with which I ordinarily would have dealt is trade. Canada is at present buying more goods on the world market than it is selling. Unless there has been a change in the situation in the last two or three months—and I doubt it—indications are that this year the value of our imports will exceed the value of exports by the largest amount in our history. This is a subject I should like to have discussed in detail.

There is also a problem with respect to current interest rates. This is a topic that is being widely discussed right across Canada. I am not saying that the Government is to blame, but I do think its whole policy on interest rates, and the reason for the present high rates, should be outlined to the people. I am not referring particularly to the interest you or I may have to pay on money we borrow from a bank or elsewhere, but I am thinking of the whole financial structure of our municipal governments, school boards and so on, whose development depends greatly on the terms of loans that they need.

Another matter: the same old problem that has faced the Prairie provinces for the last two or three years is still with us. As of November 1 there were 825 million bushels of wheat stored in our grain elevators and on our farms, waiting to be sold. Some of this grain is part of at least a two-year-old crop. Many people complain that the farmers' problems are always with us, but this particular problem is much more important to the Prairie provinces than the other provinces, especially Ontario and Quebec, seem to realize. However, as I do not intend to deal with the problem now I am not going to suggest how it should be solved.

I want to say quite candidly that I am very pleased that the Government has proposed to aid Canadian culture by setting up a

Canada Council to administer funds to assist Canadian university construction. I understand that the Government also proposes to ask Parliament to double the federal grant to universities. On a previous occasion, when the annual grant was set at \$8 million, I argued that it should have been at least doubled. Well, now it is to be \$16 million, and I am sure it will be doubled again in the lifetime of most of us in this chamber. As to the amount of \$50 million for university construction, I feel this will be far from sufficient. I am not exaggerating when I say the amount should be \$500 million. I know something about the administrative problems of universities. I happen to be Chairman of the Board of Regents of a certain college which is affiliated with the University of Manitoba, and I know of the problems facing that university, which had to turn away a large number of students this year.

I am not enough of an artist or a musician to make any comment about the university scholarships and bursaries that are to be provided to help Canadian painters, musicians and dancers.

Another subject with which I would like to have dealt is inflation. Now, I do not think anyone should criticize a Government about its handling of a certain problem without making a reasonable suggestion for solving that problem. I have heard a lot of suggested cures for inflation, and I have thought of many myself, but I am not offering any at this time. Inflation affects people in every walk of life, particularly elderly pensioners

who find that their financial burdens increase proportionately with the diminution of the value of the dollar.

Honourable senators, I am not going to talk about any of these subjects tomorrow. Instead, I shall deal only with the matters discussed by the mover (Hon. Mr. Wall) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier) of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Incidentally, this afternoon when the seconder used the words "the honourable senator from Winnipeg" in referring to the mover of the Address, I was reminded of the first debate I heard in this house. That was in January of 1936. There was then a certain member of this chamber who for many years had been known as the honourable senator from Winnipeg. I, too, was from Winnipeg and when His Honour the Speaker had occasion to point out that "the honourable senator from Winnipeg said so and so"—meaning me—the other gentleman from Winnipeg rose and said, "Your Honour, I did not say so and so. It was the junior senator from Winnipeg". Again this afternoon it was the junior senator from Winnipeg who spoke, and he made a very good speech indeed.

I thank the house for allowing me to make these preliminary remarks today. I will continue the debate tomorrow afternoon.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Haig, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 3 p.m.

---

## THE SENATE

Wednesday, November 28, 1956

The Senate met at 3 p.m. the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

Routine Proceedings.

### EMERGENCY SITTINGS

#### NOTICE OF MOTION

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I give notice of the following motion, which I shall move tomorrow:

That, for the duration of the present session of Parliament, should an emergency arise during any adjournment of the Senate, which would in the opinion of the Honourable the Speaker warrant that the Senate meet prior to the time set forth in the motion for such adjournment, the Honourable the Speaker be authorized to notify honourable senators at their addresses registered with the Clerk of the Senate, to meet at a time earlier than that set out in the motion for such adjournment, and non-receipt by any one or more honourable senators of such call shall not have any effect upon the sufficiency and validity thereof.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Will the honourable leader read what the Prime Minister said in the other place?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I thought I had a copy of the statement here, but I have not. However, I may say the intention is that when Parliament has completed the business for which it has been called into session, that is, in respect of the setting up of a United Nations police force, and the provision of assistance to Hungarian refugees, both houses will adjourn until Tuesday, January 8. The reason for this is that should another emergency arise in the meantime, we can be summoned to meet on short notice at any time. If we are not called back earlier than the 8th of January we shall reconvene at 11 o'clock on that morning, at which time the present session will be prorogued. In the afternoon we shall begin a new session. That is the purport of the motion which I wish to present formally tomorrow, and I am indebted to the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) for suggesting that I should state what the intention is.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION FOR ADDRESS IN REPLY—  
DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from yesterday, consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session

and the motion of Hon. Mr. Wall, seconded by Hon. Mr. Fournier, for an Address in reply thereto.

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable senators, I can promise you that I will not delay you for long. First of all I wish to congratulate the mover (Hon. Mr. Wall) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier) of this motion. I especially congratulate the mover, whose speech I understood. I am sorry to say that I could not follow the language of the seconder, and therefore I cannot say whether I agree with what he said or not; however, I presume the translation of his speech will appear in our *Hansard* tomorrow. These younger senators have given a fine exhibition of their worth in this chamber, and an excellent indication of their worth in the years to come. I hope that twenty years or so from now they will recall with pride that they moved and seconded the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne in the special session of 1956.

Honourable members, I took the liberty yesterday of mentioning certain matters that I do not intend to deal with at this time, and I did so because it occurred to me that somebody might ask why I did not touch on them. I said quite candidly that I was going to restrain my remarks to the matters referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

As honourable senators know, the Speech from the Throne deals with two subjects, namely, the situation in the Middle East, and recent events in Hungary. I will deal with them in the same order. This is the first time in my memory, and I think in the memory of most if not all of us that a question has arisen concerning a joint action of Britain and France, those two great pioneering nations from whose loins this country has sprung. I say that without any disrespect to the people of other nations who have come to our shores. In the course of our political struggles we have sometimes felt that the English did not act rightly, and at other times it seemed to us that the French were at fault. But here is an instance in which both our ancestral nations have acted together, rightly or wrongly. There can be no question as to that in this debate.

Let me give you some reasons for the widespread interest throughout Canada in world developments today. I know that in my own province there is far greater interest in questions involving the Middle East today than in anything else I have known of throughout my political life. The general interest arises from one or two main considerations. First, there are such questions as what the United Nations might have done, or what the United States should have done, what Britain and France did, and what

Russia and certain other world nations did in the particular circumstances. There is the further major question of whether we are just at the beginning of a world struggle, or at the end of one. That question causes deep concern to a great many people.

There are in our country people descended from Scottish, English, French, Dutch and many other racial origins. I took the trouble the other day to look into the ancestral heritage of my sons. Their great-grandmother on one side was born and educated in France, and the one on the other side was born and educated in Ireland. Their grandmothers were born and educated in Scotland and their mother comes from Scottish parentage. I give that as an example of the reason for the interest on the part of Canadian people in the background of the problems that affect other nations today.

I am thinking also of the people in Quebec, whose ancestors for the most part are French, although one finds in that province many people who spring from Irish, English and Scottish parentage.

If we go back in history we learn that during the past two or three hundred years Great Britain and France have been the outstanding nations of the world. True, they have at times stood on opposite sides, but they have been outstanding in the conduct of world affairs. For instance, at the outbreak of the Second World War it did not take Churchill long to go to France and assure that country that Britain would join it in its fight for freedom and liberty. He did not do that because of any false modesty, but because he knew the French people, knew that they loved their freedom of religion, of language and of assembly as dearly as did Britain, and that they were determined to stand against the Nazi ideology of life.

A similar situation exists today. But into the world of today has been thrust an element that even the best of us, men of the strongest courage, cannot cope with, and we cannot estimate what the future holds for any of us.

Those of us who have had the pleasure and honour of attending at the United Nations Assemblies, no matter in what capacity, have learned that Russia herself—her satellites do not count—seems to be unable to convince other people that she is genuinely in favour of doing the things that the free world thinks ought to be done. Russia cannot be led to believe that her word ought to be as good as her bond, that she should encourage freedom and allow men and women of all classes the right to lead a normal family life as people do in other parts of the world. Apparently the extension of communism depends on suppressing these things.

Now, let us look at the situation in the Middle East. What were the conditions there before Britain and France moved in at all?

It must be remembered that for many hundreds of years Israel had been occupied by the Arabs, but they were pushed out, largely through the efforts of the United States at the time of the settlement, when the Israeli people were put in. Now, it must be admitted that the Israelis did have a claim on that country, for it was their former home. But the Arabs will not admit it and do not want the Israelis to stay there. Then apparently the United States has refused to acknowledge its obligation to maintain things in the Middle East, things that only she and Russia can take care of. We might as well look the situation straight in the face and admit that a great world struggle is going on and may go on for many years to come. I cannot help thinking of the message General Gruenther gave us here in this very building, in the Railway Committee room, a year or two ago. In reply to the question "What would happen if Russia attacked?" he said, "In half an hour our bombers, loaded with bombs, would be up in the air and on their way to bomb Russia". He repeated that warning here the other day. We have not got over that feeling.

And now this is what we are up against: a dictatorship was established in Egypt. Nasser is a dictator. I say that without fear of contradiction. We know now that he hoped that the United States and Great Britain would lend his government the money with which to build a dam across the Nile and make more water available to produce cheap food in his country. I have no first-hand knowledge of why the United States refused the loan. It may be because it found out that, behind its back, Egypt was dealing with one of the Russian satellites for the purchase of war materials—which in fact were provided, and with which Nasser intended to assert what he thought were his rights against Israel. I am not here to defend Israel. But if Israel, which was established by the free nations of the world, presents any problem, it is for those nations to find some way of dealing with it in the light of their own best judgment; it is not for Russia to dictate what shall be done.

As soon as the United States found out that Egypt had acquired these armaments, it ceased to supply her with money. What happened then? Israel attacked. I do not know just why, but I do know that had I been in their place I would have attacked too,—

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:**—because Jordan and Egypt were preparing for war, and other adjacent countries were opposed to Israel. Self-defence has always been considered justifiable. The Israelis, knowing what was coming, moved in on the Egyptians, and the Egyptians simply faded out. No other expression describes it. They made practically no defence; some 54,000 men surrendered, with arms and munitions worth millions of dollars which had been supplied by Russia's satellites.

Previously Nasser had nationalized the Suez canal. There are differences of opinion as to whether he did so in pursuance of a legal right, since the company in possession has a contract which runs another eight or ten years. If the Egyptian Government had paid the operators in full there might have been some ground for the seizure. I am not going to argue the matter, because it does not enter into the subject of debate. But what followed? The canal was blocked with boats filled with cement and sunk by Egypt. That was no evidence of peaceful action; it indicated a determination to make it impossible for France or Britain or any other nation to use the waterway.

So Britain and France, faced with these conditions, and knowing that Russia was supplying arms and munitions to the Middle East—we now find that Syria is ready to ally herself with the communist states—took positive action. It may be that they should have notified the United Nations, Canada and other powers of their intentions. But let me remind honourable senators in this connection that, but for the absence of Russia from the Security Council meeting when the Korean situation was being considered, the United States would never have been allowed to enter Korea, because if Russia had been present she would have vetoed the resolution for United Nations action.

My next point is this. In recent months, before the Suez incident, Russia had made a deal with Poland which was carried through. Then, at the time when British and French troops moved into the canal zone, Russian troops took over Hungary. The United Nations voted condemnation of Russia, but what else have they done but pass pious resolutions? We are now about to provide a million dollars in aid of the Hungarians who have been driven from their native land, but the United Nations did nothing, and the United States did nothing.

I hold in my hand two editorials from New York newspapers. If anyone objects to my reading them I will not do so.

**An Hon. Senator:** Go ahead.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** One is headed "Death"; the other, "Stalin Lives Again in Death". One appeared in the New York *Times*, the other in the New York *Herald Tribune*. I will read only a sentence or so:

"Help! Help! Help!"

These were the last words heard by a shocked world as Red barbarians strangled the last free voices in martyred Hungary.

What the writer is saying is simply this, that the United States ought to have moved in and defended Hungary, that it should not have been content with pious resolutions which could have no effect on Russia.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Do you mean the United Nations should have moved in?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** No. I am not blaming nor praising the United Nations. The UN is an experiment which in my judgment can be a success only if every member is willing to do its part. The United Nations has no force to command at will. What could it have done in Hungary? The only nation which could have intervened effectively is the United States, and it did not do so. That there was an election pending at the time is not to the point. Probably the Russians counted on it as likely to prevent action. I do not know. But the United States is in fact the United Nations: there can be no question about it. Admittedly more than seventy other countries are represented in the United Nations, but if the United States will not act no other country can be counted upon to do so. Now Nasser has the audacity to demand that the canal which was blocked by his action should be cleared by the United Nations, and that if the British and French do not pay the cost, the United States should do so. It is things like that which make us wonder why people depend on the United Nations so much. I am not saying that it has no value, for it helps in the matter of negotiations, talks and interviews. It may help to keep the peace to some extent, but you cannot maintain peace between two great nations like Russia and the United States, if they finally come to grips, for those two countries are never going to sit down together until one of them is master of the world. You can take it or leave it. That is the truth, and nothing we can do will prevent this situation from developing. There is no use in saying that Russia is not going to allow this to happen. If she gains control of the Middle East as she now controls the eastern part of Europe, she will be in a position to control the world, and poor little Canada will say, "Yes, yes". That will be the end of it.

I return now to the editorial to which I was referring earlier. It says that the United

States should have asked the United Nations to do something about the situation in the Middle East and that if the United Nations failed to take action, then the United States herself should have done so. Everyone knew that Russia was sending arms into Egypt, just as everyone knew that Nasser was a dictator. Everyone knew what the Arabs wanted, and that Russia was going to back them. The United States knew that, and now her President says he wants to hold a meeting with leaders from Britain and France in order to keep the three Western powers—the United States, Britain and France—together. Well, these three powers will not be kept together if Europe is made to starve for oil.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** May I interrupt my friend to ask a question? As I understand it, the article he referred to said that the United States, not the United Nations, should have moved to help Hungary.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** No, it did not say that. It said that a move should have been made to help settle the Middle East situation.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** My question bears on that too. If the United States had made such a move, does my friend think that it would have led immediately to a general war?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I do not think so. I do not think Russia would get into a general war unless she thought the dice were loaded in her favour.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** That is a matter of opinion.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** General Gruenther is right. The dice are not loaded for Russia yet, but they will be if Russia is allowed to move into the Middle East and take over control of the oil supply in that part of the world.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Do not point at me.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Well, you are the honourable gentleman who asked me a question. Russia will not move in now. If what General Gruenther told us was the truth, and I presume it was, the United States would be ready within half an hour to retaliate against any Russian attack. My honourable friend from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) was present and heard him say that.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** A move by the United States might have meant a general war.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** It means one anyway. That is the terrible part of it.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** That may be.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Neville Chamberlain thought he could prevent a second world war by yielding to Hitler's demands at Munich,

but he was wrong. He had a chance to deal with Hitler in another way, but he trusted him.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** And you applauded Chamberlain at that time.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** The words "Don't be a Chamberlain" will go down in history. Our people seem to be afraid to go to war, but I don't think we will have to. As General Gruenther said, there won't be war as long as Russia knows we hold the position of supremacy, but the minute she thinks she holds it she will go to war. Everybody here knows that to be the fact.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I do not agree with all that.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** When it came to a show-down I think the least Canada should have done—I may be entirely wrong—

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** You probably are.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Well, the stand that I take, and I am persuaded it is the stand of the majority of the people of Canada,—

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** No.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** My honourable friend says, "No", but I do not know. He would be surprised.

**Hon. Mr. Howard:** What is the stand?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I think it is the stand of the majority of Canadians that when the chips were down Canada should have stood four-square with Britain and France.

**Hon. Mr. Baird:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Sometimes when certain issues have been raised men and women have said to me, "Senator Haig, I have French-Canadian blood and I feel the action that is being taken now is strongly pro-British. I don't think we should do so and so." At other times people have said, "I think this matter is very pro-French, but I am pro-British and I do not think we should do this." But that sort of thing does not apply here at all. This is a vital question that affects Canadian descendants of both French and English, yet our Government is taking the attitude that Britain and France have done wrong. Throughout history these countries have always fought for freedom. Everybody knew what was happening in the Middle East, and Britain and France took steps to prevent it, but the plain fact is that the United States refused to offer any help. It never moved in. It took no responsibility at all, yet the United States was one of the countries responsible for the establishment of the State of Israel. I admit the British were in favour, but not too much so. In the early twenties Britain's

Balfour was for it, but not so much the present generation. The Balfour Declaration was put into effect and was lived up to, but the British have really been more favourably disposed to Jordan and the other Arab states. That is the situation.

This whole matter is going to be a vital issue in Canada's next general election. Make no mistake about that. When I vote I will have to decide whether or not I support those who condemn the stand taken by Britain and France. That will be the issue. Having the knowledge that Russia has put arms into the Middle East and that Nasser, the dictator, has deliberately wrecked ships in the Suez Canal in order to block oil supplies to Britain, France and other European countries, am I to turn around and condemn Britain and France for moving into the Middle East? Do you think the United Nations would have given Britain and France the authority to move into the Middle East to deal with the canal situation, or to stop Russian arms going into that part of the world? The Arabs could not operate their own machines and Russians were sent to help them. Those are solemn facts. I do not speak for anybody else, but as long as I have the strength to draw a breath I will stand on the side of England and France, and not on the side of Russia. That is the whole issue.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** That is not the point at all.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** These fundamental facts will face us and our descendants as long as Russia stands as a threat to humanity. People say Russia would not do these things, but she did in Hungary and in every other part of Europe she has touched. We thought a new co-existence would be possible between the Western nations and Russia after Stalin's death, but things are worse now than ever before. All Stalin did was to kill off some of his own countrymen, but his successors are killing men, women and children of other countries. It is a terrible situation. Canada has never been confronted by anything like it before. We faced the threat of war in 1914 and again in 1939, but we are now facing the most difficult situation of all times. You have only to read press dispatches and listen to the radio to learn who is running the show. Nasser is running the show. He says, "We will let these men come in—provided so and so; otherwise, out they go." That is what his representative told them the other day at the United Nations. The Prime Minister, or the Minister for External Affairs, received a letter saying that he did not mean that, but nevertheless he said it. It was a challenge to the world that Nasser could run the canal, that Britain and France would pay the costs,

and that the armies of the United States and Russia should chase them out. Those are things which are just a little too much for me, and I think they are a little too much for most Canadians. I say that quite candidly and determinedly. I will do anything I can to re-establish the name and the honour of Britain and France in Canada, so that the people of French or British descent will feel proud of their ancestors and of the countries from which they came. I may be all alone, but I will do my best to do that.

I now come to Hungary. What can we say about Hungary? I hear criticism here of the French and the British. I hear very little criticism of Russia, although that country not only overran Hungary but murdered many of its people. I have not heard the Government of Canada say much about that at all, or make any great row about it at the United Nations.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Did you read the Prime Minister's letter to Mr. Bulganin?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Yes, but that was after it was all over. Anybody can write letters, but they do not mean much.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** What is your proposal?

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Well, I do not know; I am not paying too much attention to that. What I am saying is that at the United Nations there was not the same condemnation by Canada of Russia's action against Hungary as there was of Britain and France, by not voting in their favour. That is what the people of Canada do not understand, and they are worried about it; they want to know why. Only a couple of weeks ago a reporter from the CBC said that the intellectuals of Great Britain were opposed to the Eden Government, but that the man on the street was for the Government; and he said that the popular polls would show that.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** The by-election did not show it.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** The by-election was all right; the Government candidate had a larger majority than in the previous by-election.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I disagree. The majority was tremendously reduced in that by-election.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** The majority in a by-election is always much smaller than in a general election. It is generally about nine per cent less, and this time it was only five per cent less; that information was given over the air by a man who was opposed to the Government. That is the situation, and I do not care whether the honourable member from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) or anybody

else thinks otherwise. I do not think this country will stand for our condemning Britain and France and at the same time being very lukewarm in our condemnation of Russia's attack on Hungary.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** May I interrupt my friend? He has no right to make the assertion that Canada or the Secretary of State for External Affairs has not joined in condemning the action of Russia.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** This is a pretty good campaign of interruption. My honourable friend has the right to speak when I am through.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** When you make incorrect statements I will interrupt every time.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I am not afraid of your interruptions at all, but on a subject like this I like to feel free from little attacks as I go along. Of course, you may interrupt if you wish. I admit that the majority of this house is very one-sided, but I do not mind that; that is not the problem. The problem is what the people of this country think. In my judgment the majority of the people think as I have stated, and I am persuaded that that is the view that posterity will take.

Honourable senators, I have no objection at all to voting money for the people of Hungary who have been thrown out of their homes, or to the policy of the Government in admitting refugees into Canada. I think it is a fine idea. I also think that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is doing a splendid job in preparing to receive those people here. When the time comes, I will vote for it. I thought that the original amount of \$100,000 was too low.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** No, not \$100,000.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Was it \$200,000?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** No. You are speaking of the immediate payment; it was never intended that that was to be the total payment.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I understand that \$200,000 was the sum first mentioned, and that then it was raised to \$1 million.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** It was intended to be \$1 million from the beginning.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** The press statement which I read was that \$200,000 would be given toward the relief of the destitute in Hungary. I agreed to that, and also agreed when the amount was raised to \$1 million. I do not object to that at all. But I do not think we fully realize the situation that Britain and France found themselves in, facing, as they thought, certain possibilities in the Middle

East. They moved in to try to prevent those from developing. Whether they were right or wrong, posterity alone will decide. In my judgment, posterity will decide that they were right, in the whole circumstances of the case. I think it will also decide that the United States was, as it always has been—and I say this advisedly—late in coming in. She was late in World War II. Pearl Harbor had to be attacked before she would come in at all—about a year after the war had started. She was late in World War I, declaring that it was not her business; but a great and wealthy nation has as part of her business certain responsibilities to the rest of the world, and must see that those responsibilities are carried out. Editorials have pointed out that the United States does not seem to realize that she has grown up and should take her share of the responsibilities.

As far as Canada is concerned, I am glad that the Minister for External Affairs moved for a police force in the Middle East, but I am afraid it was too late. Nasser said he would not have our men there, that their uniforms looked like British uniforms. It was Nasser, mind you, and nobody else, who said he would not have them. It was stated in the other place that it was because our flag is the same as that of Great Britain that he did not want them there, but the truth is that Nasser said our uniforms reminded him of the British soldier and he did not want that kind of thing there.

It puzzles me why Canada should allow a man like him to tell us what we should do or should not do. When the matter was being debated in the United Nations why did we not object to his stand? A police force was asked for, and we were prepared to contribute our share with a contingent of 1,000 or 1,200 men. Instead of that we were told we would be allowed to send clerical help, stenographers, dishwashers, cooks and potato peelers, but no fighting men. Why should we listen to any such suggestions from Mr. Nasser?

For those reasons, honourable senators, I think we are making a grave mistake in the stand we have taken in this whole affair. I am absolutely opposed to any condemnation of Great Britain and France. With all the facts before me and in calm consideration I would have supported fully the action taken by those two great nations.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, my first remarks must be to congratulate the mover (Hon. Mr. Wall) and the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier) of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. This is indeed a very critical time in our history, as

the Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) has said, and we are therefore most fortunate in the selection of honourable senators to move and second the Address.

I feel it was most appropriate that the honourable junior senator from Winnipeg, as the Leader of the Opposition referred to him yesterday, moved the Address. He was born of Ukrainian parents. He has a wide knowledge of conditions in Eastern Europe and in Asia, and can speak feelingly on what is taking place today in Hungary. In his speech he told us that in the land of his parents there are conditions similar to those in Hungary today, where there is no freedom and the people are under the iron heel of Russia.

The honourable junior senator from Winnipeg has also a wide knowledge of Canada. Furthermore, he has been one of Canada's delegates to the United Nations, and the experience gained through mingling with representatives of many countries of the world made him all the more qualified to move, as he did so eloquently, the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I wish also to say how very pleased I was to hear the address by the seconder, the honourable senator from de Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. Fournier). I had the privilege of hearing him speak in the House of Commons, and therefore anticipated an outstanding address from him. The main part of his speech was in French, and in that language I shall now congratulate him and make a brief comment upon one of the points that he made.

*(Translation):*

I wish to congratulate the honourable senator who seconded the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. As we all know, he is an experienced parliamentarian, so that the clarity and excellence of the remarks he made both in English and in French surprised no one and we would like to express to him our sincere appreciation.

In the course of his speech yesterday, the honourable senator from DeLanaudière mentioned that we should have a distinctive national flag and I am sure that most honourable senators agree with him. However, as we have had occasion to note recently, public opinion on this point is far from being unanimous in the different parts of our country. I think we are all of the opinion that a national flag might help to unify our great Canadian nation, but it should not tend to divide us or cause dissension among us. There is no doubt whatever that the moment Canadians can agree on the question, Canada will have its own flag.

*(Text):*

Honourable senators, the Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks yesterday referred to certain subjects which he would not discuss at this time because this is an emergency session of Parliament. I am grateful to him for giving me notice of the subjects which he proposes to discuss when Parliament reassembles in January, and I assure him that he will be well satisfied with the action the Government is taking in regard to all these matters. The Government is giving full consideration to a satisfactory solution of these problems he mentioned, and when we meet here next session Canada will still be one of the most prosperous countries in the world and one of the most desirable in which to live.

I do not agree with all that the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech today. He said he spoke for himself, and I hope that is true, because I do not believe he spoke for any large segment of the Canadian people. I doubt very much that he spoke for his party; certainly, he did not claim to do so. I would have preferred that he did not make the speech he made today, because I believe that if Canada and the other nations had taken the attitude which he advocates we would have now been involved in a world war.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** What if we are involved in one anyway, sooner or later?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the United States and Russia might come to grips. Now, honourable senators, I am sure that if those two countries come to grips it will mean the end of the world. That is the very situation we are trying to avoid. Canada, in all her actions, has done nothing to injure either the United Kingdom or France. Our every effort has been not only to save the United Kingdom and France from a world war, but to preserve peace for the world. I shall refer in more detail later to some of the other remarks which my honourable friend made when, as he said, he was speaking for himself.

However, I did agree with the honourable leader opposite when he said that we are living in very difficult times. Quite apart from what has taken place in the Suez area, we have witnessed as brutal and criminal a betrayal of the Hungarian people as has ever been known in the history of the world. Those people are asking for nothing more than the right to run their own affairs free from communistic colonial domination, but yet Soviet tanks and Soviet guns were sent into that country and many thousands of those wonderful people were mercilessly butchered.

Fifty thousand, sixty thousand, or seventy thousand refugees have left Hungary, but Hungary still lives, and I am satisfied that most of us in this chamber will live to see the day when she will be free again.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** That will be one of our aims.

Now what did Canada do when Hungary was being overrun by these Russian hordes? Previously we had become signatories to the covenant in the United Nations Charter. We attended the United Nations Assembly and we joined in the strongest terms in condemning Russia for its treatment of Hungary. Also, as I mentioned during the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, our Prime Minister took it upon himself to write a letter to Mr. Bulganin appealing for a halt to the butchery practised by the Russian soldiers in Hungary. We did all in our power at that time to stop the massacre. Since then, we have thrown wide the doors of Canada to Hungarian refugees.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** No country in the world has opened its doors wider to Hungarian refugees than has Canada. We welcome them. To facilitate their movement to Canada we have sent all the planes at our disposal to Austria, to which country large numbers of the refugees have fled. We have waived medical examinations and other usual requirements; we have even advanced loans to pay for their transportation.

Honourable senators, what more can we do? If any honourable member can suggest anything more that Canada can do to help the refugees from Hungary I assure you that the Government will implement his suggestion, if it is at all practicable.

We have done our best as a Government, as your representatives. And Parliament now is doing its best. There remains one thing that we can all do, and that is to assist these refugees when they arrive in Canada. They have had a hard time, have suffered many privations, and it is our duty and responsibility, yours and mine—the duty and responsibility of all the people of Canada—to welcome them here and to help them become established in their new homes.

Now, honourable senators, I think I should refer briefly to the steps which have been taken at the United Nations to assure, as far as possible that we should have peace in the world.

In the first place let me point out that we are members of the United Nations Organization, we are signatories to the covenant. We passed an act of Parliament in this chamber

by which we undertook to do certain things. Therefore, we just cannot say "Oh, we don't care now about the United Nations," or "We should not be in the United Nations". The fact is that we are in the United Nations. And even if we had not signed the covenant but had only given our word, surely our word is as good as our bond.

After the trouble arose in the Suez—and I am not going to condemn anyone because of what took place there, for I know the Israeli people were hard pressed—what did we find? We found that we were nearer to a world war because of what was happening. So the United Nations assembled, and the first proposal that was made was for consideration of the Suez problem. That is the proposal which, I take it, the Leader of the Opposition objects to.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** No, that is not correct.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** What else could we do? The proposal was that this matter of the Suez should be considered by the United Nations. Now, was not one of the main reasons for establishing the United Nations that it should deal with such matters? Could we have said, "Oh, no, this thing should not even be mentioned by the United Nations"? That is the attitude of the Russians: they want to do everything on their own. But, true to our covenant we voted for consideration of this matter by the United Nations. And when it came before the assembly the first proposal was a resolution for a cease-fire.

Now our purpose, notwithstanding what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition, was that the world should get out of this crisis without a war and without violating the principles and Charter of the United Nations. That was our main aim, to keep the world at peace. Another and equal aim was to hold the Commonwealth together. That at all times has been one of Canada's main purposes, and I say this country has played a creditable, indeed a marvellous, part in this respect. Indeed, but for Canadian action I do not believe the Commonwealth would be as secure as it is today. Ours is and will continue to be a great association of peoples, and Canada will do all in its power to keep the Commonwealth as great as it is.

The first resolution which was brought forward for the cessation of fighting was one which we did not approve. We thought it had been introduced too hurriedly and that it would not have the desired effect. There was a second cease-fire resolution, which had as its object not only to bring fighting to an end but to prevent military aid from being accorded to various other countries, because it might encourage them to line up on one side or the other and so, almost inevitably, precipitate a world conflict.

We did not believe the cease-fire resolution went far enough and we abstained from voting on it. But immediately thereafter we proposed by resolution that fighting should cease and that a United Nations police force should go into Egypt to supervise the maintenance of the peace. This is the resolution under which the present force has been set up and made effective. It was provided that the Secretary General should report back in 48 hours with a plan for the setting up of the force. At the same time an Asian-Arab bloc of 19 states brought forward a resolution for a cease-fire and a withdrawal, but fortunately Canada, through the instrumentality of our own great Secretary of State for External Affairs, was able to get through the General Assembly prior passage of his police resolution. It was carried unanimously. That is, 54 nations voted for it; and although 19 nations abstained, not one opposed the Canadian proposition for the setting up of the force. Surely neither the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) nor anyone else can say that we were not acting in the interests of the United Kingdom. In fact, our Secretary of State for External Affairs had been in touch with the British representatives, and the spokesman of the United Kingdom at the UN made this statement:

The first urgent task is to separate Israel and Egypt and to stabilize the position. That is our purpose. If the United Nations were willing to take over the physical task of maintaining peace in that area no one would be better pleased than us. But police action there must be to separate the belligerents and to stop hostilities.

Clearly then, we were working in accord with the wishes of the United Kingdom. It is true that both Britain and France abstained from voting, but it is also true that both Governments subsequently expressed their appreciation of the initiative which was shown by the Canadian delegation and which resulted in the adoption of the resolution. The Asian-Arab resolution was subsequently carried by 59 votes against 5.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition stated in effect that the United Nations is just an organization for "talk, talk, talk" and "words, words, words". Well, in so far as Canada is concerned that has not been the case to date. Immediately the resolution to set up a UN police force was adopted, Canada, whose representative had done a great deal of talking up to that time, immediately took action and volunteered to provide a regiment to form part of the force. Is not that action? That is not "words, words, words". And the regiment is ready to go. Who stopped it from going?

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Nasser.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** President Nasser? No, it was not he who prevented the regiment from going. Who is heading this UN police force? A great Canadian, of whom we are all proud, General Burns. It was he, and no other, who stopped the contingent from going.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Because he was told.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** My honourable friend seems to know more about what took place between General Burns, the Secretary General of the United Nations and others than the rest of us do. But I can assure him that the Canadian force takes orders from no one except General Burns. It was he who decided what force we should send. When an infantry battalion is needed, and when General Burns says it ought to go, it will go. In the meantime what are we doing? We provided an airlift. Some of us here may consider ourselves to be great military strategists, may think we know more about running General Burns' job than the general himself does, but it was he who told us that what should now be sent was, not a thousand infantrymen, but as many aeroplanes as we could get to carry our people from Italy to the Suez. Should we tell General Burns that he does not know what he is talking about, that we are not going to provide aeroplanes, that we insist on sending soldiers? That is what the honourable Leader of the Opposition suggests. If that were done, what kind of an army would we have; what kind of a job could General Burns do? He would be helpless. I can assure honourable senators that we shall be pleased—and I know they will back us up—to carry out every request that General Burns, and he alone, makes of us.

The Government having decided to send this force, Parliament was called. You may ask, why was Parliament called? When Parliament was in session in 1950 in connection with the sending of forces to Korea, the Prime Minister gave an undertaking that in the future whenever forces were to be sent out of Canada for any reason other than the Korean war, an order in council would be passed and Parliament would be summoned within ten days to approve or disapprove of the necessary expenditure. That undertaking was given because the terms of the act establishing the Korean force were so wide that under them the regular armed forces of Canada could be sent at any time to any part of the world for United Nations' purposes. The Prime Minister gave his word that he would respect the provisions of section 33 of the National Defence Act, which reads:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the Canadian forces or any service, component or unit thereof on active service, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation

shall be issued for the meeting of Parliament within ten days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

So, in accordance with that undertaking, and an order in council having been passed, Parliament was called to approve or disapprove of the Government's action in passing this order in council and in providing for the expenses of sending troops to the Middle East.

The Secretary General of the United Nations was required to make a report within 48 hours as to what the United Nations forces should consist of. Well, he made his report within 24 hours, and a resolution was subsequently passed by the United Nations approving what he had done in setting up this force.

Let me remind the house that it was a resolution proposed by Canada which set up the United Nations Police Force. It was a Canadian who was elected as the General of that force, and when an advisory committee of seven member nations was appointed to work with the Secretary General, Canada was named as one of them. So once again Canada is playing an important role in maintaining peace in the world. I might mention that this committee consists of representatives from Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Brazil, Colombia, Norway and Canada.

On the same evening that the resolution was passed approving of the action taken by the Secretary General, a nineteen-power resolution demanding immediate withdrawal of forces from the Suez district, from the whole area, was passed by a vote of 65 to 1, with 10 abstentions. Israel was the only country that voted against it. The United Kingdom and France did not vote against it; they abstained. There was no objection to the resolution, for the forces were being withdrawn. The United Kingdom and France had already commenced to withdraw their forces, so there was actually no reason why the resolution should have been passed. The word "immediately" was already inserted in the resolution—requiring that the forces were to be withdrawn immediately. Canada refused to vote for the resolution unless it was explained whether the word "immediately" meant that the United Kingdom and French forces would not be withdrawn before the United Nations forces had been moved there and were operating satisfactorily. And that is the position Canada takes today.

There were two more resolutions moved, but I do not think I need to refer to them here. The position we find ourselves in today is that as we are moving the United Nations

Police Force into the Middle East in sufficient strength and with sufficient organization, the United Kingdom and the French forces are moving out. And who is objecting? Not the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is approving all that is being done. As their representative said at the United Nations, "When there is a force sufficiently well organized in there, we will move out". The United Kingdom is living up to the terms of the resolution.

Honourable senators, in conclusion I wish to say that I think at this time Canadians have every reason to be probably the proudest people in the world for what their representatives have done.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I cannot speak too highly of our representative the Secretary of State for External Affairs. His task has been a most difficult one. Primarily, the minister's task has been to do his best to maintain peace in the world, but he has also striven for maintenance of the feeling of friendship and helpfulness which has always existed among the Western democracies. Oh, I regretted to hear the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) today when he criticized our great neighbour to the south, the United States, for the two countries have always worked well together in the past, and we have both worked well together for the peace of the world. The Leader of the Opposition, however, used inflammatory words which would tend to cause ill feeling, malice and hatred between Canada and the United States. I am sure that no honourable senator in this chamber wants any ill feeling, malice or hatred on the part of this country toward the United States.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** We have lived in peace and harmony with the United States over the years. We do not necessarily do what they want us to do. If the honourable leader opposite followed the debates in the United Nations, which apparently he has not done, he would find that we have not supported the United States resolutions at all times. We have an independence of our own; we act in a Canadian way, and at no time take dictation from the United States. I feel that we have played our part well. We have come to the aid of Hungary to the greatest extent that we can; we want to help those people, and we are ready for further suggestions. We have done what we offered to do under the terms of the United Nations Charter, and we have been faithful to its covenants. We are doing our best to live in peace and harmony with the nations of the

world, and we are doing our best to continue good relationships among the great Commonwealth of Nations. I think honourable senators must agree with me that, considering all that has been done during the last month, Canada has played a magnificent role in maintaining the peace of the world. I hope it will continue to be maintained.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. H. de M. Molson:** Honourable senators,—

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Molson:** Honourable senators, in speaking on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I do so with some hesitation, partly because of the very brief time I have been a member of this chamber, and partly because I realize that my contribution will appear drab, indeed, in comparison with the eloquence of my colleagues whom I have been privileged to hear.

Nevertheless, I am encouraged to say my piece by the wonderfully warm welcome and friendly reception accorded by honourable senators to us when we came here last session. That welcome, followed by whole-hearted co-operation and sincerely offered friendship, is more deeply appreciated by me, and I am sure those appointed with me, than I can say.

Honourable senators, at this special session the Speech from the Throne dealt with only two subjects; first, Canada's participation in the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East; and, second, provision for relief for the gallant Hungarian victims in their desire for freedom.

In the Middle East, for some time now, we have had an anti-European dictator trying to build himself an empire. His apparent aims were to become the "Fuehrer" of all Arabs and to exterminate the State of Israel. The way in which he disregarded the Suez Canal Treaty and obtained vast quantities of military supplies from the Russian areas showed the inevitability of trouble in those countries. For years provocation succeeded provocation. Finally Israel decided—rightly or wrongly—that her only chance of survival lay in military action.

There is no doubt in my mind that the vacillations of American foreign policy were in large measure responsible for these developments. It is also true that the United Nations showed itself incapable or unwilling to stop the constant armed skirmishes and the denial of the Suez to Israeli shipping.

With the Israeli advance into Egypt Britain and France felt that their own survival depended on the security of the canal. There

were perhaps even stronger reasons, such as another Soviet liberation of the whole Middle East—I use the word "liberation" in the Russian sense. I have not been told those reasons, so I cannot judge.

At this stage Canada was faced with perhaps one of the most important decisions of her young international life, when the United Nations met to deal with these emergencies—whether to follow the heart and let loyalty to the two nations which gave her birth dictate her actions, or to adhere to the United Nations Charter, which she had signed, and which denies war as an instrument of policy. That was a truly agonizing decision, but I am one of those—perhaps because we were never fully informed by our Allies—who believe that the British Commonwealth and perhaps the United Nations might not have survived the loss of confidence which any decision other than the one taken would have entailed.

I was very proud of Canada for coming up with the resolution for the formation of the United Nations force which was so warmly received at that time of crisis at the United Nations, and without in any way accepting any political implication, because I am not ashamed of being an Independent. I was extremely proud of our Secretary of State for External Affairs for his handling and presentation of our responsibility at the United Nations Assembly.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Molson:** Honourable senators, we are now considering our action in the light of the United Nations' effort to restore peace and order. Perhaps I am not a particularly good judge of the wishes of the people of Canada. Certainly, I am the poorest authority on matters political. However, for what it is worth I believe that the duty of this honourable Senate to the people of this country is to deal with this matter as one of national urgency, to leave out politics and to act as efficiently and expeditiously as is within our power. Our position in the outside world will be a reflection of our actions now.

Honourable senators, I now come to the second reason for the calling of this special session, to vote relief for the Hungarians.

It is difficult for anyone brought up as Canadians are to speak rationally on this issue. Believing in God as we do, and accepting murder, rape, slavery, deportation, starvation, brain-washing and any form of torture to be weapons employed only by barbarians, how can we view the magnificent courage, the suffering and endurance of these Hungarian heroes without emotion? And, conversely, how can we look on the actions of Russians without emotion?

Perhaps the time has come for us to invite the Russians in our midst to go home. We have experienced, thanks to one Russian with a conscience, Igor Gouzenko, the Russian interpretation of friendship for Canada. Most of us have had no illusions as to the reasons for the vast Russian embassy and staff in Canada, quite out of keeping with the exchange of trade, culture or visitors between the two countries. Perhaps we should add our voices to the chorus swelling through the Iron Curtain from all over Eastern Europe, and say "Ivan, go home."

Incidentally, I noted by the press that a member of the United States Senate suggested not only a rupture of diplomatic relations between his country and the Soviet Union, but that all countries of our way of thought should break off diplomatic relations with Russia, apply sanctions and in fact isolate the Soviet Union until such time as it complies with the United Nations resolution.

The suggestion made on Monday by the honourable senator from Inkerman (Hon. Mr. Hugessen) that we rise for a minute of silent prayer in sympathy for the Hungarian people may have broken precedent, but my reaction was that never was precedent broken for a better cause.

We are so fortunate in this country that we probably will never appreciate what it means to be oppressed. We talk glibly about democracy, but I wonder how hard we would fight for it until we had experienced the misery of a life without it. We have not been occupied by alien forces who find it simpler to shoot first and talk afterwards.

On this point I do not forget that my French colleagues could remind me that British forces occupied New France a couple of hundred years ago. But I know that they would be the first to say that relations, policies, results and every other condition were so different that no basis for comparison exists.

All the Hungarians wanted was to choose their own form of government and to decide for themselves their relationship with foreign governments. Think of the irony of it! The United States were doing exactly the same thing at the same time. So far as I have heard, the American people elected an administration and the representatives of their choice without the loss of a single life. But, under the benevolent system hailed by the Bolshevik slave masters as enlightenment, all that the gallant Hungarian people got was a blood bath, the like of which has not been seen in modern history.

It should be remembered that this is not the first time the Hungarian people have had to fight for their freedom. At least three

times previously they have fought against oppression: the first was five hundred years ago when, under the leadership of John Hunyadi, they threw off the yoke of the Turks. A little over one hundred years ago the people rose up again to demand proper recognition under the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The third occasion perhaps had less bloodshed but it was their first experience with communism. That was in 1919. Perhaps we have forgotten that communism was imposed on Hungary right after the First World War by a minority led by the Russian-trained Bela Kun. It was on this occasion that Admiral Horthy led the White forces which drove out communism.

It is obvious, therefore, that when on this occasion they rose against their communist and Russian oppressors the people of Hungary did so with no illusions as to the cost to themselves, although it is probable that the majority of the people were sadly disappointed that no aid came from the West. They have written in blood the value of freedom, which I am sure will be felt throughout the world for many years to come.

Honourable senators, what can we do? Very little, I am afraid. The only way to stop the butchery would be to drive the Russians out of Hungary. We cannot do that. And by starting a third world war in this way no group of nations would be doing any favour to anybody, least of all to the Hungarians. We can only lend our full and unstinting support to the United Nations. We can only open our doors and our hearts to those Hungarians fortunate enough to have escaped the tender care of the Russians. We can only open our purses to give a little mite of relief from suffering to those who survived within Hungary.

Surely there are no political implications in these inadequate acts of mercy; and, if this be true, let us give the necessary legislation our ungrudging, unstinting and unanimous support.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators, it is not my intention at this hour to attempt to address you in connection with the great issues that lie before us. I cannot allow the opportunity to pass to congratulate the honourable senator from Alma (Hon. Mr. Molson) upon the remarkable and excellent address which he has just delivered. He is a comparatively new member of this house, and I understand this is his maiden speech. For his own gratification I would call to his attention the rapt attention with which he was heard, and the round of applause with which his address was closed. His very wide grasp of public affairs, the effective language

in which his sentiments were expressed and the excellent viewpoints which he placed before us proves at once that he is indeed in his right place here among the elder statesmen of Canada. I wish him a long and happy sojourn among us. If he continues to give us the benefit of his wisdom and literary ability, I am sure he will occupy an important place here and make a great contribution to the welfare of Canada.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Before moving the adjournment of the debate, I should like to express one further thought, that is, to repeat the observation of the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) when he said he regretted the speech that was delivered this afternoon by the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig). I have for the Leader of the Opposition the very highest respect. I have more than respect. I have a certain affection for that honourable gentleman, and my relations with him have been the most cordial and friendly over the years. But I think that his address today was ill-considered, and if his statements were in accord with the impression that was left on my mind—and I shall wait until I read the text before coming to a final conclusion—I think the time will come when he will regret them. They were reminiscent to me of experiences which I suffered many years ago when the little die-hard Tory clique of Toronto wrapped themselves in a blood-red flag and, with a self-righteousness that was superb, impugned the patriotism of all their fellow citizens.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** More politics.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** Now I do not say that the honourable gentleman who heads the Conservative forces in this house did that very thing, though it came close to it. I said his remarks were reminiscent of that kind of thing which I thought had passed away: I thought that we Canadians were now Canadians in our own right with a confidence in the loyalty and integrity of our fellow-citizens.

When the honourable gentleman said that the issue before us was whether we stood with Britain or Russia he surely had his tongue in his cheek, and he failed, I should think, to appreciate the insult to his fellow

citizens that was implicit in those words. Not only that—and I do not want to be too severe nor will I attempt to reply to these statements until I have at least read the text and re-read it in black and white—but I would call his attention to this, and let him absorb the fact, that the day of the little Canadian has gone by. Today Canada is a grown-up nation, unable now to cast her responsibilities upon the statesmen of Westminster but under the obligation of taking her own place among the nations of the world and of assuming the responsibilities that go with that status.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** We are grown up. We are no longer in tutelage to any other nation and it is ours to discharge our responsibility.

I fancy the honourable gentleman did not really mean to say that Canada should not have done what she did in the United Nations or that the constitution of a police force was in any way wrong or unwise, because if he did he stands alone—

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** That is not correct.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** He did not say that, but he came pretty close to it, and if he does say that he stands alone, because practically all the nations of the world have agreed, to Canada's suggestion. If he did say that what we did was right and wise in constituting a police force to keep the peace of the Middle East, then why those belligerent statements that would involve us in a global war in which millions might die in atomic and hydrogen warfare?

When speaking to the Senate of Canada one's words should be well weighed, and particularly so when saying things that might bring about the disaster of another world war which Canada has striven during so many years to avoid.

I hope I have not misinterpreted my honourable friend, for he is a friend and I hope will continue to be so, but I do regret that he made that speech.

And now, honourable senators, permit me to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Roebuck, the debate was adjourned.

The Senate adjourned until tomorrow at 3 p.m.

## THE SENATE

Thursday, November 29, 1956

The Senate met at 3 p.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

Routine proceedings.

### EMERGENCY SITTINGS

AUTHORITY TO CONVENE SENATE  
DURING ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald** moved, pursuant to notice:

That for the duration of the present session of Parliament, should any emergency arise during any adjournment of the Senate, which would in the opinion of the Honourable the Speaker warrant that the Senate meet prior to the time set forth in the motion for such adjournment, the Honourable the Speaker be authorized to notify honourable senators at their addresses registered with the Clerk of the Senate, to meet at a time earlier than that set out in the motion for such adjournment, and non-receipt by any one or more honourable senators of such call shall not have any effect upon the sufficiency and validity thereof.

The motion was agreed to.

### HON. MRS. JODOIN

BIRTHDAY FELICITATIONS

On the Orders of the Day:

**Hon. F. Elsie Inman:** Honourable senators, I am not going to speak about the international situation. I am going to speak about a happier occasion. I wish to offer congratulations to a most gracious and charming member of this chamber, the honourable senator from Sorel (Hon. Mrs. Jodoin), who is celebrating her birthday today. I wish to extend to her many happy returns of the day and best wishes for the years to come.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mariana B. Jodoin:** Honourable senators, thank you very much. I am very pleased to be a member of the Senate and I look forward to many happy years in this chamber.

### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY ADOPTED

The Senate resumed from yesterday consideration of His Excellency the Governor General's speech at the opening of the session and the motion of Hon. Mr. Wall, seconded by Hon. Mr. Fournier, for an Address in reply thereto.

**Hon. Arthur W. Roebuck:** Honourable senators,—

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear,

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** May I commence my remarks this afternoon by following what has become a tradition, in both this house and the House of Commons, that is, by tendering my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. In this instance, I do so not as a mere matter of form, but rather because of the genuine admiration I feel for the statesmanlike moderation, expressed in classical English, of the mover of the Address (Hon. Mr. Wall), and as well the marvellous eloquence and fluency of the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier).

I feel that little would be gained if I attempted to repeat the sentiments expressed in preceding speeches with which I agree. In this debate it is impossible to deal fully with the present international situation, but I wish to submit some thoughts in connection with it which I think are worthy of consideration.

May I commence with a broad general observation, that is to say, that in international affairs the leaders of the nations require both enterprise and courage—enterprise to formulate sound policies and courage to carry them out. I submit with all due deference to those who may disagree, that the members of Her Majesty's Government at Westminster exhibited an enterprise which is remarkable, in taking advantage of the passing situation to regain their bargaining position in connection with the Suez Canal and the natural resources of the Middle East.

Now, to those who would be unduly critical of the actions of Great Britain and France on that occasion, I would say let it not be forgotten that the Soviet bloc was stockpiling in Egypt arms and munitions of war in huge amounts, valued at many millions of dollars, for the obvious purpose of seizing control of the natural resources of the Middle East and obtaining for itself a strategic position in that area, one which spelled disaster to the civilized countries of the Western world.

Usually Britain's diplomacy is superb in the carrying out of her various enterprises. But on this occasion I am not impressed with the skill and diplomacy which characterized the actions of the United Kingdom and France. For instance, they failed to commit the member nations of the Commonwealth to the enterprise in advance. They lost the approval of India, of Pakistan and of Ceylon; they were outvoted in the United Nations; and, worst of all, they entered upon that most serious and grave action which they took opposed by a very considerable section of their own people in the United Kingdom.

So I say, and I think I have reason for saying it, that the action taken, no matter how sound it may have been, was not in the

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

said that Britain would not be blackmailed by anybody. I hope he meant it, and I think he did.

In this connection of being blackmailed by the fear of Russia, may I recall that I was in Berlin in 1948, having gone into that city on the airlift. Honourable senators will remember that at that time the Soviet authorities had decided to push the Allies out of Berlin and to make of the former capital of Germany a Russian city. For that purpose they had blockaded the highways and railroads that ran between Berlin and the Western states. It will be remembered that the Allies responded—rather diplomatically, I thought—by organizing an airlift, and it became the duty of General Clay, who was then Chief of the General Staff of the Allied Powers in Germany, to tell the Russians that if they interfered with the airlift we would shoot our way through. Well, we didn't shoot our way through, because the Russians did not interfere with the airlift. They desisted, and the airlift remains today an historic element of pride to ourselves and the Western world.

I had an interview with General Clay at that time and I remember one of the sentiments which he expressed. It was a pearl of wisdom distilled from his own recent experience. He said, "The men in the Kremlin are good bluffers but they are not gamblers." I have thought of that remark many times since as the occasion has presented itself—that these men in the Kremlin are good bluffers but are not gamblers. It seems to me, my honourable colleagues, that if Russia is planning a world war with the Western Powers she will commence it in her own good time and that we will not be able to prevent it, certainly not by weakening ourselves or our position in the meantime as a result of fears on our part or by reason of threats on her part.

I say this because I would like to stress at the present moment the utter worthlessness of appeasement.

I follow that comment with this question: what do the Russians plan? Do they plan at this moment a global war in which we will all be involved? I do not believe it. I am not the least impressed, of course, with the Russian humbug about their love of peace, democracy and that sort of thing; but I do believe in their love of their own hides, and I judge that the men in the Kremlin have not forgotten what happened to Hitler. As General Clay said on that occasion, they are not gamblers. If it is true, as has been reported, that President Eisenhower has told the Russians that if they send "volunteers"

into the Middle East the United States will oppose them, then the Russians will not send "volunteers" into the Middle East.

I am not prepared to say—simply because I do not know enough of the facts and I cannot see far enough into the future—that Great Britain and France should remain in permanent control of the Suez Canal; but, if they should remain in control of it, I trust they will have courage to carry out their convictions. I will say, however, from well-considered knowledge of the situation, that Great Britain and France should not withdraw their troops from the Middle East until a satisfactory arrangement has been completed for the international operation and control of that highway vital to the shipping of the world. They should not withdraw their troops from the Middle East in its disturbed condition until the security of Israel has been assured and until there is a sufficient United Nations' force in the locality to assure that the guarantee is observed.

Perhaps my colleagues will bear with me if I comment on the many references to Israel as an aggressor in this recent Sinai campaign. Honourable senators will remember that I spent nearly a month in Israel just one year ago, studying that nation and its problems. Arab raids were going on while I was there, and I have the advantage of some little touch with the victims of those raids. I fancy there are few Canadians who have had the requisite experience to realize what it means to go to bed every night with the question unanswered as to whether you will be murdered before morning.

On November 29, 1947 the British withdrew from the responsibilities of their mandate in Palestine, and the new State of Israel was created and her borders defined by resolution of the United Nations. On May 15, 1948, less than 6 months after the passage of that resolution, five armies—in defiance of the United Nations' resolution, in defiance of a world mandate, and in defiance of world public opinion—five armies, from Egypt, Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Iraq, marched across the established borders of Israel intent on conquest, plunder and murder. The invading armies were exceedingly well armed, while the local population was almost unarmed, yet by some miracle, which I have never been quite able to understand, a heroic citizenship in that little state defeated all five of those armies and drove them out. I am not wrong when I say that the feat was accomplished by some miracle, but it was accomplished, and is proven by the armistice agreements which were signed through the mediation and genius of Mr. Bunche of the United Nations.

In spite of the signing of those agreements and in violation of their terms, Egypt and her allies declared that a state of war against Israel still continued; they refused all intercourse with Israel or her nationals, they blockaded the borders of Israel, and they were guilty of a long succession of mean, unneighbourly acts. Not only so, but Egypt closed the international highway of the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, and as well the Gulf of Akaba which, as honourable senators know, is a branch of the Red Sea, and which gave to the city of Eilat on the Gulf of Akaba a port of entry to Israel. And even worse, for eight long years Israel's neighbours have been sending marauding bands of bloodthirsty thugs across her borders, who under the cover of night have burned the houses and barns of her settlers, destroyed property, carried off everything that could be stolen, and murdered the local inhabitants. Driven to desperation, the Israeli Government has counterattacked, but in her case with organized military under strict command; not in attacks upon women and children, but rather against the military establishments of the governments responsible for the villainous murderers who invaded her country.

Israel claims that 500 Israeli citizens have been killed or wounded between the armistice and the first of March 1955—500 innocent citizens of that country! Since then the rate of killings has greatly increased, and not long ago I noticed that 24 Israeli citizens were murdered in a single week by the mining of highways, ambushes, and indiscriminate shootings. Israel has hoped during all these years that time would cure, or at least alleviate, the despicable hate that prompted these crimes, and she chose to disregard the boastful threats of the Egyptian dictator, that Israel would again be invaded and this time her population massacred.

But these threats and the increased tempo of the raids could no longer be disregarded when, in September 1955, Russia intervened by delivering to Egypt, and through Egypt to the other Arab states, vast quantities of arms and munitions which were purchased, at least by Egypt, with the avowed intention of attack upon Israel.

The climax came recently when Egypt agreed with Syria and Jordan to a unified command of their combined forces for the declared purpose of annihilating the people of the State of Israel. At the same time Egypt stepped up the tempo of these illegal and murderous night raids of marauding gangs. In my judgment, the purpose of the raids was to disorganize the economy of Israel, and as well to provoke the State of Israel into some

act of desperation which later might be used as justification for the impending invasion. Unfortunately for Egypt, the provocations were more successful than she had calculated, and, on October 29, 1956, the armies of Israel marched over the borders of Egypt into the Sinai Peninsula. With the events which followed honourable senators are very familiar. The story of the Sinai campaign would be interesting to relate, but I do not intend to indulge in such a recital. The events are too recent to be made into history. However, I felt that a recital of the events which preceded that campaign, with which I have a real familiarity, was worth while, because, in spite of the facts, the press and others have continually spoken of Israel in the Sinai campaign as an aggressor.

Honourable senators, it was not Israel who sought to strangle Egypt by illegal blockade and by the destruction of her shipping; it was not Israel who sought to ruin Egypt by murderous raids upon her citizens and centres. It was not Israel who threatened to annihilate Egypt by armed invasion and massacre. It was Egypt who has been responsible for these barbarous acts and threats against the State of Israel.

It is well that we realize the situation as it has existed because, I submit, it justifies the opinion I expressed in my opening sentence and the conclusion which I now draw, firstly, that Britain and France should not leave the Suez area until satisfactory arrangements have been made to operate the canal under United Nations control; secondly, until the security of Israel has been guaranteed; and thirdly, until a sufficient United Nations force is in that vicinity to ensure that the guarantee is observed.

In conclusion, may I say that I look forward, as do all my fellow senators, to the time when the nations will beat their swords into plowshares.

I heartily approve the genius of our Secretary of State for External Affairs in his efforts to preserve the peace, and to bring about the rule of law in the East. But I say to my fellow senators, the rule of law without the power to enforce it is futile. I have from my friend the senator from Ottawa (Hon. Mr. Lambert) this quotation:

There is only one thing worse than injustice, and that is justice without her sword in her hand.

The time must come when we shall have a tribunal established to pronounce justice among the nations of the earth, and endowed with the power to enforce its decrees. If we of the Western world are the only ones who must bow to the decisions of the United Nations, so that our teeth are pulled when we are attacked, and its decisions have no

binding force upon those who oppose us, then the sooner we get out of the United Nations the better. But the hope of the world is that the United Nations shall remain and be strong, and armed with a police force, ever ready to go where justice requires it in all parts of the world. The time will come, and we in Canada may have helped greatly in bringing it about, when international justice will rule in the world.

While we all look forward to the time when the nations of the world will beat their swords into plowshares, they are not doing it at the present time. They are not observing justice; they are observing power. The only possible way to bring about a world safe for humanity, justice and democracy is through a United Nations, acting in a judicial capacity, and with power sufficient to enforce its decrees.

In the meantime, honourable senators, you and I who have some little influence in national affairs must see things as they are; we must live in the world as it is, not as we desire it to be. We must not desert our friends. We must be ready to take the chances that are always present to those who act justly. We must be strong, and being strong we will be much more safe than if we are weak.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** May I ask my honourable friend from Toronto-Trinity a question? I understood him to suggest that there should be some guarantee for the safety of Israel. Was there not an agreement between the United States and Great Britain that they would go to the assistance of either Egypt or Israel, whichever one was attacked?

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** There was a statement by the three powers, Great Britain, France and the United States, to that effect. But I call my friend's attention to the fact that arms and munitions to the value of millions of dollars were stockpiled on Israel's border, and border raids continued without any action whatsoever by the three powers. That statement was a pious one rather than a practical one.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** That is quite apparent.

**Hon. Mr. Roebuck:** My statement was that an arrangement of the kind mentioned must have force behind it to ensure that the guarantee is observed.

**Hon. W. Rupert Davies:** Honourable senators, in rising to make a small contribution to the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne I wish first to compliment, as preceding speakers have done, the mover (Hon. Mr. Wall) and seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier) of the Address in reply to the

brief but important document. As I listened to these honourable gentlemen speak, I wondered if they were as nervous as I was when I had the honour of moving the Address in reply at the opening of the session in 1942. My remarks on that occasion were by no means world shattering, but I felt terribly bucked up when an elderly senator came up to me, looked me in the eye and without cracking a smile said, "That is the best speech I ever heard delivered in this chamber." I might have continued to be proud of myself if a week later I had not heard him say the same thing to another senator on the other side of the chamber.

Like the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), and being a plain, ignorant fellow—which of course the honourable leader is not—I was unable to follow the speech of the seconder of the motion who spoke in the French language. When I am listening to a speech being made in French a couple of lines of a familiar old hymn come to my mind:

Tell me the story simply,  
As to a little child.

But I knew from the way the honourable senator was gesticulating, and the smiles upon the faces of those who understand what I call rapid-fire French, that he was making an effective and interesting speech and I wish to congratulate him. I would also congratulate the honourable senator from Alma (Hon. Mr. Molson) on the excellent speech which he made in this chamber yesterday afternoon.

Honourable senators, it is not my intention to discuss at great length the Speech from the Throne. I do feel impelled, however, to make a few remarks to explain the position in which I found myself, along with possibly many other British-born Canadians, when Britain and France took war-like action to stop the fighting between Israel and Egypt which resulted from the invasion of the Sinai Peninsula on October 29 by Israeli troops.

Before becoming involved in the Middle East problem, I would like to say I am in full accord with everything that we, the Canadian people, are doing for Hungary. The attack on Hungary by Soviet Russia was brutal and cruel. About fifteen years ago I was in Hungary for several days and I well remember the beautiful city of Budapest, where I spent a weekend, and the kindness and hospitality of the Hungarian people whom I met. It is frightening to realize that despite the convention on the crime of genocide passed by the United Nations on December 9, 1948, Russia could overrun Hungary and murder many of its people, and we were helpless to do anything about it.

What I want to discuss mainly at this time however is the Middle East situation. I am free to confess that for a brief period I was bewildered by it. I was very doubtful of the wisdom of the action taken by Britain and France, although I was convinced that it was not taken with any imperialistic designs upon Egypt, but rather in what they fully believed to be the interests of peace. They were trying to stop the fighting between Israel and Egypt and to save the Suez Canal from serious damage.

I had to remind myself that Sir Anthony Eden was an experienced and level-headed statesman, that he had had a long and distinguished diplomatic career, including many years as Foreign Secretary of Great Britain. I also reminded myself that he had been chosen by the people of Britain to succeed the great Sir Winston Churchill as their Prime Minister, and that, in a general election, he had been endorsed by the nation and given a majority of some 60 seats in the House of Commons. Furthermore, honourable senators, I reminded myself that Sir Anthony Eden was a Knight of the Garter, that great English Order of Chivalry whose carefully selected members are generally expected to be more pure in their motives, more valiant in their actions and more humane in their conduct than ordinary men. I had to remind myself too that Britain's present Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, with whom I had a delightful chat at the Rideau Club reception last spring, is a brother Welshman who also has a distinguished career. In his position as Recorder of the old Roman City of Chester he had for some years been making important judicial decisions. These two men and their cabinet colleagues are not hot-headed, impetuous, unreliable men. They are great statesmen, and I am sure they did not forget for one moment that any action which they might take should be very carefully weighed and considered.

I recollected that since the seizure of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser and the apparent failure of the United Nations to take any quick and decisive action on the matter, Sir Anthony Eden and his Government had been faced with great problems. They had had little sympathetic consideration from the United States, which is hardly to be wondered at in view of the then pending presidential election.

Now, let me say at once that I am fully in accord with the attitude which Canada has taken in the United Nations. I am 100 per cent in favour of a peaceful solution of this great world crisis if one can be achieved. We must do everything in our power to bring about such a solution. As the Leader of the

Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) told us yesterday, if we do not bring about a peaceful solution we might be facing the end of the world. I am strongly in favour of the United Nations Police Force and am proud that Canada was responsible for its formation. I am also proud that it is being headed by a Canadian general. I will say something about an international police force a little later.

Before I do that, however, I would like to say something about the pressure that was being put upon the British Government and the quiet but, nevertheless, unmistakable inferences in some newspapers to the effect that the people of Great Britain expected Sir Anthony Eden and his Government to look after their interests, come what may.

It is perhaps fair to say that Britain and France did stretch clause 52 of the United Nations Charter when they sent armed forces into Egypt. In view of the seizure of the Suez Canal by Colonel Nasser, however, and the possibility of injury to the canal if a major war broke out between Israel and Egypt, France and Britain might have felt that they were acting in defence of their own rights to some extent. It is a moot question, on which arguments have been presented by both sides in the British press. We must not forget, however, that the Suez Canal is of much more importance to Great Britain and France than it is to either Canada or the United States; therefore their thinking is no doubt somewhat different.

**Hon. Mr. Lambert:** May I ask the honourable gentleman one question at this point? Could he, from his knowledge of affairs in England, give any information about the Suez Canal Company and the financial control of it since 1888?

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** The Suez Canal Company's head office is in Paris. There has been considerable discussion in the press about the company, and perhaps there has been a good deal of difficulty in connection with the administration of the canal. While I was in Great Britain I read in one newspaper a statement that the profits of the canal amounted last year to 255 per cent, and that the company was not spending as much as it should in improving the canal, including possibly the widening of it. I am afraid that is about all I can say about the company.

When I was in Britain, in August and September of this year, I read most of the important newspapers every day; and, being myself a newspaper man, and familiar with all the more influential British papers, I am perhaps better able than most people may be to assess editorial opinion at its proper value.

A few of the British papers were severely critical of Sir Anthony Eden and his Government right from the time that Nasser seized the Suez canal and the British Government, as a precautionary measure, began to send troops to Cyprus. They talked of "sabre rattling" and tried to persuade themselves and other people that the dispatch of troops to Cyprus was done with a sinister purpose. They had said similar things at the time of and after Munich. These papers are never friendly to a Conservative government, and this was a good opportunity for them to throw a few bricks at it. As I have said, Sir Anthony Eden is a Knight of the Garter, and he would not have that distinction if he were not an honourable man. During the week of August 6 Sir Anthony broadcast a speech on the Suez canal. What he said can be summed up in three paragraphs which were quoted in the London *Sunday Times* of August 12. This is a paper, with which many of you no doubt are familiar, owned by Lord Kemsley. Sir Anthony said:

First, the freedom of the canal is vital to Britain's economic life. Secondly, to stake that vital interest upon the will of a single power, especially one that has already shown itself untrustworthy, is something we cannot accept. Thirdly,—

And I would draw special attention to this.—we do not seek solution by force but one achieved by the widest international agreement.

That was the opinion of Sir Anthony Eden during the first week of August. The *Sunday Times* took the attitude that there was nothing in those three points to justify charges levelled by Egypt and her sympathizers, and also by some critics in Britain, of sabre rattling, jingoism and repudiation of the United Nations.

The *Sunday Times* continued that for Britain to make itself militarily prepared for whatever might befall, in the light of what Sir Anthony had said, was logical, and, this paper was inclined to think, it would be fully endorsed by the majority of the British people, who sought peace and who respected their international duty, but who refused to be forced to the wall in the name of any one sovereignty.

The *Sunday Times* dealt with the matter at some length, but I would like to quote the last paragraph of its editorial to show what I mean when I say that there was pressure, if not direct at least indirect, on Sir Anthony Eden to look after the interests of Britain. This is what the *Sunday Times* says in its last sentence:

Our military preparations are not aggressive but precautionary and as such, essential. We must keep our heads cool and our powder dry.

The London *Times*, which, as everybody knows, is an excellent newspaper, independent in politics but normally supporting the

government of the day, had a leading editorial on Tuesday, August 14, in which it pointed out the very difficult position Great Britain would be in if its supply of oil from the Middle East were seriously interfered with. It pointed out that before the Second World War most of Great Britain's oil came from the western hemisphere, and even as late as 1947 two-thirds of it was drawn from the Caribbean and the United States; but eight years later, by 1955, four-fifths of Britain's imports of oil were received from the Middle East.

I am trying to point out some of the important economic difficulties which faced Great Britain as a possible result of the seizure of the Suez canal by Colonel Nasser.

In 1955, nearly 1,500,000 tons of oil from the Middle East were used in steel-making in Britain; 300,000 tons for the making of glass and ceramics; over 500,000 tons for gas-making; 176,000 tons by the Central Electricity Authority, and over 800,000 tons for central heating. Last year 67,000,000 tons of Middle East oil came through the canal, of which 14,000,000 tons were destined for North America. About 40,000,000 tons came by pipe line from the Mediterranean. Slightly over half of all Europe's supply and over half of Great Britain's came through the Suez canal.

I mention these figures to point out how very serious the blocking of the canal is to Great Britain. Let me quote the last sentence of the London *Times* editorial:

Nasser, by his act of brigandage—

Please note the word "brigandage".—has delivered a threat to the Middle East countries as well as to Great Britain.

Further pressure appeared in the press of Great Britain every day. Letters were written calling Nasser a dictator, pointing out the economic dangers which threatened Britain if the canal were not kept open and free, urging ships not to pay dues to the new National Egyptian Suez Authority, and stating that nothing short of territorial internationalization of the canal zone could furnish an adequate guarantee against Egypt's denying use of the canal to Israel and other nations to whom she was not friendly. As honourable senators are well aware, Egypt has denied Israel use of the canal for the past five years, despite a resolution of the United Nations that she must not do it.

I read these articles and letters of opinion from readers very carefully every day, and I wondered what would be the outcome. The London *Times*, in a leading editorial published on August 27, took to task seriously those who were inclined to sympathize with

Nasser and criticize what the British Government was doing. It quoted a number of authorities to show that in the eyes of responsible political leaders in Britain the seizure of the canal by Colonel Nasser was a very unfriendly act towards Britain and was very much resented. It quoted Mr. Gaitskell, the Leader of the Opposition; it quoted Mr. Herbert Morrison, another great labour leader, who claimed that Nasser had acted contrary to the law of nations and contrary to international good faith. Mr. Morrison was very severe against those people in Britain who, having spent many years in denouncing jingoism, imperialism and excessive nationalism in respect of Britain, and having enjoyed the advantages of living in Britain, were now spending their spare time in praising countries like Egypt. The *Times* was very censorious of the persons trying to sanctify Makarios, who was exiled from Cyprus, and of those seeking to get people to believe that British soldiers when endeavouring to preserve law and order in a turbulent area are cruel and oppressive. The newspaper went on to say that colonialism in the minds of some people was all a matter of water. If Russia, China or any other continental power overran, captured, dictated to or even destroyed a neighbouring country, apparently everything was well. In such a case the most elementary freedoms could be exterminated and the most outrageous excesses committed and there would be silence. This was written before the rape of Hungary by the Soviet Union troops. But, said the *Times*, if Britain seeks to keep law and order in some territory that she is bringing along to self-government, where she is trying to teach the people to walk before they can run, a great cry of colonialism goes up.

Honourable senators, let me quote further from this same article, to show what I call the indirect pressure that was exerted on the Prime Minister of Britain and his Government, and which no doubt influenced them in their decision to join up with France and send troops to Egypt. This is what the *Times* said:

All this is part of a deplorable flight from responsibility which has sapped so much of the effectiveness both of our national life and our international position.

And further:

Public opinion, despite what the dissidents angrily say, is remarkably firm. Of course, it wants to avoid the use of force. So does everyone and we hope no one does more than the British Government. But

—there always seemed to be a “but”—

—that is a far cry from saying that because there seems little we can do about it the best thing is to find excuses for, and forget, the whole business.

And note this sentence:

Nations live by the vigorous defence of their interests. Even Mr. Nehru, who so conscientiously sermonizes the rest of the world, does not let a trick go in Kashmir.

And, applying indirect pressure on the Government by reference to days gone by, the editorial concludes by saying:

As G. M. Trevelyan reminded us many years ago, the sun of Venice set because of the double event of the Turkish blocking of the caravan routes and the discovery of the Cape route and America.

Doubtless it is good to have a flourishing tourist trade and to win Test matches. But nations do not live by circuses alone. The people, in their silent way, know this better than the critics. They still want Britain great.

That was the *London Times*. I have a fairly large file of clippings from other papers here, many of them along much the same line. Is it surprising that when the great *London Times*, known for many years as “The Thunderer”, told the Government that the people still want Britain great, Sir Anthony Eden wondered if he was fulfilling his duty in not preparing Britain to take some action in Egypt if the United Nations did not quickly do so?

I am not saying that Sir Anthony Eden, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd and others did the right thing. I am saying, however, that they did what I think the majority of the press and the people of Britain expected them to do. When the British air forces started to bomb Egyptian airports, there was, naturally, a great protest—a protest in many British papers as well as in the papers of other countries. But that feeling is not nearly so vociferous in Britain today. Many papers there were saying that what the Government did was contrary to the wishes of the people. However, the latest public opinion poll shows, according to a Reuter's dispatch of November 15, that 53 per cent of the people of Britain now support what Sir Anthony Eden and his Government did.

Honourable senators, I am sorry to have spoken so long. I had no intention of doing so when I started to prepare my remarks. But as I progressed I felt that I should try to explain that in my opinion the action of Sir Anthony Eden and his Government was not a sudden, impetuous, imperialistic action, but one to which much serious thought had been given and one which, inferentially at any rate, appeared to have the backing of responsible public opinion. The action took the world by surprise. People were bewildered and wondered if this was the start of another world war. Even some members of the British House of Commons were bewildered. There are about three million Liberal voters in Britain today, but their opinion is represented by only six members

in the British House of Commons. To show you how confused opinion was on this great issue, when the first vote of confidence in the Eden Government was taken, three of the six Liberals went into the Conservative lobby to support the Prime Minister and three went into the Labour lobby to support Mr. Gaitskell's vote of censure.

I am very happy that this great problem is now in the hands of the United Nations. It was disturbing to read in the *Ottawa Journal* last evening that a young Ottawa captain now in Egypt has said that the Queen's Own Rifles cannot sail unless Nasser changes his mind; but it was stated in the same paper that France had withdrawn an infantry company and a naval commando unit, and also that the Secretary General of the United Nations had announced that he expects to have over 4,000 United Nations troops in Egypt within two weeks. It is unfortunate that the United Nations did not build up a police force for just such emergencies as the present one many years ago.

Everyone knows that an international police force is no new idea. I was writing editorials twenty years ago on the proposal to establish an international police force in connection with the League of Nations. This proposal was put forward by the New Commonwealth Society which was founded in 1932 by the late Lord Davies of Llandinam, and of which Sir Winston Churchill was at that time the president. Lord Davies wrote several books on the subject, copies of which he sent to me. Lord Davies spent much of his vast fortune in promoting international peace. He built a Temple of Peace and Health in the city of Cardiff, the capital of Wales, at a cost of £1 million. This distinguished gentleman was no relation of mine, although we were of the same generation and were born and brought up in the same county in Wales. There was, however, a very decided difference between the two families. Lord Davies' grandfather and father made a vast fortune out of coal mines and the building of railways and ports in Britain; my grandfather and father did not make a vast fortune. My grandfather was a very successful merchant and at one time had five prosperous businesses in North Wales. But he made the mistake that many men make after they have accumulated a little bit of money: he thought he could farm. He did not know anything about farming, but he bought himself a mansion and several hundred acres of land, and he set himself up as a gentleman farmer. As the honourable member from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner) well knows, if you are going to be a successful farmer you must know something about farming. We lost all our money, and, strange

as it may seem, for that I am truly grateful, for if we had made money instead of losing it my father would not have brought his little family out to Canada in the early nineties, and my brothers and sisters and I would not have had the great privilege of living our lives in this wonderful country.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** While I am making personal references, perhaps honourable senators will pardon another one, which, to me, is rather interesting. When my father decided to bring his family out to Canada he went to the public library in the little Welsh town in which we lived, and he said to his old friend Charlie Jones, the librarian: "Charlie, have you got any good books about Canada?" Mr. Jones looked over the shelves, and he picked out one and said: "Walter, I think this is about what you want." So my father came home armed with a book entitled *Roughing it in the Bush*, by Susannah Moodie. Sixty years later my son Robertson was asked to write a play for the centenary of the Peterborough district, and it so happened that the book he chose on which to found his play *At My Heart's Core* was this same *Roughing it in the Bush*, not knowing that it had played a part in our family many years ago.

Honourable senators, in conclusion, let me express the hope that the great difficulties facing the world in the Middle East will be settled without any more bloodshed, and that before many months are past the sun will shine upon a Hungary that is enjoying the freedom that has been bought so dearly by the heroic people of that country.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. R. B. Horner:** Honourable senators, I wish to make a few remarks on one or two matters, but at the outset may I say that it will not be necessary to speak at any length, because the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) covered the ground fully. I agree with almost his entire remarks, and they were in much better form than I could put them.

I congratulate the mover of the Address (Hon. Mr. Wall), and also the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier). Both gentlemen spoke very well. I also wish to compliment all others who have taken part in the debate, particularly the new member from Alma (Hon. Mr. Molson). While I sympathize with his feeling that possibly the time has come when we should ask certain gentlemen to get out of this country, I think it would be a mistake to take that step, for sometimes I wonder how such people can live in this country, even in large numbers, without receiving some good influences. I doubt if the people of the

world can be brought together in understanding if they are fenced off entirely into different camps. I understand that the Russian Ambassador to Canada attended the Calgary Stampede, and I do not know how any man representing a dictatorship could attend that event and remain quite the same, because that is a place where a democracy has full sway and one man is as good as another.

Honourable senators, I propose to touch on a little bit of history. I recall the great hopes we had of the League of Nations, when it was declared that World War I was a war to end all wars. I also have in mind the Fourteen Points enunciated by a former President of the United States, and his great effort to secure for them the support of the American people. I often think how different a place the world would be to live in today, and how much greater power the United Nations might have to create and maintain an international force, if in those days the United States had joined the League of Nations. I must say that I am critical of the whole Eastern policy of the United States. I also am dubious of Canada's part in it, as well as of certain activities of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, for it seems to me that on several occasions we have not been permitted to make a move without the permission of the United States.

Honourable senators will remember that when Mussolini set his armies in motion to rape the kingdom of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie, the little dark, bearded emperor, begged and pleaded for assistance. At that time, Dr. Riddell, who represented Canada at the League of Nations, promised that we would impose sanctions against Italy immediately. I regret to say that Canada's role at that time was certainly nothing for any Canadian to be proud of. The Italian Ambassador appealed to the Canadian Government, and the Prime Minister of that day repudiated Dr. Riddell's statement and said that Dr. Riddell did not speak for the Canadian Government. Thereupon Haile Selassie, having begged in vain for assistance, said, "All right, you are going to see many thrones topple in Europe, and I will be back on my throne before any of them are restored." His prophecy proved to be perfectly correct. The emperor also said: "Many of you will never return. I can stand before God, my conscience is clear, but I cannot be expected to fight against tanks and planes with barefoot soldiers."

As I said, I agree with the sentiments of the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity. As a man having six sons—thank God, all medically fit—I am all for peace, but like the honourable senator, I am not for peace at any

price. I agree with him that we have been blackmailed in every direction. I think that we were lax, and the United States too was lax.

We shall probably have spent in the neighbourhood of \$500 million by the time we are through with that great enterprise in the northern tundra and in the barren west of Canada, partly for ourselves and partly for the United States. It is being done by the most expensive method possible, and Canada will have to pay her share. We were jockeyed into that unfortunate position. I believe the money spent there would have built the Aswan dam for Egypt and would have brought about other favourable developments in a country where people can go about with little clothing and there are immense resources of oils and minerals. Had that been done, we might well have avoided the impasse we are facing today.

I am critical of the United States because it was the last to come into the picture. I resent its attitude in connection with the Suez Canal affair. What sympathy has it shown Britain in her very difficult time in Cyprus? What has been its attitude through all this crisis? I say the United States has done nothing but cause embarrassment to Great Britain.

With respect to the Suez Canal, the international agreement under which it was operated had only ten years to run, and the Egyptian Government could well have waited until that time expired. But no, it chose to block the canal. The honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) yesterday disagreed with me when I said that it was Nasser who was telling General Burns what troops he could bring into Egypt, how they were to be dressed and everything else. What a humiliating position for the Western powers to be placed in! I left the chamber and went directly to my room, and there I read the news headlines which confirmed what I had said.

Let us look at the confusion which Nasser caused in Canada. The Canadian soldiers were flown from Calgary to Halifax, where they marched up Citadel Hill and marched down again. The ship on which they were to sail had all its armaments removed. The men were required to wear a plastic arm band and a coloured ribbon. Perhaps they were equipped with a night stick instead of a rifle. I ask you, of what use can a police force of that kind be?

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** They have a psychological effect!

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Yes. With all due respect, I say we are placed in a most humiliating position. I have great admiration for the British Government in the stand it has taken. I hope and believe that history will prove its decision was right. It had inside information of the build-up of arms which was taking place in Egypt.

Honourable senators, I hesitate at this time to say anything that might make conditions in the world more difficult.

So far as our giving aid to Hungary goes, I am all in favour of it. But surely it would be possible to make an arrangement whereby our representative and a staff might be allowed to stay in that country to assure an equitable distribution of the funds and clothes that are being sent in. According to the reports I hear, and they appear to be authentic, the Russians are taking over even the money and clothes that are being sent by the Red Cross. Of course, the Secretary General of the United Nations has asked for permission to enter Hungary to inspect conditions there, but the puppet government of that country, backed by Moscow, has refused to permit this.

Canada is perhaps able to and may give more than a million dollars. We are taking a calculated risk in making this contribution, but I am not complaining about it. I do not criticize the suggestion that we should waive medical examination of refugees from Hungary. It may well be that in the exodus from that country we shall get some undesirable persons. In the circumstances, we must take that chance.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Calvert C. Pratt:** Honourable senators, I am glad to have the opportunity of saying a few words at this time. It is difficult to appraise the finer points of policy which are involved in the subject before us. Without an intimate knowledge of the facts from a close association with the problems, one cannot speak with full assurance on many aspects of the case.

However, in the overall problem we are united in one thought, namely, that the great need is to work towards world peace. There can be no division on that policy. More particularly is that true of today, when we cannot think in terms or methods of the past. We have to realize that nations have grown together, that geography is no longer important, that rapid transportation and communication have for all practical purposes eliminated distance, and we simply have to learn to get along with one another as best we can.

The complex situation in the Middle East has been built up by the rapid events which have taken place. Within a short time we have witnessed such disturbing happenings as Israel's invasion of Egypt, behind which there had been irreconcilable conflicts. We have seen the intervention of Great Britain and France, the resurgence of Arab nationalism, and the belligerence displayed by Nasser. A further complication was caused by the contribution of armaments by Russia and other supporting groups. This was followed by the seizure of the Suez Canal and the bombing of Egyptian air bases.

Arising out of these and other events there are bound to be conflicting views among nations which I would regard as nations of good judgment, peace and intelligence, and with a will to co-operate. We know who the great opponents are, and we know the general divisions in the world today. Knowing that, we shall make a serious mistake if in these days of emergency and stress our eyes are focused too closely on the issues between nations of good will.

**Hon. Mr. Hugessen:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Pratt:** That is a point, honourable senators, which we must keep in mind, and not allow ourselves to be carried away by matters of policy which in the overall picture are minor issues.

In the Middle East an actual war has been in progress. True, it has been localized, but it was fraught with the very great danger of spreading out into a world conflict.

The United Nations Police Force which was accepted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, I understand, without a dissenting vote—there were some abstentions, but not one vote against it—was certainly not to be a fighting force in the full military sense. It was introduced, however, as a contribution towards law and order and a token of the will and determination of nations to exert their influence and strength to maintain peace. And I think, honourable senators, we have every reason to be thankful and to appreciate the leadership which was given by Canada in the introduction of that policy in the United Nations.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Pratt:** The immediate result of it is that four countries that were engaged in military operations have agreed to a cease-fire. They have not agreed to a cease-fire because of force, but because of this evidence, we might say, of earnest intervention, or earnest attempt to bring them together; and except for the leadership given by Canada

we might have found by this time that a world conflict was more evidently before us than it is now, if indeed it was not actually raging.

Honourable senators, some of the remarks about the police force were in my view uncalled for. It has been referred to as a conveyor of typewriters and so forth, instead of an armed force. Well, I think that sort of talk gets us nowhere. The result so far is that it has had an arresting effect, and that is worth a tremendous lot. True, there has not been a solution of the great difficulties involved, but at least the trouble up to this stage has been arrested. Who can honestly look lightly upon that achievement? What is ahead of us no one knows. However, I think we can be thankful that that arresting step at least has been taken.

The issues before the world in these matters and the consequences of them baffle the imagination. As has been repeatedly said, if earnest and co-operative efforts toward peace are not made by the great powers, there may be a war of extermination. For there is no longer a possibility of victory for one and defeat for another. The day for that kind of thing is gone. This fact makes co-operative efforts toward international good will absolutely essential. Reference has been made in this chamber to the Munich Pact and so on, but where does that get us? Honourable senators, that belongs to the past. Today we may look upon the attempt of appeasement that was made only a few years ago as a mistake, but we must not forget that the atom bomb was then only in the realm of speculation and the hydrogen bomb was not even dreamt of. So these references to the past are meaningless in the present situation.

Let us recall for a moment what was probably one of the most significant statements ever made, a statement which will be remembered down through the years. It was made for publication by that great scientist Einstein just before he died and might be regarded as his last message to the world. I do not remember his exact words, but the substance was that he regretted the progress that had been made in atomic science, seeing, as he did, what might be ahead.

I bring this matter up because I feel our thinking ought to be influenced and guided by the changed circumstances of life. Honourable senators, as was said here just now we should not advocate peace at any price; nevertheless we must work harder and more realistically for peace with honour, and perhaps sacrifice more for it, than at any time in human history. It is true we must have a proper balance, but we should do nothing

which would in any way thwart an honest down-to-earth effort to try to get the nations together and resolve their difficulties.

We have heard it said, and it is true to a certain degree, that there is a rift between the Western nations. An honourable senator said he regretted the attitude of the United States to the Middle East question. I know that his intention is good and sincere, but I think it is a mistake at this time to express recriminations which might tend to separate us from our neighbours. If we are really separated let us try to get together, not keep apart, since it is only by working together that we can possibly solve the tremendous problems now facing the world.

There is one other phase of this matter to which I would like to refer. I think that public affairs today, in terms of party issues and the conduct of our political life, must be subordinated to the cause of international co-operation. I do not speak from the viewpoint of any party in saying that partisan considerations should not be allowed to affect our thinking on this matter. It may be that a general election is not far off, but, whether it is or not, while these great issues must be discussed freely and publicly they should be excluded from the realm of party politics, because they rank in importance far above such problems as we discuss and contend about in our local communities.

I would like to mention from a non-partisan standpoint and pay tribute to the work which has been done by our representatives at the United Nations, and to express pride at the place this country is taking in connection with these momentous affairs. Without respect to party, or to any political affiliations whatsoever, all possible encouragement should be given to those who, facing the tremendous issues of the hour, are doing their best to act as mediators and co-ordinators. And that, I believe, is exactly what our Canadian representatives are trying to do, and I believe with very helpful effect.

**Hon. L. M. Gouin:** Honourable senators, I wish in the first place to congratulate sincerely our junior senator from Winnipeg (Hon. Mr. Wall) and my good friend from De Lanaudière (Hon. Mr. Fournier) upon the excellent speeches they delivered in respectively moving and seconding the motion which is now before us.

I have listened with great interest to this debate, but for me to attempt to compliment all who have already spoken would take too long. I listened with particular interest to the remarks so well presented by the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald).

My contribution will be brief. I simply want to express my opinion on the role played

by Canada at the United Nations since the beginning of the double crisis which now confronts the world.

In the Middle East the Arab nations have never reconciled themselves to the existence of Israel as an independent state. Our honourable colleague from Toronto-Trinity (Hon. Mr. Roebuck) has explained elaborately the situation, which may be summed up in the statement that peace has never been restored to that troubled area of the world. The purpose of the Arab states is simply to drive the Jews into the sea. Tragic incidents have multiplied during the last months. Aggression, of course, called for retaliation, at first on a minor scale and then with increasing frequency and rapidity. Although Israel, in trying to obtain redress for her grievances, may have made some errors, she also endured intolerable provocations, manifested in deeds as well as words. For instance as was noted by the honourable senator from Toronto-Trinity, she was denied the use, to which she was fully entitled, of the Suez canal. On that point Egypt refused to comply with a decision of the United Nations; and suddenly, on July 26, Colonel Nasser violated the treaty of Constantinople, of 1888, by forcibly taking possession of all the assets of *La Compagnie Universelle du Canal de Suez*. He then nationalized the canal, although the company was entitled to manage it until 1968.

This breach of the obligation which arose under the treaty of 1888 was, in my opinion, the immediate cause of what followed. Israel started a so-called preventive war. But under the Charter of the United Nations resort to armed force is now allowed, though only in the case of repelling an armed attack against a given country. Such is the provision of article 51. I believe in the rule of law in international as well as in domestic matters. Preventive war cannot be justified under the United Nations Charter, and this principle applies to Israel, to Great Britain, to France, and to all countries. Those two great countries to which we are so closely attached felt that it was in their vital interest to resort to armed intervention in the Middle East because hostilities between Israel and Egypt threatened the freedom of the Suez Canal, which is literally a lifeline to Great Britain and exceedingly important to France.

I appreciate all those facts, but I deeply regret that Great Britain and France invaded Egypt before they had exhausted all peaceful means of settlement—illusory as they may seem—provided by the Charter of the United Nations. I regret, too, that this military action was taken by Great Britain and France without their consulting other members of

NATO, and especially, in the case of Great Britain, her sister nations of the Commonwealth.

This action seems to have endangered the existence of NATO and the Commonwealth, but thanks to the efforts of our Prime Minister and thanks to the splendid and prompt action of our Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Mr. Pearson, a solution was found—the only practical solution in these tragic circumstances. The United Nations General Assembly accepted Mr. Pearson's original suggestion that the Secretary General make arrangements for a United Nations' force to supervise cease-fire arrangements and to replace the Anglo-French forces in Egypt. This Canadian proposal saved the situation, and a United Nations Police Force, under the very able command of a great Canadian, General Burns, will ensure the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East, and, with the help of God, may make it possible to bring about a permanent settlement between Israel and Egypt, which is something we are all hoping for.

Canada has thus played a role of world leadership in the deliberations of the United Nations. Her action has kept the Asian members of the Commonwealth from leaving this great voluntary association of free nations to which we are so proud to belong. Canada has greatly contributed, also, to healing the breach which has momentarily separated Great Britain and France from the United States. The Canadian Government fully deserves our congratulations for what she has accomplished, and it should be given our support in the difficult days ahead. At the meetings of the General Assembly of the United Nations it was towards Canada that the majority of member states were turning for guidance. This marks a historical occasion which should be a source of legitimate pride for all Canadians.

The case of Hungary is pitiful. I feel powerless in the face of such drama, and as a lover of democratic freedom I am overwhelmed with emotion when I think of the brutal aggression committed by communist Russia. Hungarian hospitals have been shelled, Red Cross ambulances have been set afire, and thousands upon thousands of Hungarian men, women and children, have been killed, wounded or deported. Those brave people were able to regain their liberty for only a few days, but we are confident that time will prove that the Hungarian workers and students who fought for freedom will not have shed their blood in vain, and that these tragic days will mark the dawn of a new freedom for all Hungarians. In the meantime the Canadian Government is doing

everything in its power to assist Hungarian refugees who want to come to Canada. The gates of our country are open wide to them, and so are our hearts. We are confident that once these people reach our shores they will be proud to become Canadians. In this country they will share our liberty, happiness and prosperity.

Canada is not one of the world's great powers, but she is a land of freedom where the rule of law is supreme. Under the premiership of Mr. St. Laurent, Canada has assumed the role of a champion of justice and human brotherhood. The name of our country is respected throughout the world as that of a peace-loving Christian nation which fulfils religiously all her obligations under the United Nations Charter, and which endeavours earnestly under all circumstances to set a good example for the rest of the world.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. W. D. Euler:** Honourable senators, may I compliment the mover of the Address, (Hon. Mr. Wall), who gave, I think, one of the most scholarly and informative addresses that we have had the pleasure of hearing in this chamber.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I also compliment my friend the seconder (Hon. Mr. Fournier), with whom I sat in the House of Commons several years ago. Unfortunately, I was not able to understand everything he said, but what I did understand I enjoyed. While he was speaking I said to myself that I would not like to be running against him in his constituency, for I felt he would be quite invincible.

May I compliment also the member from Alma (Hon. Mr. Molson). I am sure his address was appreciated to the full by everyone who heard it.

Perhaps my congratulations should really go to the Prime Minister for his appointment of these new members.

**Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I think it would be consistent for me to express the hope that when the many vacancies in this chamber are filled the new appointments will be as commendable as those of the members to whom I have referred.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** The Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig), who is my friend—and I hope we shall continue to be friends—referred to the two dominant races in this

country, and implied, perhaps, that because of a certain sentiment, which is quite understandable, they might be disposed to support Britain and France in the actions which they have taken in Egypt. Without for one moment impugning the sincerity of anyone who takes the attitude that the Leader of the Opposition has taken, I suggest that a Canadian who is not a member of either of the dominant races can discuss the matters before us objectively, without prejudice, and with a reasonable degree of the saving grace of common sense.

May I also say, as one who does not always see eye to eye with the Government, that I take a real pleasure in finding myself in agreement with it in so far as its actions in the Middle East and in the United Nations are concerned.

I need not deal with the matter of Hungary, for it has already been discussed. However, I think I should say that in spite of what my honourable friend across from me said—and I do not believe he really meant it—I am confident that the Senate, the Commons, the Government, the Parliament of Canada, and, indeed, everyone in Canada is entirely in sympathy with the people of Hungary, and that all are willing to do everything possible to assist her unfortunate people.

The question of the invasion of Egypt by Britain, France and Israel does not particularly trouble me so far as making a decision is concerned. For me it is quite simple. The United Nations, of which Canada, in common with 78 other countries, is a member, was formed for one distinct and vital purpose—the maintenance of peace, and all the members pledged themselves under the charter to compose their differences without the use of force. That is a purpose I want to support. Therefore, I merely have to decide whether my country is going to honour her obligation to the only organization in the world which has at least a prospect of avoiding another world war, faint as that hope may be. After all, the United Nations is the only mechanism—if I may so describe it—that has for its purpose that one great desirable thing, the discontinuance of settling grievances through war.

You may talk all you like about the grievances of the Arabs and the Israelis, about the Suez affair, about the action of Egypt in fomenting trouble in Algeria, about the build-up of military forces in Egypt, and the policy of Nasser, but while these matters may be important, they are not germane to the question which is before us. What we have to decide is whether the Canadian Government's action in support of the work

of the United Nations shall be approved; whether Canada shall observe its pledge as a faithful member of the United Nations. To me it is just as simple as that. We, together with others, must support the United Nations or it will die, and with it will perish the one chance of maintaining peace. To me that seems important, for once we condone the action of any country or countries which, in violation of their pledge, proceed on their own to begin hostilities and establish the very vicious principle of preventive war, the United Nations will die; for this is war, although, quite unconvincingly to me, it is called a police action. The United Nations can play no favourites. If powerful nations can repudiate the vital principles which they are pledged to observe as members, yes, as leading members in the organization of the United Nations, then in the future any one of the 79 member nations can attack any other country for grievances, real or imaginary, and the whole purpose of the United Nations will be defeated. Then the UN will die, as the League of Nations died after it refused to intervene when Mussolini attacked Ethiopia.

To my mind it would be a crime if Canada were to assist in the destruction of the only organization that has at least a prospect of avoiding a world war. I disagree entirely and emphatically with the defeatist and depressing prophecy of my friend the leader opposite (Hon. Mr. Haig) that there must be, as I think he called it, a show-down or a war between Russia and the United States, and that either the one or the other will control the world. I do not like that thought.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** May I ask the honourable member a question?

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Certainly.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** What action has the United Nations taken against Russia's attack on Hungary?

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I have not commented on that.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Both countries are members of the United Nations.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Quite so. I am not saying the United Nations is perfect, but I maintain that it is the only organization from which we can gather any hope of preserving the peace of the world. That in itself is ample reason for preserving the United Nations.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** I am sure there is not a member of this chamber so pessimistic in his outlook as to believe that inevitably Russia

and the United States will go to war, and that as a result one or other will rule the world.

May I say, with respect to attacks on smaller nations, that the day of so-called gunboat diplomacy is gone, and the more powerful nations must realize that threats against smaller countries will no longer be effective, provided the United Nations observes the principles upon which it is founded.

My friend the Leader of the Opposition made some reference to Mr. Chamberlain, one-time Prime Minister of Great Britain, and his trip to Munich to make an agreement with Hitler. My friend was not very complimentary to Mr. Chamberlain; he even used the expression "Don't be a Chamberlain". I would remind my friend that at the time of Mr. Chamberlain's return from Munich to London the people of Great Britain and Canada and, indeed, the world at large, rejoiced at what he had done. The experiment, as my friend called it, was unsuccessful. Unfortunately, that is so, but it is easy to be wise after the event. At that time the world thought Mr. Chamberlain had done a wonderful thing in ensuring "peace in our time".

In passing I might mention the fact that Mr. Eden, as he then was, was Foreign Secretary in Mr. Chamberlain's cabinet.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** And he resigned.

**Hon. Mr. Euler:** Yes, he resigned in protest against what he called the appeasement of Hitler. Well, Mr. Eden, now Sir Anthony, has tried another experiment: along with France and Israel, Britain has invaded Egypt. I am very sure that if something were not being done to modify the results of their action, that experiment might have proved more disastrous than Mr. Chamberlain's negotiations with Hitler.

What have been the results of this adventure against Egypt? It has brought about the very things which the attackers professed they wished to avoid. One of the reasons advanced was that they wanted to preserve the Suez Canal. But they did not preserve it: it is now out of use for six months and perhaps longer. The pipe lines through Syria have been partially destroyed. Not only are Britain and France deprived of the use of necessary oil, but all the nations of Western Europe are in the same position, and may continue to be for a long time.

Let us look at some other very undesirable results of the action. There is the slaughter of thousands of people in the attack made on Port Said and elsewhere. It has resulted, I regret to say, in the humiliation of two proud

nations, Britain and France. It is a great shock to the world that they, of all countries, should have repudiated their obligations to the United Nations. It has created hatred in the hearts of the Arab people. We may not regard them as important, but they are human beings and in some number. Not only that, but it has caused distrust among hundreds of millions of people living in the Far East. A still more unfortunate result is the extreme danger of disunity in the Commonwealth. Mr. Pearson himself said in the House of Commons that there was an imminent danger of a breach between the member countries of the Commonwealth. A further result has been the very unfortunate rift between Britain and the United States.

My friend the Leader of the Opposition has said some rather unkind things about the United States. I have not always been in favour of the actions of that country; in fact, in this chamber I criticized very severely the conduct of Mr. Dulles, its Secretary of State, for certain actions which he took, and by which, he boasted, he brought his country to the brink of war, and then avoided it. I disapprove very strongly of such actions. But let us not forget the unalterable fact that Britain and France cannot afford to get along without the friendship and assistance of the United States.

I come to the last and most serious result of the action taken in the Middle East, namely, that through our actions we are playing directly into the hands of Russia. To offset all these unfavourable results there is no gain that I can see.

I detest war. As a matter of principle, I suppose everyone claims to detest war, but in practice many people do not follow that principle. Surely the last two wars have convinced us that no one wins a war, and that everyone loses.

Some years ago I attended a gathering of prominent men, among whom was a statesman well known to most of you. The Second World War was threatening at the time, and the discussion was with regard to Danzig, the Baltic German port, which was taken from Germany and ceded to Poland under the Treaty of Versailles. During the discussion this wise old statesman said, "Surely we are not going to war on account of Danzig". One of the younger and less wise men there said, "Oh, there are worse things than war". I asked him, "Just tell me one". I received no reply.

During the current debate there have been quotations from some philosophers. Believe it or not, in the past few weeks I have been reading the works of some of the great philosophers. I recently read with much

interest some of the writings of that outstanding Frenchman, Voltaire, and noted with special interest this observation:

War is the greatest of all crimes and yet there is no aggressor who does not colour his crime with the pretence of justice. It is forbidden to kill; therefore murderers are punished unless they kill in large numbers and to the sound of trumpets.

Honourable senators, my criticisms today may not be received favourably by all, but I am sincere in what I say. I rose to speak solely for the purpose of saying that Canada must adhere to its pledges in the United Nations, whose Charter we signed, and which is the one organization today that has any chance of bringing about peace. May we hope that the situation may yet be saved. It is no disgrace to admit a mistake; it may indeed be a noble thing to do.

The erring countries—and I use the word advisedly, because I think these nations were wrong in invading Egypt—have agreed to withdraw. I am glad of that. Let them as quickly as is reasonably possible retire from an untenable position, regain the respect and the good will of the world, and co-operate with the United Nations in pursuing the purposes for which it was established. When that is done, when the hot blood and the passions have cooled, I believe the matter of the Suez, together with the other difficulties of the Middle East, can be adjusted with justice to all.

**Some Hon. Senators:** Hear, hear.

**Hon. J. W. DeB. Farris:** Honourable senators, I did not intend to speak in this debate. I arrived here only this afternoon after being up all night on a plane. I have been tied up with other work and so have had no opportunity to prepare notes on the subject under discussion; and it is something on which one should not speak without very thoughtful preparation. However, a remark of my honourable friend from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler) has prompted me to go on record with just a word or two. There is a higher law even than that of unvarying loyalty to the United Nations, and that is the law of self-preservation. When nations like England and France take action in the honest belief that events are moving that will threaten their existence, and when Russia and certain other members of the United Nations voice their disapproval with tongue in cheek, I am not prepared to accept the suggestion that Britain and France have repudiated their obligations.

The motion for the Address was agreed to.

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Ordered that the said address be presented to His Excellency

the Governor General by such members of this house as are members of the Honourable the Privy Council.

### ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I understand that the Address has received approval in the House of Commons and that that house is now in committee of supply and may dispose of its business this evening. I would therefore suggest that this chamber now rise, to reassemble at 9.30 this evening, or earlier at the call of the bell.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

At 8.00 p.m. the sitting was resumed.

### APPROPRIATION BILL No. 7

#### FIRST READING

A message was received from the House of Commons with Bill 2, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1956.

The bill was read the first time.

#### SECOND READING

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, when shall this bill be read the second time?

**Hon. W. Ross Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I move the second reading now.

This bill provides for the payment of the sum of one million dollars.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Have copies of the bill been distributed?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** No; the bill has just come from the Commons and it is impossible to have it printed and distributed this evening.

As far as I know, thus far no bill of this kind has been based entirely on the contents of a Speech from the Throne. Honourable senators will recall that the Speech referred to two matters only: one, the setting up of a police force under the United Nations; the other, provision for the grant of a sum of money for Hungarian relief. The present bill deals with both these matters: it is to provide one million dollars for Hungarian relief. I do not know whether on a previous occasion I explained how that sum will be spent.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** You did not.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** I intended to ask about that before the honourable Leader of the Government (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) resumed his seat.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I might answer it now.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** I was going to ask the honourable Leader of the Government to tell us what form this grant of one million dollars is to take. Is it to be in the form of a grant of wheat, or of flour? I should like to see some wheat sent over. Will the provision be of goods or of money? And how is it to be distributed? What agency will handle it? Will the honourable gentleman give us the fullest particulars he can in regard to these matters?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I think that is a fair question and I will try to answer it as completely as I can.

If I recall correctly, when the honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne he referred to a grant of \$200,000. In so stating it he was correct. That is the amount which was originally mentioned, but it was never the intention that there should be no more. It was made up of two definite sums of \$100,000; and the arrangement which we hope to carry out is to remit \$100,000 in cash to the International Red Cross, which is already operating inside Hungary, and \$100,000 to the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees. The remaining \$800,000 may be paid in cash or may be in the form of supplies. A definite decision in that respect has not yet been reached. Probably distribution will be made as recommended to the Government by the Secretary of State for External Affairs when the situation has been more completely studied.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Will some of this million dollars be expended to advance fares to refugees, or will such advances be apart from the present million dollar grant?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I doubt very much whether any of the million dollars will be used for advancing fares to refugees. That is not the intention. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration has funds for that purpose. It is expected that a large portion of this money will go for the alleviation of suffering among the refugees who are already outside Hungary, living in emergency refugee camps in Austria.

I think I should emphasize the fact that any money which eventually will be administered or used for relief purposes within the borders of Hungary will not be handed over to the Hungarian Government or to any of its agencies, but will be carefully administered by the International Red Cross, which, as I have said, is already operating within Hungary itself. I mention that because during the debate it was suggested, I think by the

honourable senator from Blaine Lake (Hon. Mr. Horner), that some of this money had already got into the hands of the Hungarian Government.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** Yes. I was quoting from a statement in the press.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I repeat that the Government is making sure that none of this money shall pass into the hands of the Hungarian Government. All of it will be used for the benefit of the refugees.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** Can the honourable leader estimate how much money has already been forwarded for distribution?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I do not know, but it is possible that \$200,000 or a portion of that sum has already gone forward.

**Hon. Mr. Aseltine:** The reason I asked that question is that the need appears to be very urgent, and as I am in favour of the appropriation of the amount mentioned for purposes of relief, I am anxious that it shall be used as soon as possible. Winter is coming along, and these people will need food and clothing at an early date.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I quite agree with what the honourable senator from Rosetown (Mr. Aseltine), has said; and it is my impression that a part of the \$200,000 has already been advanced.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** I noted in today's papers that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is going to Austria to see about the migration of refugees to this country. Has the honourable Leader of the Government (Mr. Macdonald), any idea of the number of refugees who have already signified a desire to come to Canada?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I was speaking to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration just before I came into the chamber. He expects to leave for Austria tomorrow morning. We have no estimate which we regard as accurate as to the number who may come to this country. They will declare their intentions while they are in Austria. All I can say is that we are doing everything in our power to assist those who want to come to Canada to do so.

**Hon. Mr. Davies:** Where will they go when they get here? Will there be hostels ready to receive them?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** We have some hostels ready and we hope that Hungarian descendants living in Canada, and Canadians generally, will receive some of these people in their own homes, if necessary. The Department of Citizenship and Immigration has already been in touch with the National

Employment Service of the Department of Labour to ascertain where jobs will be available. Everything that we can think of which might be of assistance to these immigrants is being done. We are doing everything possible to see that they are supplied with accommodation and placed in jobs as soon as they arrive in this country. However, I should point out that the people of Canada will be given every opportunity to put into action what they have said about welcoming these unfortunate people to our country. How these people will get along in Canada will depend to a very large extent on the manner in which Canadians generally receive them.

**Hon. John T. Haig:** Honourable senators, I have read in the press that the Government is hopeful Canadians will open their homes to these Hungarians. I also heard that many who are willing to accept these refugees are not in a position to do so financially, and that the Government, after sufficient investigation, intends to advance moneys to defray some of this expense. That is all to the good.

Apparently Ontario is the only province which is taking active steps to sponsor these Hungarians in Canada. The Ontario Government has sent one of its officers, who is of Hungarian descent, to meet these people in Europe and to encourage them to settle in Ontario. I am wondering whether the federal Government would not endeavour to induce the other provincial Governments to do the same.

I can well imagine that refugee immigrants would be rather bewildered as to what part of the country to go to. For instance, if I were to emigrate to Austria I would not know where to settle there. On the other hand, if I were to meet these Hungarians in Europe I could outline the employment situation in Manitoba and I could tell them what qualifications they needed for various jobs. If there are any farmers amongst them I am sure they would be welcomed in Prairie farm homes.

I am sure everyone in Canada is in favour of our action in authorizing this relief for the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary. We all admire the heroism displayed by the Hungarian people in their vicious struggle against their oppressors, and we are only too anxious to help them and to show the rest of the world that our hearts are in the right place.

I feel the Government is doing its best to aid these people, but I am wondering if it could not take the further step of urging the other provincial Governments to do something about placing these refugees in jobs.

I know the provincial Governments would listen to a request from the federal Government more than they would from some of us fellows in opposition here and in another place.

I happen to know a few European refugees who settled in and around Winnipeg after the Russians had overrun their countries a few years ago. One couple came from Germany, where the woman had been a dressmaker and the husband a tailor. When they arrived here a group of welfare workers in Winnipeg got the woman placed in a home as a domestic. Under the regulations she had to work as a domestic for one year, then she was free to take employment elsewhere. She is a very clever dress designer and is now operating a profitable dressmaking establishment in Winnipeg. There are many similar cases.

**Hon. Mr. Horner:** There has been an alarming shortage of farm help in this country and it has been almost an impossibility to get hired help on farms in Saskatchewan this fall and winter. Many farmers have moved into the city and have vacated comfortable farm homes. It may be that with financial assistance some of these Hungarian refugees could acquire a bit of stock and move onto these farms and start a new life in that way. I am sure that if there are any experienced farmers amongst these people they will have no difficulty in securing farm employment in the West. This may also be so in eastern Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Howden:** I believe it is one of the functions of the Department of Citizenship and Immigration to help place people like these. It is to my definite knowledge that the department has done a good job in settling many immigrants in Winnipeg and elsewhere in Manitoba, and I am quite sure that it could make satisfactory arrangements to place these unfortunate Hungarians in homes throughout Manitoba and other parts of Canada.

**Hon. Mr. Gershaw:** Honourable senators, I wonder if it would be feasible to have a part of this relief aid take the form of credits? I have in mind the use of some of our surplus food supplies. In the district from which I come there are large piles of wheat lying around in the open. I spoke to a farmer just a few days ago who said he had 200,000 bushels of wheat and his neighbour had 250,000 bushels, which they could not sell. It would be a great help to everybody if some of this food could be used for the relief of the Hungarian people.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, first, with regard to the co-operation which

the Department of Citizenship and Immigration is receiving from the provincial Governments, may I say that I am sure that the Honourable Mr. Pickersgill and his officials welcome wholeheartedly any assistance and co-operation which may be received from any provincial Government in Canada. I recall, as the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) said, that the Ontario Government has sent its Agent General in London, England, Major J. S. P. Armstrong, to Austria, and I noticed in the press today that the honourable Mr. Frost, Premier of Ontario, sent one of the members of the Legislature to Austria to assist. If other provinces would like to do so, I can assure the Leader of the Opposition that they will get all the help it is possible to give them from our Immigration Department in Vienna, and also that the department will welcome them.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Thank you.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** It may be possible to use a portion of this money to send supplies from Canada. The sum of \$800,000 will be used in the way which is deemed best, and the advice on that matter we will take from our Department of External Affairs, which is in close touch with the situation in Austria and in Hungary. I am sure that the Leader of the Opposition and others who have spoken will all feel confident that this money will be handled as quickly as possible for the relief of these people, and in the best manner possible.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Is there not an item there for one dollar?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Yes.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** That is for the United Nations Police Force, is it not?

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Yes; there are the two items.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** I do not think some of our members understood that. I have had the advantage of seeing that and looking it over carefully.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I intended to say, and I thought I did say, that the bill covered the two items referred to in the Speech from the Throne, that is, \$1 million for Hungarian relief, and \$1 in connection with our contribution to the expenses of the United Nations Police Force—one dollar being voted because we do not know yet what the cost will be. It is included in the present grant of \$1 million for national defence, so \$1 will be added, making a total of \$1 million and one dollar.

**Hon. Calvert C. Pratt:** May I have the privilege of drawing to the attention of honourable senators a clipping from a newspaper I have just received today with reference to relief which is being offered in Newfoundland for the Hungarian refugees who are passing through Gander airport? The relief is being organized by the Canadian Red Cross Society; and the Salvation Army, the Canadian Legion, service clubs and other organizations in Newfoundland, under the society's direction, are very actively engaged in this work. These organizations are calling for men's, women's and children's clothing, which will be offered to the refugees as they are passing through Gander airport, and the response of the people has been so generous that, as the newspaper says, the organizations were "bombarded with clothing" and can scarcely cope with the large quantity that has been received.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the second time.

**THIRD READING**

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I move the third reading of the bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill was read the third time, and passed.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I move that when the Senate adjourns this evening it stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 8, 1957, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMUNICATION FROM GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SECRETARY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform you that I have received the following message from the Secretary to the Governor General:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE  
OTTAWA

November 29, 1956.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Patrick Kerwin, Chief Justice of Canada, acting as Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber today, the 29th November, at 8.30 p.m., for the purpose of giving Royal Assent to a certain Bill.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

J. F. DELAUTE,

Secretary to the Governor General  
(Administrative)

The Honourable  
The Speaker of the Senate,  
Ottawa.

**THE ROYAL ASSENT**

The Honourable Patrick Kerwin, Chief Justice of Canada, Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons having been summoned and being come with their Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give the Royal Assent to the following bill:

An Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1957.

The House of Commons withdrew.

The Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to retire.

The sitting of the Senate was resumed.

The Senate adjourned until Tuesday, January 8, 1957, at 10 a.m.

## THE SENATE

—  
 Tuesday, January 8, 1957

The Senate met at 10.30 a.m., the Speaker in the Chair.

Prayers.

Routine proceedings.

## SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY—MESSAGE OF THANKS  
 FROM HIS EXCELLENCY

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that he had received a message from His Excellency the Governor General, reading as follows:

The Honourable the Members of the Senate:

I have received with great pleasure the Address that you have voted in reply to my speech at the opening of Parliament. I thank you sincerely for this Address.

Vincent Massey

## PROROGATION

NOTICE

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have received the following communication:

GOVERNMENT HOUSE  
 Ottawa

January 8, 1957.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform you that the Hon. Patrick Kerwin, in his capacity as Deputy Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber at 11.00 a.m., today, the 8th January, 1957, for the purpose of proroguing the Special Session of the Twenty-Second Parliament.

I have the honour to be,  
 Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
 J. F. Delaute,  
 Secretary to the Governor General,  
 (Administrative)

The Honourable  
 The Speaker of the Senate,  
 The Senate,  
 Ottawa.

## NEW SENATORS

The Hon. the Speaker: Honourable senators, I have the honour to inform the Senate that the Clerk has received certificates from the Secretary of State of Canada showing that the following persons, respectively, have been summoned to the Senate:

Hon. Sydney John Smith,  
 Hon. Austin Claude Taylor,  
 Hon. William Albert Boucher,  
 Hon. Henri Charles Bois.

## NEW SENATORS INTRODUCED

The Hon. the Speaker having informed the Senate that there were senators without, waiting to be introduced:

The following newly-summoned senators were severally introduced, and presented Her Majesty's writs of summons, which were read by the Clerk Assistant, and took the oath prescribed by law, and were seated:

Hon. Austin Claude Taylor, of Salisbury, New Brunswick, introduced between Hon. Mr. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Burchill.

Hon. Henri Charles Bois, of St. Bruno, Quebec, (Electoral division, Montarville), introduced between Hon. Mr. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. Vaillancourt.

The Hon. the Speaker informed the Senate that each of the two newly-summoned senators named above had made and subscribed the declaration of qualification required by the British North America Act, 1867, in the presence of the Clerk of the Senate, the Commissioner appointed to receive and witness the said declaration.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: Honourable senators, unfortunately the other two new senators, the Honourable Sydney John Smith and the Honourable William Albert Boucher, cannot be here today, but it is expected that they will arrive before the beginning of next week.

## BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Hon. W. Ross Macdonald: Honourable senators, at this point perhaps I may announce the business that it is proposed to deal with in the Senate for the remainder of this week. Honourable senators will observe that the chamber is arranged for the formal opening of the new session this afternoon. It will take a long time to re-establish our desks, for the facilities for moving them are not good. In the circumstances, it is unlikely that much work can be done satisfactorily here until the beginning of next week.

I have asked Senator Vaillancourt to sit at my right, as Deputy Leader of the Government, when the desks are properly set up.

Hon. Senators: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: He will take the place of Senator Godbout, who passed away shortly after the close of the last session.

I understand that His Honour the Speaker proposes to open the new session this afternoon with prayers, after the Governor General has read the Speech from the Throne. There will then be the usual formal motions, one of which will be to set up the Selection Committee, composed of the

same members as were appointed to it last year. I would suggest that that committee meet tomorrow morning. Its report would then be brought in tomorrow afternoon, and considered on Thursday.

One committee that would like to start work as soon as possible is the Divorce Committee. I suggest that tomorrow afternoon we could approve the report of the Selection Committee with respect to the Divorce Committee only, so that that committee may meet on the following day for organizational purposes, if the Chairman so desires. If that were done he would be in a position to bring in his first report on Thursday. The other committees would not be approved until Thursday.

Honourable senators will have noticed that I did not refer to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I do not think it would be fitting to proceed with the Address while the chamber is in its present condition, and I suggest that we proceed with it next Tuesday evening. I have asked Senator Bois to move, and Senator Sydney Smith to second, the Address. Of course, this is all conditional on any other legislation which might come to us, although I have no notice of any such legislation.

Honourable Senators, this is a tentative program which I hope will meet with the approval of the members of the Senate.

**Hon. Mr. Haig:** Honourable senators, I wish to thank the honourable leader for his clear statement. I think it would be most helpful to all of us if this procedure were followed more often.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators, I move that the Senate rise at this time, to resume at the call of the bell, at approximately 10.55.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

---

The sitting was resumed.

### SIR ROBERT BORDEN STATUE

#### UNVEILING CEREMONY

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I should like to announce that at ten minutes to twelve this morning a statue in

memory of Sir Robert Borden, on the lawn west of the West Block of the Parliament Buildings, will be unveiled.

The actual unveiling will be shown on television screens set up at the entrance of the Hall of Honour in the Centre Block, where continuing ceremonies will be held immediately after the unveiling. Honourable senators and members of their families are cordially invited to attend.

The Senate adjourned during pleasure.

### PROROGATION

#### SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

The Honourable Patrick Kerwin, the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, having come and being seated at the foot of the Throne, and the House of Commons being come with their Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy of the Governor General was pleased to close the Fourth (Special) Session of the Twenty-Second Parliament with the following Speech:

Honourable Members of the Senate,

Members of the House of Commons,

Developments in the international situation were fortunately such that it was not necessary to resume the session which I now bring to a close.

Members of the House of Commons,

I thank you for the provision you have made for the purposes of Canada's participation in the United Nations Emergency Force in fulfilment of our country's obligations to the United Nations Organization under the Charter and for 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 bless and protect this nation.

---

#### The Hon. the Speaker:

Honourable members of the Senate,

Members of the House of Commons,

It is the will and pleasure of the Honourable the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General that this Parliament be prorogued until a later hour this day, to be here holden; and this Parliament is prorogued accordingly.

---

# INDEX

## DEBATES OF THE SENATE

FOURTH (SPECIAL) SESSION, TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT, 1956-57

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne** at opening of session  
Motion for, 2; adopted, 51  
Speakers: Hon. Senators Wall (mover), 14-18; Fournier (seconder), 18-20; Davies, 40-44; Euler, 49-51; Farris, 51; Gouin, 47-49; Haig, 21-22, 23-28; Horner, 44-46; Macdonald, 28-33; Molson, 33-34; Pratt, 46-47; Roebuck, 34-35, 36-40  
Message of thanks from Governor General, 56
- Appropriation bill No. 7.** 1st reading, 52; 2nd reading, 52-55; 3rd reading, 55; Royal Assent, 55
- Aseltine, Hon. W. M.,** Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the Senate  
Appropriation bill No. 7, 52, 53  
Hungarian relief, 52, 53  
Tributes to the memory of:  
Hon. George H. Ross, 8  
Hon. John J. Stevenson, 7-8
- Bills (Public)**  
Appropriation No. 7. 1st reading, 52; 2nd reading, 52-55; 3rd reading, 55; Royal Assent, 55  
Railways (*pro forma*). 1st reading, 2
- Bois, Hon. Henri Charles**  
Introduction to Senate, 56
- Borden, Sir Robert, Statue**  
Unveiling ceremony, 57
- Bouffard, Hon. Paul H.**  
Tributes to the memory of:  
Hon. J. Adélar Godbout, 10  
Hon. John T. Hackett, 10-11
- Britain—See** Great Britain
- Burns, Major General E. L. M.,** Commander of United Nations Police Force, Middle East, 31, 48
- Canada Council,** proposed establishment, 22
- Committees**  
Appointment, 2; quorum, 14
- Communists—See** Russia
- Davies, Hon. W. Rupert**  
Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 40-44  
Appropriation bill No. 7, 53  
Great Britain  
Economic difficulties after Suez Canal nationalized by Egypt, 42  
Franco-British military action in Middle East, 40, 41, 43  
Newspaper pressure on Government, 41, 42, 43  
Hungary  
Russian tyranny, 40  
Migration of refugees to Canada, 53  
Suez Canal Company, 41  
United Nations Police Force, Canada's participation in, 41  
International police force, idea not new, 44
- Dessureault, Hon. J. M.**  
Tribute to the memory of Hon. J. Adélar Godbout, 9
- Eden, Right Hon. Sir Anthony,** Prime Minister of United Kingdom, 41, 42, 50
- Egypt**  
*See* Middle East
- Euler, Hon. W. D., P.C.**  
Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 49-51  
Egypt, results of invasion of, 50, 51  
Hungary, 26, 28; assistance to, 49  
Israel, international guarantee of safety, 40  
United Nations, support of essential to maintenance of peace, 49-50, 51

**Farris, Hon. J. W. de B.**

Franco-British action in Middle East, 51

**Federal election**—Middle East question predicted issue, 27

**Fergusson, Hon. Muriel McO.**

Tributes to the memory of:

Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 12

Hon. John T. Hackett, 12

Hon. Frederick W. Pirie, 12

Hon. George H. Ross, 11

Hon. John J. Stevenson, 11

**Flag, Canadian**, not distinctive, 19-20, 28, 29

**Foulkes, General Charles**, Chairman, Chiefs of Staff

Statement on NATO quoted, 16

**Fournier, Hon. Sarto**

Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, motion for seconded, 18-20

Canadian contribution to world peace, 18-19

Egypt

Invasion of, 18

Relations with Russia, 19

Flag, Canadian, not distinctive, 19-20

Hungary, help to victims of recent events in, 20-21

NATO, world's greatest co-operative for peace, 18

Prosperity in Canada, 21

United Nations

Middle East Police Force, 19

Military strength necessary for survival, 19

**France**

Middle East, Franco-British action in, 18, 19, 23, 24-25, 26, 27, 32, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43

**Gershaw, Hon. F. W.**

Appropriation bill No. 7, 54

Wheat surplus, suggested use in Hungarian relief, 54

**Godbout, Hon. J. Adélard**, death of—tributes to his memory, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-13

**Golding, Hon. William H.**

Tribute to the memory of Hon. George H. Ross, 9

**Gouin, Hon. L. M.**

Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 47-49

Egypt

Invasion by Britain and France, 48

Suez Canal, nationalization, 48-49

**Gouin, Hon. L. M.—Con.**

Hungary, fight for freedom, 48-49

Refugees, assistance for, 48-49

Tributes to the memory of:

Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 11

Hon. John T. Hackett, 11

Hon. Frederick W. Pirie, 11

Hon. George H. Ross, 11

Hon. John J. Stevenson, 11

United Nations, role of Canada in crisis, 48

**Governor General, Right Hon. Vincent Massey, C. H.**

Opening of session, 1; Speech from the Throne, 1-2; message of thanks for Address in reply, 56

Deputy of Governor General

Hon. Patrick Kerwin, Chief Justice

Prorogation of Parliament, Speech from the Throne, 57

Royal Assent, 55

**Great Britain**

Middle East, Franco-British action in, 18, 19, 23, 24-25, 26, 27, 32, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43

**Gruenther, General Alfred**, Commander in Chief, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE)

Warning to Russia, 24, 26

**Hackett, Hon. John T.**, death of—tributes to his memory, 3, 6, 8, 10-11, 12

**Haig, Hon. John T.**, Leader of the Opposition in the Senate

Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 21-22, 23-26, 27, 28

Appropriation bill No. 7, 53-54

Britain and France

Ancestral ties with, 24, 26, 27, 28

Middle East action, support for, 26

Canada Council, proposed establishment, 22

Egypt

Invasion of, 24-25

Nationalization of Suez Canal, 25, 27

President Nasser's objection to Canadian troops, 28

Hungary

Russian aggression in, 25

Refugees, 28; immigrants, 53-54

Relief for victims, 28, 53

Imports, excessive buying by Canada, 21

Inflation, effect on pensioners, 22

Interest rates, 21

Middle East question, widespread interest in, 23-24; predicted issue in federal election, 27

United Nations Police Force, 28

Russia and United States, opposing powers, 25

- Haig, Hon. John T.—Con.**  
 Tributes to the memory of:  
 Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 6  
 Hon. John T. Hackett, 6  
 Hon. Frederick W. Pirie, 7  
 Hon. George H. Ross, 7  
 Hon. John J. Stevenson, 6-7  
 United Nations  
 Hungary—unable to intervene in, 25  
 Middle East Police Force, 54
- Horner, Hon. R. B.**  
 Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 44-46  
 Appropriation bill No. 7, 52, 53, 54  
 Egypt  
 Nationalization of Suez Canal, 45  
 President Nasser's refusal to accept certain troops from United Nations, 45  
 Hungary  
 Refugees from—employment available on western farms, 54  
 Relief for victims of Russian aggression in, 46  
 United States—Eastern policy, 45
- Howden, Hon. John P.**  
 Hungarian refugees, placement of immigrants, 54
- Hugessen, Hon. A. K.**  
 Hungary, fight for freedom, 2  
 Legislation Committee, appointment, 2; report, 14  
 Orders and Privileges Committee, appointment, 2
- Hungary**  
 Fight for freedom, 2, 14-18, 33-34, 40, 48-49  
 Relief for victims of recent events, 15, 20-21, 28, 52-55  
 Refugees, 15, 28, 46, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55  
 Welcome to, 30; accommodation and assistance, 53, 54, 55
- Immigration**  
 Hungarian refugees, 15, 46, 53, 54
- Imports**  
 Excessive in relation to exports, 21-22
- Inflation**  
 Effect on pensioners, 22
- Inman, Hon. F. Elsie**  
 Jodoin, Hon. Mrs., birthday felicitations, 36  
 Tributes to the memory of:  
 Hon. John T. Hackett, 10  
 Hon. George H. Ross, 10
- Interest rates, 22**
- Israel**  
 See Middle East
- Jodoin, Hon. Mariana B.**  
 Birthday felicitations, 36  
 Tribute to the memory of Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 9
- Kerwin, Hon. Patrick, Chief Justice, Deputy of Governor General**  
 Prorogation of Parliament, Speech from the Throne, 57  
 Royal Assent, 55
- Lambert, Hon. Norman P.**  
 Suez Canal Company, 41
- Legislation Committee**  
 Appointment, 2; quorum, 14; report, 14
- Library of Parliament—Librarian and Associate Librarian, xix**
- Lloyd, Right Hon. Selwyn, United Kingdom Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 41**
- Macdonald, Hon. W. Ross, P.C., Solicitor General and Leader of the Government in the Senate**  
 Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 28-33  
 Appropriation bill No. 7, 52, 53, 54  
 Flag, national, 29  
 Hungary  
 Refugees, 29-30  
 Welcome to, 30; accommodation and assistance, 53, 54  
 Relief for victims of recent events, 28, 52, 53, 54  
 Middle East  
 United Nations Police Force, Canada's participation, 30-32, 54  
 Senate  
 Business of, 1  
 Emergency sittings, authority to convene during adjournment, 23, 36  
 Tributes to the memory of:  
 Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 3, 4  
 Hon. John T. Hackett, 3  
 Hon. Frederick W. Pirie, 3, 5  
 Hon. George H. Ross, 3, 5  
 Hon. John J. Stevenson, 3, 4-5  
 United States, friendly relations with, 32
- MacKinnon, Hon. James A., P.C.**  
 Tribute to the memory of Hon. George H. Ross, 11
- Middle East**  
 Egypt  
 Invasion of, 18, 24-25, 26, 27, 36-38, 40, 41, 48, 49, 50, 51

**Middle East—Con.**

- President Nasser's refusal to accept certain troops from United Nations, 28, 44, 45
- Russia, relations with, 19, 24
- Suez canal
  - Administration, 41
  - Importance to West, 19, 42, 48
  - Nationalization, 25, 27, 40, 45, 48
- Israel
  - Invasion of, 38-39
  - Security, responsibility of United Nations, 39-40
  - Self-defence, 24-25
  - United Nations Police Force, Canada's participation, 2, 14, 28, 30-32, 33, 35, 39-40, 41, 46-47, 48

**Ministry, the**—according to precedence (January 8, 1957), iii-iv

**Molson, Hon. H. de M.**

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 33-34
- Hungary, fight for freedom, 33-34
  - Relief for victims of Russian tyranny, 33-34
- Middle East crisis, 33
  - Canada's leadership at United Nations, 33
- Russian Embassy—diplomatic relations, 34
- United States, foreign policy, 33

**Nasser, Colonel Gamal Abdel**, President of Egypt, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49

**NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)**

- Important role of, 16, 17, 18
- Statement by General Charles Foulkes quoted, 16

**Newfoundland**

- Aid to Hungarian refugees, 54

**Orders and Privileges Committee**, appointment, 2

**Parliamentary Assistants to Ministers** (January 8, 1957), iv

**Pearson, Hon. Lester B., P.C., M.P.**, Secretary of State for External Affairs  
Leadership in Middle East crisis, 14, 28, 31, 48

**Pirie, Hon. Frederick W.**, death of—tributes to his memory, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 12

**Pratt, Hon. Calvert C.**

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 46-47

**Pratt, Hon. Calvert C.—Con.**

- Appropriation bill No. 7, 55
- Hungarian refugees, Newfoundland aid, 54
- Middle East situation, 46-47
- United Nations
  - Canada's leadership, 46, 47
  - Middle East Police Force, 46-47

**Press, the, and periodicals**

- Globe and Mail—United Nations policy to prevent use of force, 37
- London Sunday Times—quotation from speech by Sir Anthony Eden, 42
- New York Herald Tribune—Russian tyranny in Hungary, 25
- New York Times—Russian tyranny in Hungary, 25

**Prime Minister**—See St. Laurent, Right Hon. Louis S., P.C., M.P.

**Privy Council**, principal officers (January 8, 1957), iv

**Public bills**, suspension of rules, 14

**Railways bill** (*pro forma*), 1st reading, 2.

**Robertson, Hon. Wishart McL., P.C.**, Speaker  
Royal Assent, notice of, 55  
Senators, new, 56  
Session, notice of opening, 1; prorogation, 56-57

**Roebuck, Hon. Arthur W.**

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, 34-35, 36-40
- Canada's responsibilities as nation, 35
- Middle East
  - Egypt, invasion of, 36-38
  - Israel
    - International guarantee of safety, 40
    - Unfriendly acts by Egypt, 38-39, 40
  - United Nations Police Force, Canada's participation in, 35
  - Power to enforce UN decrees necessary, 39
- Tributes to the memory of:
  - Hon. George H. Ross, 8-9
  - Hon. John J. Stevenson, 8

**Ross, Hon. George H.**, death of—tributes to his memory, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

**Royal Assent**, 55

**Russia**

- Arms and munitions supplied to Egypt, 36, 38, 40
- Embassy in Canada—diplomatic relations, 34
- Hungary and, 14-18, 23, 25, 27, 33-34, 40, 46, 48, 50

**Russia—Con.**

- Nations submerged within USSR, 17
- United States and, 25, 29

**St. Laurent, Right Hon. Louis S., P.C., M.P.,  
Prime Minister**

- Broadcast on Middle East and Hungary, and letter to Premier Bulganin of Russia regarding Hungary, quoted, 16, 17
- Middle East crisis, efforts toward practical solution, 48

**Senate**

- Bills, public—suspension of rules, 14
- Business of, 1, 56-57
- Committees—Legislation, 2, 14; Orders and Privileges, 2
- Emergency sittings, authority to convene, 23, 36
- Officers and Chiefs of Principal Branches, xix

**Senators**

- (January 8, 1957) according to seniority, v-vii; alphabetically, ix-xi; by provinces, xiii-xvii
- Deceased:
  - Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12-13
  - Hon. John T. Hackett, 3, 6, 8, 10-11, 12
  - Hon. Frederick W. Pirie, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12
  - Hon. George H. Ross, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
  - Hon. John J. Stevenson, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11
- New, 56

**Speech from the Throne**

- At opening of session, 2; at prorogation, 56
- See Address in reply

**Stevenson, Hon. John J., death of—tributes  
to his memory, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11****Suez Canal**

- See Middle East

**Taylor, Hon. Austin Claude**

- Introduction to Senate, 56

**United Kingdom—See Great Britain****United Nations, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 49, 50,  
51**

- International organization for peace, 16, 49, 50, 51
- Middle East Police Force, 2, 14, 19, 28, 31, 32, 33, 39-40, 46-47, 48
- Power to enforce UN decrees necessary, 19, 39

**United States**

- Friendly relations with Canada, 32; with Britain and France, 51
- Hungary, non-intervention by United States in, 25
- Middle East policy, 24, 26, 33, 45
- Russia and, 25, 29

**Vaillancourt, Hon. Cyrille, Deputy Leader of  
the Government in the Senate, 56**

- Tribute to the memory of Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 12-13

**Wall, Hon. William M.**

- Address in reply to Speech from the Throne, motion for, 14-18
- Hungary
  - Fight for freedom, 15-17
  - Refugees—haven in Canada, 15
  - Relief for victims of recent events, 15
- NATO—important role of, 16-17
- Prime Minister—radio broadcast and letter quoted, 16, 17
- Russia, nations submerged within, 17
- United Nations
  - International vehicle for peace, 16
  - Police Force, 14, 16-17
  - Security Council, right of veto, 16

**Wheat**

- Surplus, 22; suggested use in Hungarian relief, 54

**Wilson, Hon. Cairine R.**

- Tribute to the memory of Hon. J. Adélard Godbout, 11