



CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

FOURTH (SPECIAL) SESSION
TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT
4-5 ELIZABETH II

IN ONE VOLUME (WITH INDEX)

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1956,
TO THE EIGHTH DAY OF JANUARY, 1957, INCLUSIVE

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

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT
OF THE
RIGHT HON. LOUIS STEPHEN ST. LAURENT

Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council	RIGHT HON. LOUIS STEPHEN ST. LAURENT
Minister of Trade and Commerce and Minister of Defence Production	RIGHT HON. CLARENCE DECATUR HOWE
Minister of Agriculture	RIGHT HON. JAMES GARFIELD GARDINER
Minister of National Health and Welfare	HON. PAUL JOSEPH JAMES MARTIN
Minister of National Revenue	HON. JAMES J. McCANN
Minister of Labour	HON. MILTON FOWLER GREGG
Secretary of State for External Affairs	HON. LESTER BOWLES PEARSON
Minister of Justice and Attorney General	HON. STUART SINCLAIR GARSON
Minister of Public Works	HON. ROBERT HENRY WINTERS
Minister of Veterans Affairs and Postmaster General	HON. HUGUES LAPOINTE
Minister of Finance and Receiver General	HON. WALTER EDWARD HARRIS
Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys	HON. GEORGE PRUDHAM
Minister of Fisheries	HON. JAMES SINCLAIR
Minister of National Defence	HON. RALPH OSBORNE CAMPNEY
Solicitor General and Leader of the Government in the Senate	HON. WILLIAM ROSS MACDONALD
Minister of Citizenship and Immigration	HON. JOHN WHITNEY PICKERSGILL
Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources	HON. JEAN LESAGE
Minister of Transport	HON. GEORGE CARLYLE MARLER
Secretary of State	HON. ROCH PINARD

PARLIAMENTARY ASSISTANTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker HON. L. RENÉ BEAUDOIN, Q.C., M.P.
Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees
of the Whole WILLIAM ALFRED ROBINSON, Q.C., M.P.
Deputy Chairman of Committees
of the Whole EDWARD T. APPLEWHAITE, M.P.

Clerk of the House LÉON-J. RAYMOND, B.A., O.B.E.
Clerk Assistant THOMAS R. MONTGOMERY
Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel MAURICE P. OLLIVIER, Q.C., LL.D.
Second Clerk Assistant J. GORDON DUBROY

Sergeant-at-Arms Lieut.-Col. W. J. FRANKLIN, M.C., V.D.
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms PHILEAS JEANVENNE

Debates Reporting Branch—

English Section:

Editor THOMAS S. HUBBARD
Assistant Editor W. WARREN BUSKARD
Parliamentary Reporters: E. L. Featherston, D. R. Butt, W. J. Clinton, N. L. Price,
J. G. Robertson, Roger White.
Assistant to the Editors Miss M. E. BLACK

French Section:

Editor PAUL FRENETTE
Assistant Editor ANDRÉ NAUBERT
Parliamentary Reporters L. R. GUERTIN, R. LANGLOIS
Indexing Miss Y. LAVERTU

Index and Reference Branch SAMUEL C. SAGER

ALPHABETICAL LIST
OF THE
MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fourth Session (Special)—Twenty-second Parliament

HON. L. RENÉ BEAUDOIN, Speaker

AITKEN, MISS MARGARET—York-Humber.	BOURGET, MAURICE—Lévis.
ANDERSON, RAYMOND ELMER—Norfolk.	BOURQUE, ROMUALD—Outremont-St. Jean.
APPLEWHAITE, EDWARD T.—Skeena.	BRETON, MAURICE—Joliette-L'Assomption-Montcalm.
ARGUE, HAZEN ROBERT—Assiniboia.	BRISSON, LOMER—Saguenay.
ARSENAULT, BONA—Bonaventure.	BROOKS, ALFRED JOHNSON—Royal.
ASHBOURNE, THOMAS GORDON WILLIAM—Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador.	BROWN, DONALD FERGUSON—Essex West.
BALCER, LÉON—Trois-Rivières.	BROWN, JAMES E.—Brantford.
BALCOM, SAMUEL R.—Halifax.	BRUNEAU, RAYMOND—Glengarry-Prescott.
BARNETT, THOMAS SPEAKMAN—Comox-Alberni.	BRYCE, WILLIAM—Selkirk.
BATTEN, HERMAN M.—Humber-St. George's.	BRYSON, HUGH ALEXANDER—Humboldt-Melfort.
BEAUDOIN, HON. L. RENÉ—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.	BUCHANAN, WILLIAM MURDOCH—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
BEAUDRY, ROLAND—St. James.	BYRNE, JAMES A.—Kootenay East.
BELL, THOMAS MILLER—Saint John-Albert.	CAMERON, ALAN JOHN PATRICK—High Park.
BENIDICKSON, WILLIAM MOORE—Kenora-Rainy River.	CAMERON, COLIN—Nanaimo.
BENNETT, COLIN EMERSON—Grey North.	CAMPBELL, ALEXANDER MAX.—The Battlefords.
BERTRAND, LIONEL—Terrebonne.	CAMPNEY, HON. RALPH OSBORNE—Vancouver Centre.
BLACKMORE, JOHN HORNE—Lethbridge.	CANNON, CHARLES ARTHUR DUMOULIN—Îles de la Madeleine.
BLAIR, WILLIAM GOURLAY—Lanark.	CARDIFF, LEWIS ELSTON—Huron.
BLANCHETTE, JOSEPH ADÉODAT—Compton-Frontenac.	CARDIN, L. J. LUCIEN—Richelieu-Verchères.
BOISVERT, MAURICE—Nicolet-Yamaska.	CARON, ALEXIS—Hull.
BOIVIN, MARCEL—Shefford.	CARRICK, DONALD D.—Trinity.
BONNIER, JOSEPH ARSÈNE—St. Henry.	CARTER, CHESLEY WILLIAM—Burin-Burgeo.
BOUCHER, JEAN—Châteauguay-Huntingdon-Laprairie.	CASSELMAN, ARZA CLAIR—Grenville-Dundas.
	CASTLEDEN, GEORGE HUGH—Yorkton.

CAUCHON, ROBERT—Beauharnois-Salaberry.	FULTON, EDMUND DAVIE—Kamloops.
CAVERS, HARRY PETER—Lincoln.	GAGNON, PAUL EDMOND—Chicoutimi.
CHARLTON, JOHN ALPHEUS—Brant-Haldimand.	GARDINER, RIGHT HON. JAMES G.—Melville.
CHURCHILL, GORDON—Winnipeg South Centre.	GARLAND, JOHN RICHARD—Nipissing.
CLARK, STUART MURRAY—Essex South.	GARSON, HON. STUART S.—Marquette.
CLOUTIER, ARMAND—Drummond-Arthabaska.	GAUTHIER, ANDRÉ—Lac St. Jean.
COLDWELL, M. J.—Rosetown-Biggar.	GAUTHIER, J. LÉODA—Nickel Belt.
CRESTOHL, LEON DAVID—Cartier.	GAUTHIER, PIERRE—Portneuf.
DECHÊNE, JOSEPH MIVILLE—Athabaska.	GILLIS, CLARENCE—Cape Breton South.
DECORE, JOHN—Vegreville.	GINGRAS, ERNEST O.—Richmond-Wolfe.
DEMERS, LÉOPOLD—Laval.	GINGUES, MAURICE—Sherbrooke.
DENIS, AZELLUS—St. Denis.	GIRARD, FERNAND—Lapointe.
DESCHATELETS, J. P.—Maisonneuve-Rosemont.	GOODE, THOMAS H.—Burnaby-Richmond.
DESLIÈRES, JOSEPH LÉON—Brome-Missisquoi.	GOUR, JOSEPH OMER—Russell.
DICKEY, JOHN H.—Halifax.	GOURD, DAVID—Chapleau.
DIEFENBAKER, JOHN GEORGE—Prince Albert.	GREEN, HOWARD CHARLES—Vancouver Quadra.
DINSDALE, WALTER GILBERT—Brandon-Souris.	GREGG, HON. MILTON F.—York-Sunbury.
¹ DREW, HON. GEORGE A.—Carleton.	HABEL, JOSEPH A.—Cochrane.
DUFRESNE, J. WILFRID—Quebec West.	HAHN, FREDERICK GEORGE J.—New Westminster.
DUMAS, ARMAND—Villeneuve.	HAMILTON, JOHN BORDEN—York West.
DUPUIS, HECTOR—St. Mary.	HAMILTON, WILLIAM McLEAN—Notre-Dame-de-Grâce.
ELLIS, ALFRED CLAUDE—Regina City.	HANNA, RICHARD FRANCIS LIONEL—Edmonton-Strathcona.
ENFIELD, FRANK A.—York-Scarborough.	HANSELL, ERNEST GEORGE—Macleod.
EUDES, RAYMOND—Hochelaga.	HARDIE, MERVYN ARTHUR—Mackenzie River.
EYRE, KARL ARLISS—Timmins.	HARKNESS, DOUGLAS SCOTT—Calgary North.
FAIRCLOUGH, MRS. ELLEN L.—Hamilton West.	HARRIS, HON. WALTER EDWARD—Grey-Bruce.
FAIREY, FRANCIS THROWER—Victoria (B.C.).	HARRISON, JOHN HORNBY—Meadow Lake.
FERGUSON, JULIAN HARCOURT—Simcoe North.	HEALY, THOMAS PATRICK—St. Ann.
FLEMING, DONALD METHUEN—Eglington.	HEES, GEORGE HARRIS—Broadview.
FOLLWELL, FRANK S.—Hastings South.	HELLYER, PAUL THEODORE—Davenport.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH—St. Hyacinthe-Bagot.	HENDERSON, WILLIAM JAMES—Kingston.
FORGIE, JAMES MOFFAT—Renfrew North.	HENRY, CHARLES—Rosedale.
FRASER, ALLAN MACPHERSON—St. John's East.	HERRIDGE, HERBERT WILFRED—Kootenay West.
FRASER, GORDON KNAPMAN—Peterborough.	HODGSON, CLAYTON WESLEY—Victoria (Ont.)

¹Resigned, Jan. 8, 1957.

- HOLLINGWORTH, ALLAN H.—York Centre.
- HOLOWACH, AMBROSE—Edmonton East.
- HOSKING, HENRY ALFRED—Wellington South.
- HOUCK, WILLIAM LIMBURG—Niagara Falls.
- HOWE, RIGHT HON. C. D.—Port Arthur.
- HOWE, WILLIAM MARVIN—Wellington-Huron.
- HUFFMAN, EDWARD BLAKE—Kent (Ont.).
- HUNTER, JOHN WILLIAM GORDON—Parkdale.
- JAMES, JOHN MASON—Durham.
- JOHNSON, WILLIS MERWYN—Kindersley.
- JOHNSTON, CHARLES EDWARD—Bow River.
- JONES, OWEN L.—Okanagan Boundary.
- JUTRAS, RENÉ NORBERT—Provencher.
- KICKHAM, THOMAS JOSEPH—Kings.
- KIRK, JAMES RALPH—Antigonish-Guysborough.
- KIRK, THOMAS ANDREW MURRAY—Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare.
- KNIGHT, ROBERT ROSS—Saskatoon.
- KNOWLES, STANLEY HOWARD—Winnipeg North Centre.
- LACROIX, WILFRID—Québec-Montmorency.
- LAFLAMME, OVIDE—Bellechasse.
- LAFONTAINE, JOSEPH—Mégantic.
- LANGLOIS, J. G. LÉOPOLD—Gaspé.
- LANGLOIS, JOSEPH—Berthier-Maskinongé-Delanaudière.
- LAPOINTE, HON. HUGUES—Lotbinière.
- LAVIGNE, ALBERT—Stormont.
- LEBOE, BERT RAYMOND—Cariboo.
- LEDUC, EDGAR—Jacques Cartier-Lasalle.
- LEDUC, RODOLPHE—Gatineau.
- LEDUC, YVES—Verdun.
- LEFRANÇOIS, J. EUGÈNE—Laurier.
- LÉGARÉ, GÉRARD—Rimouski.
- LENNARD, FRANK EXTON—Wentworth.
- LESAGE, HON. JEAN—Montmagny-L'Islet.
- LOW, SOLON EARL—Peace River.
- LUSBY, AZEL RANDOLPH—Cumberland.
- MACDONNELL, JAMES MACKERRAS—Greenwood.
- MACEACHEN, ALLAN JOSEPH—Inverness-Richmond.
- MACINNIS, ANGUS—Vancouver-Kingsway.
- MACKENZIE, HUGH ALEXANDER—Lambton-Kent.
- MACLEAN, J. ANGUS—Queens.
- MACNAUGHT, JOHN WATSON—Prince.
- MACNAUGHTON, ALAN AYLESWORTH—Mount-Royal.
- MCBAIN, JAMES ALEXANDER—Elgin.
- MCCANN, HON. JAMES JOSEPH—Renfrew South.
- MCCUBBIN, ROBERT—Middlesex West.
- MCCULLOCH, HENRY BYRON—Pictou.
- MCCULLOUGH, EDWARD GEORGE—Moose Mountain.
- MCDONALD, WILFRED KENNEDY—Parry Sound-Muskoka.
- MCGREGOR, ROBERT HENRY—York East.
- MCILRAITH, GEORGE JAMES—Ottawa West.
- MCIVOR, DANIEL—Fort William.
- MCLEOD, GEORGE WILLIAM—Okanagan-Revelstoke.
- McMILLAN, WILLIAM H.—Welland.
- McWILLIAM, GEORGE ROY—Northumberland-Miramichi.
- MALTAIS, AUGUSTE—Charlevoix.
- MANG, HENRY PHILIP—Qu'Appelle.
- MARLER, HON. GEORGE C.—St. Antoine-Westmount.
- MARTIN, HON. PAUL—Essex East.
- MASSÉ, ARTHUR—Kamouraska.
- MATHESON, NEIL ALEXANDER—Queens.
- MÉNARD, J. ARMAND—St. Jean-Iberville-Napierville.

-
- MEUNIER, J. ADRIEN—Papineau.
MICHAUD, HERVÉ J.—Kent (N.B.).
MICHENER, ROLAND—St. Paul's.
MITCHELL, DAVID RODGER—Sudbury.
MITCHELL, ROBERT WELD—London.
MONETTE, MARCEL—Mercier.
MONTEITH, JAY WALDO—Perth.
MONTGOMERY, GAGE WORKMAN—Victoria-Carleton.
MURPHY, HENRY J.—Westmorland.
MURPHY, JOSEPH WARNER—Lambton West.
- NESBITT, WALLACE BICKFORD—Oxford.
NICHOLSON, ALEXANDER M.—Mackenzie.
NICKLE, CARL OLOF—Calgary South.
NIXON, GEORGE EWART—Algoma West.
NOWLAN, GEORGE CLYDE—Digby-Annapolis-Kings.
- PALLET, JOHN CAMERON—Peel.
PATTERSON, ALEXANDER BELL—Fraser Valley.
PEARKES, GEORGE RANDOLPH—Esquimalt-Saanich.
PEARSON, HON. L. B.—Algoma East.
PERRON, ROBERT—Dorchester.
PHILPOTT, ELMORE—Vancouver South.
PICKERSGILL, HON. JOHN W.—Bonavista-Twillingate.
PINARD, HON. ROCH—Chambly-Rouville.
POMMER, WILLIAM ALBERT—Lisgar.
POULIN, RAOUL—Beauce.
POWER, FRANK G.—Quebec South.
POWER, JAMES AUGUSTINE—St. John's West.
PROUDFOOT, JOHN HUGH—Pontiac-Témiscamingue.
PRUDHAM, HON. GEORGE—Edmonton West.
PURDY, GORDON TIMLIN—Colchester-Hants.
- QUELCH, VICTOR—Acadia.
- RATELLE, J. GEORGE—Lafontaine.
REA, CHARLES E.—Spadina.
REGIER, ERHART—Burnaby-Coquitlam.
REINKE, RUSSELL EARL—Hamilton South.
RICHARD, JEAN THOMAS—Ottawa East.
RICHARD, JOSEPH ADOLPHE—St. Maurice-Lafèche.
RICHARDSON, CLAUDE S.—St. Lawrence-St. George.
ROBERGE, LOUIS EDOUARD—Stanstead.
ROBERTSON, FREDERICK GREYSTOCK—Northumberland (Ont.).
ROBICHAUD, HEDARD J.—Gloucester.
ROBINSON, ANDREW E.—Bruce.
ROBINSON, WILLIAM ALFRED—Simcoe East.
ROCHFORD, JOSEPH I.—Champlain.
ROULEAU, GUY—Dollard.
ROWE, HON. WILLIAM EARL—Dufferin-Simcoe.
ROY, GUSTAVE—Labelle.
- ST. LAURENT, JEAN PAUL—Témiscouata.
ST. LAURENT, RIGHT HON. LOUIS S.—Quebec East.
SCHNEIDER, NORMAN C.—Waterloo North.
SHAW, FREDERICK DAVIS—Red Deer.
SHIPLEY, MRS. ANN—Timiskaming.
SIMMONS, JAMES AUBREY—Yukon.
SINCLAIR, HON. JAMES—Coast-Capilano.
SMALL, ROBERT HARDY—Danforth.
SMITH, JAMES ALEXANDER—Battle River-Camrose.
SMITH, JOHN EACHERN—York North.
STANTON, HAYDEN—Leeds.
STARR, MICHAEL—Ontario.
STEWART, ALISTAIR McLEOD—Winnipeg North.
STICK, LEONARD T.—Trinity-Conception.
STUART, ANDREW WESLEY—Charlotte.
-

STUDER, IRVIN WILLIAM—Swift Current-
Maple Creek.

THATCHER, WILBERT ROSS—Moose Jaw-Lake
Centre.

THIBAULT, LÉANDRE—Matapédia-Matane.

THOMAS, RAY—Wetaskiwin.

²TRAINOR, OWEN C.—Winnipeg South.

TUCKER, WALTER A.—Rosthern.

TUSTIN, GEORGE JAMES—Prince Edward-
Lennox.

VALOIS, PHILIPPE—Argenteuil-Two Mountains.

VAN HORNE, JOSEPH CHARLES—Restigouche-
Madawaska.

VIAU, FERNAND—St. Boniface.

VILLENEUVE, GEORGES—Roberval.

VINCENT, AUGUSTE—Longueuil.

WEAVER, GEORGE DYER—Churchill.

WEIR, WILLIAM GILBERT—Portage-Neepawa.

WESELAK, ANTON BERNARD—Springfield.

WHITE, ARTHUR W. A.—Waterloo South.

WHITE, GEORGE STANLEY—Hastings-Frontenac.

WHITE, HARRY OLIVER—Middlesex East.

WINCH, HAROLD EDWARD—Vancouver East.

WINTERS, HON. ROBERT H.—Queens-Lunen-
burg.

WYLIE, WILLIAM DUNCAN—Medicine Hat.

YULL, CHARLES—Jasper-Edson.

ZAPLITNY, FRED S.—Dauphin.

²Died, November 28, 1956.

ALPHABETICAL LIST
OF THE
CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Fourth Session (Special)—Twenty-second Parliament

ACADIA—Quelch, Victor.	CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Buchanan, William Murdoch.
ALGOMA EAST—Pearson, Hon. L. B.	CAPE BRETON SOUTH—Gillis, Clarence.
ALGOMA WEST—Nixon, George Ewart.	CARIBOO—Leboe, Bert Raymond.
ANTIGONISH-GUYSBOROUGH—Kirk, James Ralph.	CARLETON— ¹ Drew, Hon. George A.
ARGENTEUIL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Valois, Philippe.	CARTIER—Crestohl, Leon David.
ASSINIBOIA—Argue, Hazen Robert.	CHAMBLY-ROUVILLE—Pinard, Hon. Roch.
ATHABASKA,—Dechêne, Joseph Miville.	CHAMPLAIN—Rochefort, Joseph I.
BATTLE RIVER-CAMROSE—Smith, James Alexander.	CHAPLEAU—Gourd, David.
BEAUCE—Poulin, Raoul.	CHARLEVOIX—Maltais, Auguste.
BEAUHARNOIS-SALABERRY—Cauchon, Robert.	CHARLOTTE—Stuart, Andrew Wesley.
BELLECHASSE—Laflamme, Ovide.	CHÂTEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON-LAPRAIRIE—Boucher, Jean.
BERTHIER-MASKINONGÉ-DELANAUDIÈRE—Langlois, Joseph.	CHICOUTIMI—Gagnon, Paul Edmond.
BONAVENTURE—Arsenault, Bona.	CHURCHILL—Weaver, George Dyer.
BONAVISTA-TWILLINGATE—Pickersgill, Hon. John W.	COAST-CAPILANO—Sinclair, Hon. James.
BOW RIVER—Johnston, Charles Edward.	COCHRANE—Habel, Joseph A.
BRANDON-SOURIS—Dinsdale, Walter Gilbert.	COLCHESTER-HANTS—Purdy, Gordon Timlin.
BRANTFORD—Brown, James E.	COMOX-ALBERNI—Barnett, Thomas Speakman.
BRANT-HALDIMAND—Charlton, John Alpheus.	COMPTON-FRONTENAC—Blanchette, Joseph Adéodat.
BROADVIEW—Hees, George Harris.	CUMBERLAND—Lusby, Azel Randolph.
BROME-MISSISQUOI—Deslières, Joseph Léon.	DANFORTH—Small, Robert Hardy.
BRUCE—Robinson, Andrew E.	DAUPHIN—Zaplitny, Fred S.
BURIN-BURGEO—Carter, Chesley William.	DAVENPORT—Hellyer, Paul Theodore.
BURNABY-COQUITLAM—Regier, Erhart.	DIGBY-ANNAPOLIS-KINGS—Nowlan, George Clyde.
BURNABY-RICHMOND—Goode, Thomas H.	DOLLARD—Rouleau, Guy.
CALGARY NORTH—Harkness, Douglas Scott.	DORCHESTER—Perron, Robert.
CALGARY SOUTH—Nickle, Carl Olof.	DRUMMOND-ARTHABASKA—Cloutier, Armand.

¹Hon. George A. Drew resigned Jan. 8, 1957.

DUFFERIN-SIMCOE—Rowe, Hon. William Earl.	HULL—Caron, Alexis.
DURHAM—James, John Mason.	HUMBER-ST. GEORGE'S—Batten, Herman N.
EDMONTON EAST—Holowach, Ambrose.	HUMBOLDT-MELFORT—Bryson, Hugh Alexander.
EDMONTON-STRATHCONA—Hanna, Richard Francis L.	HURON—Cardiff, Lewis Elston.
EDMONTON WEST—Prudham, Hon. George.	ÎLES DE LA MADELEINE—Cannon, Charles Arthur Dumoulin.
EGLINTON—Fleming, Donald Methuen.	INVERNESS-RICHMOND—MacEachen, Allen Joseph.
ELGIN—McBain, James Alexander.	JACQUES CARTIER-LASALLE—Leduc, Edgar.
ESQUIMALT-SAANICH—Pearkes, George Randolph.	JASPER-EDSON—Yuill, Charles.
ESSEX EAST—Martin, Hon. Paul.	JOLIETTE-L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM—Breton, Maurice.
ESSEX SOUTH—Clark, Stuart Murray.	
ESSEX WEST—Brown, Donald Ferguson.	
FORT WILLIAM—McIvor, Daniel.	KAMLOOPS—Fulton, Edmund Davie.
FRASER VALLEY—Patterson, Alexander Bell.	KAMOURASKA—Massé, Arthur.
	KENORA-RAINY RIVER—Benidickson, William Moore.
GASPÉ—Langlois, J. G. Léopold.	KENT (N.B.)—Michaud, Hervé J.
GATINEAU—Leduc, Rodolphe.	KENT (Ont.)—Huffman, Edward Blake.
GLENGARRY-PRESCOTT—Bruneau, Raymond.	KINDERSLEY—Johnson, Willis Merwyn.
GLOUCESTER—Robichaud, Hedard J.	KINGS—Kickham, Thomas Joseph.
GRAND FALLS-WHITE BAY-LABRADOR—Ashbourne, Thomas Gordon William.	KINGSTON—Henderson, William James.
GREENWOOD—Macdonnell, James MacKerras.	KOOTENAY EAST—Byrne, James A.
GRENVILLE-DUNDAS—Casselman, Arza Clair.	KOOTENAY WEST—Herridge, Herbert Wilfred.
GREY-BRUCE—Harris, Hon. Walter Edward.	
GREY NORTH—Bennett, Colin Emerson.	LABELLE—Roy, Gustave.
	LAC ST. JEAN—Gauthier, André.
HALIFAX—Dickey, John H. Balcom, Samuel Rosborough.	LAFONTAINE—Ratelle, J. George.
HALTON ²	LAMBTON-KENT—MacKenzie, Hugh Alexander.
HAMILTON EAST ³	LAMBTON WEST—Murphy, Joseph Warner.
HAMILTON SOUTH—Reinke, Russell Earl.	LANARK—Blair, William Gourlay.
HAMILTON WEST—Fairclough, Mrs. Ellen L.	LAPOINTE—Girard, Fernand.
HASTINGS-FRONTENAC—White, George Stanley.	LAURIER—Lefrançois, J. Eugène.
HASTINGS SOUTH—Follwell, Frank S.	LAVAL—Demers, Léopold.
HIGH PARK—Cameron, Alan John Patrick.	LEEDS—Stanton, Hayden.
HOCHELAGA—Eudes, Raymond.	LETHBRIDGE—Blackmore, John Horne.

²Miss M. Sybil Bennett died November 12, 1956.

³Mr. Thomas H. Ross died November 20, 1956.

LÉVIS—Bourget, Maurice.	OKANAGAN BOUNDARY—Jones, Owen L.
LINCOLN—Cavers, Harry Peter.	OKANAGAN-REVELSTOKE—McLeod, George William.
LISGAR—Pommer, William Albert.	ONTARIO—Starr, Michael.
LONDON—Mitchell, Robert Weld.	OTTAWA EAST—Richard, Jean Thomas.
LONGUEUIL—Vincent, Auguste.	OTTAWA WEST—McIlraith, George James.
LOTBINIÈRE—Lapointe, Hon. Hugues.	OUTREMONT-ST. JEAN—Bourque, Romuald.
MACKENZIE—Nicholson, Alexander M.	OXFORD—Nesbitt, Wallace Bickford.
MACKENZIE RIVER—Hardie, Mervyn Arthur.	PAPINEAU—Meunier, J. Adrien.
MACLEOD—Hansell, Ernest George.	PARKDALE—Hunter, John William Gordon.
MAISONNEUVE-ROSEMONT—Deschatelets, J. P.	PARRY SOUND-MUSKOKA—McDonald, Wilfred Kennedy.
MARQUETTE—Garson, Hon. Stuart S.	PEACE RIVER—Low, Solon Earl.
MATAPÉDIA-MATANE—Thibault, Léandre.	PEEL—Pallett, John Cameron.
MEADOW LAKE—Harrison, John Hornby.	PERTH—Monteith, Jay Waldo.
MEDICINE HAT—Wylie, William Duncan.	PETERBOROUGH—Fraser, Gordon Knapman.
MÉGANTIC—Lafontaine, Joseph.	PICTOU—McCulloch, Henry Byron.
MELVILLE—Gardiner, Right Hon. James G.	PONTIAC-TÉMISCAMINGUE—Proudfoot, John Hugh.
MERCIER—Monette, Marcel.	PORT ARTHUR—Howe, Right Hon. C. D.
MIDDLESEX EAST—White, Harry Oliver.	PORTAGE-NEEPAWA—Weir, William Gilbert.
MIDDLESEX WEST—McCubbin, Robert.	PORTNEUF—Gauthier, Pierre.
MONTMAGNY-L'ISLET—Lesage, Hon. Jean.	PRINCE—MacNaught, John Watson.
MOOSE JAW-LAKE CENTRE—Thatcher, Wilbert Ross.	PRINCE ALBERT—Diefenbaker, John George.
MOOSE MOUNTAIN—McCullough, Edward G.	PRINCE EDWARD-LENNOX—Tustin, George James.
MOUNT-ROYAL—Macnaughton, Alan Aylesworth.	PROVENCHER—Jutras, René Norbert.
NANAIMO—Cameron, Colin.	QU'APPELLE—Mang, Henry Philip.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Hahn, Frederick G. J.	QUEBEC EAST—St. Laurent, Right Hon. Louis S.
NIAGARA FALLS—Houck, William Limburg.	QUÉBEC-MONTMORENCY—LaCroix, Wilfrid.
NICKEL BELT—Gauthier, J. Léoda.	QUEBEC SOUTH—Power, Frank G.
NICOLET-YAMASKA—Boisvert, Maurice.	QUEBEC WEST—Dufresne, J. Wilfrid.
NIPISSING—Garland, John Richard.	QUEENS—MacLean, J. Angus. Matheson, Neil Alexander.
NORFOLK—Anderson, Raymond Elmer.	QUEENS-LUNENBURG—Winters, Hon. Robert H.
NORTHUMBERLAND (Ont.)—Robertson, Frederick Greystock.	RED REER—Shaw, Frederick Davis.
NORTHUMBERLAND-MIRAMICHI—McWilliam, George Roy.	
NOTRE-DAME-DE-GRÂCE—Hamilton, William McLean.	

REGINA CITY—Ellis, Alfred Claude.	SHELburne-YARMOUTH-CLARE—Kirk, Thomas Andrew Murray.
RENFREW NORTH—Forgie, James Moffat.	SHERBROOKE—Gingues, Maurice.
RENFREW SOUTH—McCann, Hon. James Joseph.	SIMCOE EAST—Robinson, William Alfred.
RESTIGOUCHE-MADAWASKA—Van Horne, Joseph Charles.	SIMCOE NORTH—Ferguson, Julian Harcourt.
RICHELIEU-VERCHÈRES—Cardin, L. J. Lucien.	SKEENA—Applewhaite, Edward T.
RICHMOND-WOLFE—Gingras, Ernest O.	SPADINA—Rea, Charles E.
RIMOUSKI—Légaré, Gérard.	SPRINGFIELD—Weselak, Anton Bernard.
ROBERVAL—Villeneuve, Georges.	STANSTEAD—Roberge, Louis Edouard.
ROSEDALE—Henry, Charles.	STORMONT—Lavigne, Albert.
ROSETOWN-BIGGAR—Coldwell, M. J.	SUDBURY—Mitchell, David Rodger.
ROSTHERN—Tucker, Walter A.	SWIFT CURRENT-MAPLE CREEK—Studer, Irvin William.
ROYAL—Brooks, Alfred Johnson.	
RUSSELL—Gour, Joseph Omer.	TÉMISCOUATA—St. Laurent, Jean-Paul.
	TERREBONNE—Bertrand, Lionel.
SAGUENAY—Brisson, Lomer.	THE BATTLEFORDS—Campbell, Alexander Max.
ST. ANN—Healy, Thomas Patrick.	TIMISKAMING—Shipley, Mrs. Ann.
ST. ANTOINE-WESTMOUNT—Marler, Hon. George C.	TIMMINS—Eyre, Karl Arliss.
ST. BONIFACE—Viau, Fernand.	TRINITY—Carrick, Donald D.
ST. DENIS—Denis, Azellus.	TRINITY-CONCEPTION—Stick, Leonard T.
ST. HENRY—Bonnier, Joseph Arsène.	TROIS-RIVIÈRES—Balcer, Léon.
ST. HYACINTHE-BAGOT—Fontaine, Joseph.	
ST. JAMES—Beaudry, Roland.	VANCOUVER-BURRARD ⁴
ST. JEAN-IBERVILLE-NAPIERVILLE—Ménard, J. Armand.	VANCOUVER CENTRE—Campney, Hon. Ralph Osborne.
SAINT JOHN-ALBERT—Bell, Thomas Miller.	VANCOUVER EAST—Winch, Harold Edward.
ST. JOHN'S EAST—Fraser, Allan MacPherson.	VANCOUVER-KINGSWAY—MacInnis, Angus.
ST. JOHN'S WEST—Power, James Augustine.	VANCOUVER QUADRA—Green, Howard Charles.
ST. LAWRENCE-ST. GEORGE—Richardson, Claude S.	VANCOUVER SOUTH—Philpott, Elmore.
ST. MARY—Dupuis, Hector.	VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Beaudoin, Hon. L. René.
ST. MAURICE-LAFLÈCHE—Richard, Joseph Adolphe.	VEGREVILLE—Decore, John.
ST. PAUL'S—Michener, Roland.	VERDUN—Leduc, Yves.
SASKATOON—Knight, Robert Ross.	VICTORIA (B.C.)—Fairey, Francis Thrower.
SELKIRK—Bryce, William.	VICTORIA (Ont.)—Hodgson, Clayton Wesley.
SHEFFORD—Boivin, Marcel.	VICTORIA-CARLETON—Montgomery, Gage Workman.
	VILLENEUVE—Dumas, Armand.

⁴Mr. John Lorne MacDougall died June 6, 1956.

WATERLOO NORTH—Schneider, Norman C.	WINNIPEG SOUTH CENTRE—Churchill, Gordon.
WATERLOO SOUTH—White, Arthur W. A.	YORK CENTRE—Hollingworth, Allan H.
WELLAND—McMillan, William H.	YORK-EAST—McGregor, Robert Henry.
WELLINGTON-HURON—Howe, William Marvin.	YORK-HUMBER—Aitken, Miss Margaret.
WELLINGTON SOUTH—Hosking, Henry Alfred.	YORK NORTH—Smith, John Eachern.
WENTWORTH—Lennard, Frank Exton.	YORK-SCARBOROUGH—Enfield, Frank A.
WESTMORLAND—Murphy, Henry J.	YORK SOUTH ⁵
WETASKIWIN—Thomas, Ray.	YORK-SUNBURY—Gregg, Hon. Milton F.
WINNIPEG NORTH—Stewart, Alistair McLeod.	YORK WEST—Hamilton, John Borden.
WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE—Knowles, Stanley Howard.	YORKTON—Castleden, George Hugh.
WINNIPEG SOUTH— ⁶ Trainor, Owen C.	YUKON—Simmons, James Aubrey.

⁵Died November 28, 1956.

⁶Mr. Joseph William Noseworthy died March 31, 1956.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Speaker: The Honourable L. René Beaudoin

Monday, November 26, 1956

FOURTH (SPECIAL) SESSION—TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The parliament which had been prorogued on the fourteenth day of August, 1956, met this day at Ottawa for the dispatch of business.

The house met at 2.30 o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the secretary to the Governor General, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at 2.30 o'clock on this day for the purpose of formally opening the special session of the dominion parliament.

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And the house being returned to the Commons chamber:

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and the bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that when the house did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both houses of parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

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.

81537—1

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.

TRIBUTES TO DECEASED MEMBERS

THE LATE SYBIL BENNETT—THE LATE THOMAS H. ROSS

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, until quite recently we had reason to have high hopes that the then next session of parliament would open without having to deplore the passing of any hon. member of this house. Then it was with deep sorrow that we learned of the death of two of our esteemed colleagues, of Miss Sybil Bennett on November 12 and of Mr. Tom Ross on November 20.

Unfortunately Miss Bennett was in ill health practically from the beginning of her parliamentary career and only because of her courage, which can be truly called heroic, was she able to continue her public duties. When she returned to the chamber last May we were all hopeful that her health had been restored and that she would be able to take a more active part in our deliberations.

Miss Bennett, as we know, was descended on both sides of her family from United Empire Loyalist stock and she was proud of her ancestry. She was also justly pleased to have been related to a former prime minister of Canada, the late Right Hon. R. B. Bennett.

Miss Bennett was elected in the general election of 1953 for the constituency of Halton and when parliament met later that year we were all delighted to welcome another honourable lady member to our midst, particularly one who had earned such a fine

Tributes to Deceased Members

reputation in our legal profession and as a citizen interested in the welfare of our fellow Canadians.

Tom Ross' death also grieved all his friends, and he had many, inside and outside this chamber. He was first elected to the House of Commons in the general election of 1940 to represent the constituency of Hamilton East and the record shows that since that time he has never been defeated at the polls. Tom Ross' mission in life was to make friends and this came quite easy to him because of his personality and because of his wide experience in public relations.

He was born in Woodstock, Ontario, where a good many new Canadians have settled, and because of his daily contact with them he had from the outset a genuine and sincere interest in their welfare in our country. The importance of their great contribution to the economic and cultural patrimony of Canada was encouraged by him and he never ceased to be their champion.

Although Tom Ross did not participate as often as a number of us in the debates in the house, his long experience in parliament made his services most valuable on numerous committees of the house and he always served both his country and constituents with the utmost devotion and sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I speak for all hon. members of the house in saying that these two hon. members will be remembered with genuine affection and respect and that we wish to extend our sincere sympathy to Mrs. Ross and to Mr. Arnold Bennett, the brother of the late hon. member for Halton.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I join the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) in extending sympathy to the families and friends of the two deceased members. It had been my privilege to know them both for many years.

As the Prime Minister has so well said, Miss Bennett was very active in many activities in this country. Some years ago she was president of the Conservative women's association of Canada and I believe was the first lady to be made a K.C. at the bar. She was a member of the women's bar association and was highly regarded in her profession locally, being I believe the first woman to practise law in a rural district in Ontario.

As the Prime Minister has said, she showed a heroic courage even from the early days when she put herself through university until she attained such great distinction at the bar. During her last few years she suffered ill health but very few knew of this. I understand that those who

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

were closest to her in her immediate family and in her party activities in the riding never heard a word of complaint. Up to the hour she lost consciousness she showed a continuing interest in the affairs of her district. She was active in church work and in club and social activities in her community.

Miss Sybil Bennett will be missed greatly in the county of Halton. She will be missed especially in Georgetown where she practised; she will be missed by her brother and immediate relatives; she will be missed greatly by the party which she belonged to and served so well and so effectively.

I know that all members of this party and, as the Prime Minister has said, all members of the house will join in extending to her brother and her relatives our sincere sympathy and our appreciation of her loyal devotion to duty in this country.

I had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Tom Ross for many years, even before he became a member of the Canadian House of Commons in 1940. He was a most genial member who had many friends on both sides of the house. He was active in almost every activity around Hamilton and in many other places. He never missed an opportunity to speak on behalf of Hamilton, and his interest in sports and other activities marked him as one who was well known by young and old and whose company was enjoyed by a great many.

He will be missed greatly in this house and I know he will be missed greatly in the Hamilton district. I join with the Prime Minister in extending to Mrs. Ross and the members of the family, as well as to his riding and party, the deep sympathies of this party and I am sure of all members of this house.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) has said, I think we all hoped that at this session of parliament we might be spared having to record the passing of any of our members. We join of course with others in the house in the expressions of sympathy to the friends and relatives of Miss Bennett and to the family of Mr. Ross. We join too in the expression of sympathy to the Liberal party in the loss of one of its members and colleagues and to the Conservative party in the loss of a very charming lady in the person of Miss Bennett.

Mr. Ross, as has already been said, was known to all of us in the house as a very friendly member, always willing at any time to help anyone who needed his help. I wish to record our personal appreciation of the

Hon. George A. Drew

manner in which he always greeted those of us who, though often disagreeing with him in the policies that he followed, none the less respected him very highly.

Miss Bennett was a newcomer to the house and she brought charm to it. As the Prime Minister has said, she came here in May suffering serious illness. I noted at the time that she looked ill and I inquired how she was. She said she was very much better. Consequently I was very sorry to learn of her passing. We join, Mr. Speaker, in the expressions of sympathy that have already been made by the Prime Minister and the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe).

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, we in this group would like to associate ourselves with the tributes that have been paid by previous speakers to these two former members of the house, our associates. I did not know Miss Bennett long. She was a newcomer to the house but it is quite evident that she was an eminent lady and one of great distinction who, as has been said, conducted herself here in a most charming manner. She was ill during most of the time that she was in the house and it was an inspiration to me to see how she bore her afflictions without complaint and how calm and patient she was in the face of her adversities. We feel that her passing was a distinct loss to the whole house and naturally our sympathies go out to the members of her family and her friends and to the Conservative party in the loss of such a fine supporter and member.

I was also exceedingly sorry to learn of the passing of my friend, Tom Ross. He was indeed a friendly fellow, one with great and wide interests. I think that Tom must have discovered the secret of diversified living because it was evident to me over the years I had known him that he believed that the whole secret of living was in being interested in one thing profoundly and in a thousand things well. Mr. Ross took a great interest in new members of the house and invited them one by one to visit his constituency. He had a double purpose. As I recall it, one was to teach members of the house the great things he believed and felt about his constituency and also at the same time to get acquainted with them and make them acquainted with his own people.

I enjoyed the privilege of a visit to his constituency. I enjoyed not only the things I saw but the very wonderful hospitality extended to me by both Mr. and Mrs. Ross. I counted them amongst my great friends and, along with others, I wish to record my sorrow at his passing. I extend to Mrs. Ross our very warm sympathy and to the Liberal

party our sympathy in the loss of a very devoted follower and a good member of parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

EXPRESSIONS OF REGRET AT ABSENCE OF FORMER LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is one other circumstance of this day which saddens us all, and that is the absence from his usual place in the house of the former leader of the official opposition. We were all very sorry to learn some several weeks ago that the state of the hon. gentleman's health was such that he proposed asking his followers to relieve him of the heavy responsibilities of leadership of that party. I make no comments upon that because the matter has not yet been considered by the members of that party, and I understand that it is to be considered at a relatively early date.

But I do want to put it on the records of the house that we were all shocked when we heard that there was going to be—not a cessation, we hoped, but an interruption in the service to the Canadian nation of Mr. George Drew. I hope it is only a temporary interruption and that circumstances will be such that he will have many more years when he can contribute, as he has contributed in the past, to the advancement of public affairs in this country. I am sure that I express the feelings of all my colleagues on this side of the house when I say to our hon. friends of the official opposition that we do sympathize with them in the circumstance that made it necessary for Mr. Drew to consider the course which he has proposed to submit to his followers.

It is unfortunate that in these trying days Mr. Drew is not the only one who has spent his energies to the very limit in the service of his fellow citizens. I am sure we were all saddened to hear that Sir Anthony Eden had also been constrained to take quite a long rest at a time when we all know how anxious he would have been to continue to share in the responsibility for the decisions that the world situation requires to be made at this time.

We rejoice that Mr. Drew is making such a splendid recovery. It was my privilege to see him for a few minutes the other day and to say to him that I sincerely hoped that he felt as well as he looked. That is my hope and the hope of all my colleagues for the future of the hon. gentleman, and we will certainly rejoice with all his friends in the other parties in this country when circumstances make it possible for him, without departing

Hon. George A. Drew

too severely from the recommendations of his medical advisers, to resume his activities in public life in Canada.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggarr): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) said that he was speaking on behalf of all those around him, his colleagues. I can assure him that when he expressed sympathy to the official opposition on the absence from the house for the time being at least of the leader of the opposition he was speaking for all of us in this chamber irrespective of where we sit.

Mr. Drew's ill health is of course a personal tragedy involving as it does a man occupying his position and rendering the service that he rendered. While I have often disagreed with him, none the less I regarded him as a brilliant oppositionist, one who was able to go very often to the heart of a problem and to discuss it from the point of view of those who surrounded him. I know this must be a very serious blow to them.

May I also say that I am not unmindful of the part that Mrs. Drew has played in the public affairs of this country and the blow it must have been to her at this particular time when she has been a charming hostess and a personality who did much to enhance the position of the leader of the opposition throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, we regret the circumstance. I too join with the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) in hoping that Mr. Drew will be restored to complete health and strength and that he will be able to continue his services in some form or other to the people of Canada for many years to come.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the acting leader of the Conservative party will, before he speaks, allow me to say that with what the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) has said concerning the leader of the opposition and also with what the leader of the C.C.F. party has said we heartily agree. We should like to have it known that we feel extremely sorry that it has been necessary for Mr. Drew to consider stepping down from his responsible position, one that has taken a tremendous toll of his health and strength. As has rightly been said, we are also mindful of the position that Mrs. Drew has occupied and of the contribution she has made to the work that Mr. Drew has done.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, as has been said by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) and by the hon. member who has just resumed his seat, little need be added, as the Prime Minis-

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

ter has spoken for all in the house. On behalf of the opposition I want to say that I appreciate the words of the Prime Minister and those of the members of the other parties who have spoken here today. Fortunately it seems to be one of the happy traditions of public life that there is an underlying sympathy with each other's problems. Mr. Drew and Mrs. Drew have given a great deal to the public life of Canada. No man could have been more devoted to duty. Since his early teens he has served this country in almost every capacity one could think of, including service overseas, municipal service, provincial premier and leader of the opposition in this house for some years. Despite the great apparent strength with which he was endowed by nature, as the years went by he seemed to put more into the service rather than what often appears to be less, as might be expected as we get into the twilight of our life.

Hon. George Drew had great energy and he devoted a great deal of it to the cause of public life in this country. I know that he and his wife will keenly appreciate the expressions of sympathy that have been voiced in this house by the Prime Minister and others, and I shall be glad to pass them on to them. I also join with the Prime Minister in hoping that Mr. Drew may be able to serve in other important capacities. I can also assure you, Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has said, that he is gaining his strength rapidly. He is looking well and, by all appearances, should soon be able to resume an important place in public life in Canada. I am sure his vast experience would fit him to discharge extremely important duties in the future. As the hon. member has said, I hope that he will for many years enjoy the strength to devote himself to public service as has always been his desire.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

MOTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION LATER THIS DAY

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there are not only things that cause us real sadness that are happening but we have or we were to have the pleasure—we will have it at another moment—of the presence of a distinguished commonwealth colleague. When he is here I am sure we will all rejoice in his presence. By leave of the house, and seconded by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Howe), may I now move:

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both houses of parliament be taken into consideration later this day.

Motion agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS

EMERGENCY FORCE—TABLING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, by leave of the house I should like to table copies, in English and in French, of order in council P.C. 1956/1712 of November 20, 1956, relating to Canada's participation in the United Nations emergency force for service in the Middle East.

(For text of order in council see page 105.)

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

COMMITTEES OF SUPPLY AND WAYS AND MEANS—
DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with the speech from the throne and this order in council before the house I would beg leave to move—as it was my privilege to move at the special session we had in 1951—for certain relaxations of some of the rules of the house in order to deal with this matter. The motion, which is substantially similar to that which was accepted by the house in 1951, is as follows—

Mr. Knowles: In 1950.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Yes; in 1950. The motion is as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 55, the house will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and also into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

That Edward T. Applewhaite, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Skeena, be appointed deputy chairman of committees of the whole house.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East) moves, seconded by the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Howe):

That, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 55, this house will, at its next sitting, later this day, resolve itself—

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): No. Would Your Honour be kind enough to strike out "later this day"? I think it would be at the next sitting of the house because that is an indefinite term which means when it can be reached after the sitting of this house.

Mr. Speaker: Then the motion will read as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of standing order 55, this house will, at its next sitting, resolve itself into a committee to consider of a supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and also into a committee to consider of the ways and means for raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Then there is a second paragraph. Does the Prime Minister intend to make the two subject matters the object of one motion or are there supposed to be two different motions?

Business of the House

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If Your Honour felt it was better to submit the paragraphs separately, I would have no objection to that course being followed. All that is desired is to have the committee of supply and the committee of ways and means set up so that a message from His Excellency with respect to the supply to be asked for may be referred to that committee to be dealt with by the committee when we can reach it in the due course of the proceedings.

Mr. Rowe: Mr. Speaker, I would understand that there should be notice of the motion. However, I do not think there will be much opposition to it. It is understood that it is merely setting up the committees?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Yes.

Mr. Rowe: And it is understood that we will proceed with the speech from the throne tomorrow?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): No, we will proceed with the speech from the throne this afternoon. It is not the intention of the government to try to thwart the desire of any of the hon. members with respect to discussion of the speech from the throne. We had hoped that hon. members might find it more convenient to have the whole discussion on the estimate. But if that procedure is not agreeable, it is not our intention to force anybody's hand or mind in respect of that procedure.

Mr. Fleming: May I ask the Prime Minister if that means that the government will not seek to resolve the house into committee of supply until the house has indicated that it has completed the debate on the address or unanimously agreed to some other course?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): We will see what course the debate takes. I would hope it would not be necessary, on a speech from the throne the length of the one to which we have listened this afternoon, to have a 10-day debate. I would hope that would not be the case. There are things, I think, that are more serious at this time than the discussion of procedure. I think all hon. members will want to reach a point where a decision can be made as to whether or not the house is going to allow the government to carry out the decision implemented in the order in council that I have just tabled. We will see how things proceed. We do not intend to precipitate matters, and it will be our desire to proceed in a way that will meet what we apprehend is the wish of the

Business of the House

country, that parliament do, after proper consideration, pronounce itself upon the conduct of the government in making the order that has just been tabled.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt this motion?

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES, 1956-57

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting further supplementary estimates for the financial year ending March 31, 1957, was presented by Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the house, and referred to the committee of supply.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**HOURS OF SITTING AND SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN STANDING ORDERS**

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Now, Mr. Speaker, I would make the other part of the motion I referred to a moment ago with respect to the rules of the house during this, what I think would be called, emergency or special session. It is as follows:

That the following changes be made in the procedure of the house for the present session:

1. That the house shall sit every day except Sunday, and that standing orders 2 and 6 be suspended in relation thereto.

2. That, until the proceedings on the proposed appropriation bill have been disposed of, the daily hours of sitting shall be 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m., 2.30 p.m. to 6.00 p.m., and 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.; government orders shall have precedence of all other business except the daily routine of business, notices of motions for the production of papers, and questions; and that the provisions of standing orders 2, 6 and 15 be suspended in relation thereto.

3. That the provisions of standing orders 15, 41, 71 and 93 providing for the introduction, printing and consideration of notices of motions and bills by private members be suspended.

4. That the provisions of standing order 42 requiring unanimous consent for a motion in a case of urgent and pressing necessity be suspended.

5. That standing order 65 respecting the appointment of standing committees be suspended.

6. That the provisions of standing orders 75 and 78, restricting bills to a separate reading in each sitting be suspended.

7. That standing orders 81, 85 and 120 respecting the presentation of certain reports and the printing and distribution of a list of statutory documents be suspended.

That is the motion that was made at the special session when we were dealing with the railway strike and I think hon. gentlemen who were here will recall that we were able to deal in a reasonable and responsible fashion with the business that the house had to consider. I may say at this time that it is not the intention of the government, unless

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

of course something that has not been foreseen were to occur, to introduce any other legislation but this appropriation bill.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is rather a large order. It would appear to me that we might have until tomorrow to consider the motion, and take it as a notice of motion today.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If hon. gentlemen feel they would like to read it and make sure it does not go beyond what would appear to them to be reasonable, I would have no objection to the putting of the motion standing over until the opening of tomorrow morning's session.

Mr. Coldwell: We cannot sit tomorrow morning unless this is passed.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): That is so, but possibly paragraphs 1 and 2 might be adopted, and paragraphs 3 and following left for further consideration. Paragraphs 1 and 2 have to do with sitting every day and the hours of sitting; that is all. Perhaps I could restrict my motion to those paragraphs 1 and 2 and have the consent of the house to present another motion with the remaining portion tomorrow morning.

Mr. Lennard: Let it stand until tomorrow.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If we let it stand until tomorrow, we cannot meet tomorrow morning.

Mr. Lennard: All right.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks it is all right, but I am under the impression the Canadian public would expect us to devote more time, while we are here, to considering these important matters.

Mr. Rowe: I do not want to hold up proceedings, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with the Prime Minister. In fact, I would even go farther and say that the Canadian public thought we should have met two weeks ago.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): We will answer that when the point is made.

Mr. Rowe: In any event, I would agree, if other hon. members would agree, that we meet tomorrow morning by unanimous consent at eleven o'clock and leave this motion over until tomorrow. This would serve your purpose to meet tomorrow at eleven o'clock.

Mr. Coldwell: I do not know whether a motion is required for that.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I think there should be something on record because

The Address—Mr. Legare

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. GERARD
LEGARE AND SECONDED BY MR. A. B.
WESELAK

I do not think we can just meet outside the time provided by the orders and competently deal with parliamentary business.

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): I think the procedure that was suggested of moving a part of the motion relating to tomorrow morning would be appropriate, and I would be prepared to accept the entire motion because it is in line with the 1950 precedent. If there is any division, could we not have the motion setting the time of meeting tomorrow and then take the other part of the motion later tomorrow?

Mr. Rowe: That is very good.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Then I shall redraft the other paragraphs, which will be as I have read them into the record, but I will redraft them as a motion to be presented tomorrow morning.

Mr. Speaker: May I be allowed to point out to the house that the Clerk has indicated to me that if paragraph No. 3 of the original motion is not agreed upon, the 15 notices of motion that have been received will have to be printed tomorrow and the same situation would apply to private members' bills. Paragraph No. 3 of the motion reads as follows:

That the provisions of standing orders 15, 41, 71 and 93 providing for the introduction, printing and consideration of notices of motions and bills by private members be suspended.

I merely want to pass on this information to the house in case it wishes to deal with it.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If that can be added to this motion, paragraphs 4, 5, 6 and 7 will be dealt with tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: By leave, Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East) moves, seconded by Mr. Harris, that the following changes be made in the procedure of the house for the present session:

1. That the house shall sit every day except Sunday, and that standing orders 2 and 6 be suspended in relation thereto.

2. That, until the proceedings on the proposed appropriation bill have been disposed of, the daily hours of sitting shall be 11.00 a.m. to 1.00 p.m., 2.30 p.m. to 6.00 p.m., and 8.00 p.m. to 10.00 p.m.; government orders shall have precedence of all other business except the daily routine of business, notices of motions for the production of papers, and questions; and that the provisions of standing orders 2, 6 and 15 be suspended in relation thereto.

3. That the provisions of standing orders 15, 41, 71 and 93 providing for the introduction, printing and consideration of notices of motions and bills by private members be suspended.

Motion agreed to.

The house proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

(Translation):

Mr. Gerard Legare (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I felt greatly honoured in being invited by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) to move the address in reply to the speech from the throne. The invitation came to me in New York at the very time when the General Assembly was considering the situation in the Middle East. In my own name and in the name of all my constituents, I want to express my very sincere appreciation to him.

The session which is starting today is and will remain a historical one. It is the result of serious unforeseen and regrettable events that took place during the last few weeks and which, I am sorry to say, still darken the international horizon.

Those events are of a different nature and cannot be compared; on the one hand, there is military action by three states which, because they foresaw trouble and a further deterioration of an already upsetting situation, decided upon an emergency operation; on the other hand, we have an almighty state bent upon the wholesale butchery of a defenseless people in order to maintain the control it has been exerting too long now, with total disregard for the most elementary rules of law and justice.

Could Canada, which, though an autonomous country, is interdependent with all nations seeking peace, the establishment of a reign of justice and the respect of individual rights, dissociate itself from those events?

Could the Canadian government remain unconcerned by the suffering and the tortures of a whole nation which, wearied of oppression and persecution, was seeking freedom?

I say no, and that for two reasons.

When the invasion of Egypt occurred, followed by the armed intervention of the French and British forces, Russia offered to send thousands of volunteers to support president Nasser.

The whole world shuddered at the thought that we might be on the threshold of another vast and terrible world conflict.

Urgently called in special session, the United Nations Organizations seemed falter-

The Address—Mr. Legare

ing in its efforts to ensure peace. And at that moment of extreme anguish—and the C.B.C. enabled us to witness its most pathetic moments—our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) put forth a motion advocating the setting up and the sending of an international police force to bring about and supervise the cessation of hostilities.

Without depriving the hon. minister of the great share of credit to which he is entitled—and I add that he enjoys everywhere a reputation which all diplomats envy him and which honours us—I must say that the proposal for an international police force, of a peace mission to which Canada could participate, had been studied and approved previously by the right hon. Prime Minister and the cabinet and that it was submitted to the United Nations with their assent.

That proposal, one of capital importance at that crucial moment, the only practical one submitted to the confused assembly, received the approval of the vast majority of members of the United Nations. It led to the cease-fire and we are now witnessing the gradual withdrawal of the occupation forces.

All powers, great and small, the world press and even some hon. members to my left who, through force of habit, almost always hold opinions different from ours, have accepted with much enthusiasm the idea of a United Nations police force.

I could quote many opinions of people who warmly welcomed this proposal but I will be satisfied with quoting what the president of Morocco said about this:

The creation of that police force will remain one of humanity's greatest achievements.

I feel I should point out that this police force, to which we have the privilege of contributing, has been put under the United Nations and will take its orders from the United Nations only. Canada is represented on the advisory committee of seven members which sets its terms of reference and which has laid that condition.

The American delegate to the world organization, Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge, expressed his feelings in these terms:

The whole matter is a collective responsibility of the General Assembly. No single government can dictate terms for its solution.

It has already been made quite clear that this force is not a fighting force and that it is clearly meant to ensure and maintain peace. If ever the United Nations were to subscribe to the idea of an international army—an idea which has been long advocated—then, and then only, should we pause to consider its advantages or its drawbacks.

[Mr. Legare.]

May I repeat what was said last week by the commander of this peaceful United Nations mission, that great Canadian, General Burns:

Egypt has accepted the presence of United Nations forces on its territory and must therefore accept the Canadians that are part of it.

He was answering a rumour according to which Colonel Nasser had objected to Canada's part in this police action.

Our participation in this action stems primarily from our responsibilities as a member of the United Nations, and then, principally because of the moral responsibility incumbent upon all nations to work towards the maintenance of peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, quite different but highly humanitarian considerations call for our participation in relieving the Hungarian people. More than 60,000 refugees have fled the Soviet hordes, thousands of wounded moan in the ruins of Budapest, while an unknown number of young men have been deported to Siberia in railway cars sealed against any attempt to escape.

The United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for refugees, Mr. James Read, who came back from Austria last week, stated last Friday before a United Nations committee:

I have seen Hungarian refugees, men, women and children, poorly clad, shivering from the cold, their faces emaciated from privations and sleepless nights, who could still smile because they had just recovered freedom.

For the past several days, the United Nations secretariat has been receiving offers of assistance for this sorely tried people which has given evidence of unparalleled heroism. Millions of dollars will be required. Moreover, several countries have agreed to accept refugees. Canada's spontaneous contribution greatly honours us and I congratulate the government which is now asking Canadian parliament to ratify it.

I also wish to congratulate the government and more particularly the Department of External Affairs for their valuable co-operation in all the activities of the United Nations Organization and its specialized agencies. Our country undoubtedly exerts a deep influence upon that organization. May I add this: When the representative of a country goes to the rostrum at the General Assembly of the United Nations, he is not customarily applauded. Last Friday, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada ascended the rostrum to reply to the abusive language of the representative of the Soviet union, the public gallery burst into applause.

We therefore find that the popularity enjoyed by the present government in Canada extends into the international field. We find its cause in the government's constant endeav-

our to promote universal peace and the improvement of social and economic conditions everywhere and for all.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Weselak), I have the honour to propose:

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

To His Excellency the Right Honourable Vincent Massey, C.H., Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of Canada.

May it please Your Excellency:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the House of Commons 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.

(Text):

Mr. A. B. Weselak (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, when the message of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) inquiring whether I would second the address in reply to the speech from the throne was relayed to me at the United Nations in New York, realizing the gravity of the present situation and the serious threat to world peace, I could not help but feel grateful that I could in Canada help initiate this debate and assist in the opening of this special session of the Canadian House of Commons which has been called for the purpose of carrying through and assisting in the work of the United Nations, work designed to avert war in the Middle East where world peace is seriously threatened; a session also called for the purpose of assisting refugees from a region in Europe from which my own ancestors came to Canada and from which many of my constituents and their parents also came to Canada. They came here to find opportunity and freedom which they have found and now value so highly.

I therefore thank the Prime Minister and his cabinet for the honour bestowed upon me, and, through me, on the people of the constituency of Springfield.

To the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Legare) who has had the honour of moving this address I tender my heartiest congratulations upon his splendid presentation.

Having witnessed for the past two weeks the proceedings of the general assembly of the United Nations as a member of the Canadian delegation, I cannot refrain from attempting to impress upon this house the gravity and seriousness of the problems facing the assembly, and their complexity.

I feel satisfied that the United Nations has in the past month stopped a major conflict in the Middle East. This was not easily accomplished. Hon. members will recall that in the emergency sessions of the security council and the general assembly held late in October

The Address—Mr. Weselak

and early this month, England and France opposed resolutions of the security council calling for a cease fire and for prompt withdrawal of all troops, and subsequently in the general assembly, against a large majority of the members, voted against a similar resolution.

Obviously Britain and France felt that they could not leave the Suez area until some other solution was found to protect and assure the passage of ships through the canal, which is so vital to their economy. At this stage it appeared as though the United Nations, facing a supreme test, had failed.

Canada had abstained from voting on the resolution, but in explaining her reason for so doing, the chairman of the Canadian delegation, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, (Mr. Pearson), suggested that a United Nations emergency force be established and that this force be sent to the Middle East to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the instructions received by it from time to time from the United Nations.

This suggestion of the Secretary of State for External Affairs was immediately seized upon by members of the United Nations and he was urged to formulate and propose a resolution implementing his suggestion. This was done and the resolution received general acceptance and support and was supported by both England and France. The support given to this resolution is indicated by the fact that of a membership of 76, 57 voted in favour of the resolution, 19 abstained, and none were opposed.

This resolution was passed on November 4 and a cease fire went into effect on November 6. On November 7 the general assembly voted to set up immediately the international force to be known as the United Nations emergency force. An advisory committee of seven nations in which Canada was included was established to assist the secretary general in his efforts to solve the many problems which faced him in establishing this unique force, the first of its kind in world history. It is a tribute to Canada that Major General Burns has been appointed by the secretary general of the United Nations to assume command of this special force.

The matter of our contribution to the United Nations force as well as its functions and authority are solely matters for determination by the United Nations itself and are not matters for determination by any one country, group of countries or the recipient country. In our support of the United Nations we must accept its decisions in this respect. Our support of the United Nations must be such that we will in the interest of world

The Address—Mr. Weselak

peace subordinate our own desires and willingly make such contributions as may be required of us by the secretary general of the United Nations.

The force being provided is not intended to be a fighting force but is intended to be a police force. It is being sent to the Middle East to create a favourable climate for negotiations which we hope will result in solution of the problems in the area and establish an enduring peace. The duration of the force's stay may well depend upon the progress made in this respect.

The force is now being assembled in Egypt. The British and French have agreed and are in the process of withdrawing their troops. Progress is being made toward clearing the canal, the opening of which to navigation is so important not only to the European countries but also to the Afro-Asian countries which, while the canal remains closed, are suffering great economic loss.

The United Nations, despite its appearance of power, is nevertheless a very fragile creature, still in its infancy. Its weapons have not been force, they have been those of world opinion dependent upon the good faith of its members and their national moral responsibility.

We in Canada who have been staunch supporters of the United Nations should be glad and thankful that in the crises which now exist, and which threaten world peace, the United Nations has been effective and we should with humility take pride in the role which Canada has played and the contribution she has made toward the solution of these difficult problems.

One cannot spend any length of time at the United Nations and not become consciously aware of the fact that there is general acceptance and recognition that Canada has played and is continuing to play a leading role in the solution of the Middle East problem. It is also accepted and recognized that a great deal of the progress made in this connection has been due to the untiring personal efforts of the chairman of the Canadian delegation, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson), who time and time again when serious differences arose between the nations affected acted as adviser and mediator to and between the parties.

Through his efforts these nations were brought together and their differences were overcome by consultation, discussion and compromise. We are deeply grateful for the efforts put forth by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and by the Secretary of State for External Affairs directed toward obtaining a solution to these complex and difficult problems.

[Mr. Weselak.]

I would now like to turn to another matter which has been referred to in the speech from the throne, namely the matter of assistance to Hungarian refugees. Five centuries ago the Hungarian hero, John Hunyadi, won freedom for his people by defeating the Turkish forces. The freedom so won and the hope for its continuance has never died in the hearts of the Hungarian people. Since that time the people of Hungary and her neighbours have repeatedly risen against tyranny, and once again we see them rise in protest against Moscow-dominated communist oppression.

Russia and her satellites would have us believe that this uprising is a fascist resurgence of the old ruling class, a rebellion instigated from outside the country without the support of the common people of Hungary. This, however, is not the case. In the United Nations spokesmen for Austria, Belgium, France and other neighbouring countries who are well aware of what is going on in Hungary denied the Russian allegations, stated that the revolt is from within and is a revolt of the common worker, of the student and of other ordinary people.

The revolt began on October 23; it started as a peaceful demonstration of students and workers, demanding redress of their grievances. It became a revolution when bullets from men in the uniforms of the secret police and of the Soviet army indiscriminately slaughtered unarmed men, women and children. It appeared for a while as though the rebels had succeeded in their fight for freedom and self-determination. A provisional government was set up under Imre Nagy and plans were announced for free democratic elections.

Then what happened? Overwhelming Soviet forces with tanks and planes, with a ruthlessness repugnant to even the most hardened, crushed, killed and smashed the Hungarian patriots and brought forward a small clique of traitors headed by Janos Kadar as its puppet government of the people of Hungary.

The result of the savagery with which the Soviet forces quelled the revolt has been the flight for their lives of over 70,000 people to Austria and to other parts of the free world. Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Austria, who was released from imprisonment by the short Nagy regime has once again had to flee and now finds refuge in the United States embassy in Budapest.

Irrefutable evidence obtained by Canada, the United States and other countries discloses that Hungarians by the thousands are being shipped east to Siberia in sealed box

The Address—Mr. Rowe

cars in trains with Soviet crews. The displacement of a nation and its replanting by Soviet communist indoctrinated nationals once again becomes the order of the day.

Russia and her satellites categorically deny such deportations. Yet in spite of two resolutions of the general assembly passed by overwhelming majorities the present Hungarian government and the Soviet refuse to permit the secretary general of the United Nations or his representatives entry into Hungary to verify the facts. If what Russia says is true, what has she to fear by the entry of a United Nations observer?

Even the Polish and Yugoslav governments have refused to support the Soviet opposition to United Nations observers in Hungary. The failure of Poland to vote for the Russian stand is particularly significant in view of the fact that this is the first time in the history of the United Nations that Poland has failed to support Russia with her vote.

World opinion was expressed in the United Nations when the assembly by a vote of 55 members out of 79 with abstentions called for a withdrawal of Russian troops from Hungary, for a stop to deportations and for the furnishing of aid and relief to refugees. Russia not only refused to accept the resolution but moved an amendment which would have required all nations to return refugees to Hungary where no doubt swift Soviet justice would have been their lot.

The heroic people of Hungary have paid and are paying a terrible price in their fight for freedom. They have however shown the free world what the Soviet interpretation of the words "peaceful coexistence", so freely used by them in recent months, actually mean in the Soviet mind. Obviously one can only coexist peacefully if one accepts the dictates of the Soviet from Moscow and accepts Soviet dictatorship. Hungary has found this out to her sorrow.

We of the free world who have the priceless freedom for which so many Hungarian patriots have so recently died because of their courage and their struggle for the principle we value so highly owe a debt to these people which we must acknowledge by pressing in every forum of world opinion the battle for Hungarian freedom, by using every political and economic weapon against the Soviet oppressor, and by providing relief and asylum to the tens of thousands of refugees who have escaped.

I am sure the hon. members of this house will agree with me when I say that Austria deserves the warm-hearted commendation of the people of Canada for the charitable manner in which she has taken to her these unfortunate refugees. Austria was indeed

fortunate when at the termination of hostilities following the last world war she was occupied by the four powers. As a result of this occupation democratic free elections were held in Austria, she gained her independence and has since fortunately been able to maintain her neutrality. Austria has become the haven for refugees from almost all parts of central Europe, particularly of peoples fleeing Soviet oppression. She is not a large or over-wealthy country, yet she has not closed her borders to anyone and in the flight from Hungary alone, as I have said before, she has accepted over 70,000 refugees. In addition to these recent refugees she has within her borders roughly 120,000 other refugees. The situation in Austria is becoming very critical. I am pleased to see that in the speech from the throne this matter is also to be considered by this House of Commons.

In conclusion I have the honour and take pleasure in seconding the motion of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Legare).

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to congratulate the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. Legare) and the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Weselak) who have just moved and seconded the adoption of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. They have spoken rather briefly and despite their eloquence have not offered much by way of clarification of the confusion and uncertainty which seems to hang over the Canadian people as to this country's position in the United Nations and our contributions in the Near East.

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

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Address—Mr. Rowe

Mr. Rowe: Hon. Selwyn Lloyd—I am getting great names confused—"forthwith" perhaps did not mean forthwith.

Conditions of course are very critical. Conditions during the last few years have changed a great deal. In the past number of years our security has more or less depended on firm alliances. For many years the most intimate alliance so far as we are concerned has been that of Great Britain and the British Commonwealth. That more or less recognized unwritten unity has, I believe, often prevented trouble. Such alliances have been based on mutual trust. They were limited to clear objectives and no one distrusted the other in carrying out those objectives. It would have been unheard of in years past for one ally to make a public statement against the action taken by another for its own security. It would indeed have been unheard of for a Canadian prime minister or Canadian cabinet minister to repudiate the British in public for action taken which in this instance has now been generally justified and has in reality meant perhaps the saving for the time being of the Middle East.

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

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

Events are happening in Poland and Hungary that give us cause to believe that the Soviet domination of their huge empire is going to be maintained by force. The retreat from Stalinism so much advertised lately has been merely a farce and a fraud. Russia is back again to the regime of Stalin. She is also an important member of the United Nations, ever ready to veto any move that may restrain her devious plans.

[Mr. Rowe.]

This makes us wonder just what the United States and Canada are doing at the United Nations to enable us to maintain our security against aggression. Let it be understood at the beginning that this problem, of course, is universal. The other day when the British Prime Minister was repudiated by our Canadian Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and by our Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) this thought occurred to me. What sort of situation are we going to drift into if the organization we are asking to do something will not actually do it and if some nation such as Britain or France takes a move to protect a vital sector of our economy, an important zone in the area of dispute, and is going to be repudiated by its closest friends? It would mean that we very soon would have no action at all except action by the enemy dictators.

We talk, Mr. Speaker, about the Middle East reverting to a normal situation in the next six months. Why, Mr. Speaker, that is not true at all. The problem is far wider than that. We are forgetting Soviet Russia's plans. What more profitable place is there for Russia to strike than in the Middle East? She would be able to play a double role. She would have the commanding power over a vital resource and she could strengthen her popularity, position, influence and so forth in the Arab world.

We know now that the supplies she sent to Egypt were much greater than Egypt needed, and while they were for Egypt they were really serving Russia's devious plan. We are faced with a form of treachery that has never before confronted us and the hand that directs that treachery votes in the same way that Canada does in the United Nations as one of the so-called peacemakers of the world.

Surely we are not going to make any distinction between troops going from Russia as part of the Russian army and troops going as volunteers. Playing along with such cunning devices simply enables Russia step by step to make a mockery of the United Nations. Who volunteers in Russia or does anything there unless they are told to by the Russian dictators?

What is the present situation as of today? The Prime Minister has said that our troops are going to the Middle East to maintain an armistice between the Israelis and the Arabs and also between the Russians and the French and the British. This raises some interesting questions. If Britain and France refuse to take out their troops, what is the position of our government and our troops? We do not know at the moment how this police force will function. We do not even know where it is going and how long it is going

The Address—Mr. Rowe

to stay. Britain, France and Israel should not be asked to withdraw their troops without any guarantee of the settlement of the Suez question and not until Egypt reaches a permanent political settlement with Israel. They should not be asked to move out of the Near East until an effective police force is established, which was a condition of the cease-fire agreement.

The Nasser government has made considerable headway towards turning a military defeat into a political victory. This has been made possible by the unfair criticism and the unnecessary compromises of the United Nations and, I might say, by our Canadian statesmen and those of the United States.

Mr. Ferguson: Who said he is a statesman?

Mr. Rowe: They have encouraged our enemies and so embarrassed our friends. Now President Nasser insists upon what would in effect be a return to the political status before the invasion. President Nasser regards the United Nations police force solely as an instrument to force the invaders to go home. Surely it was never proposed for any such purpose.

This house and the country are entitled to know if they are only going to police the evacuation of British and French troops and then move out when demanded by President Nasser. If the United Nations yields to this request, our troops should not leave Canada because such a plan would be likely to do more harm than good.

Russia's objective is, and has been all along, to exploit this crisis and to carve out a position for itself in the Middle East. The recent action that the United Nations has taken was not, as in the case of Korea, by a decision of the veto-bound Security Council but on the recommendation of the General Assembly backed by some three-score nations, including the United States. It used the last reserve power that the United Nations has and that makes it vitally important that it must not fail now if it is going to live effectively in the future.

But what are the results by which success or failure may be judged? The immediate mission is to prevent the further outbreak of war, of course, but this is of no use in itself alone. What is the use of Britain and France agreeing to a cease-fire or a withdrawal of troops with no assurance or guarantee of a settlement in the Middle East? What is the use of Israel withdrawing troops if Russia is to be free at any time to put its power behind Egypt and the Arab world, who collectively boast they will wipe

out the state of Israel and eliminate all British and French influence in the whole Suez region and Mediterranean area?

If our Canadian troops are to be used as part of UN police forces, it is our duty to see that they are given a possible function toward a sound objective. We must never ask them merely to clear a course and police a route for Colonel Nasser and his Russian comrades to pursue quietly and cunningly toward the diabolical purpose they have so boldly emphasized.

During the last session of parliament repeated requests were made by the opposition for information on Canada's interest in the Mediterranean crisis. Such requests were made by the hon. member for Prince Albert and others. Such requests produced only evasive answers from the Prime Minister and from the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Despite our membership in the commonwealth, in the United Nations and in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, we were willing to allow a solution to the crisis to be worked out at one of the conferences called in London. When asked particularly whether Canada's official stand followed the United Kingdom and France or the United States, the Secretary of State for External Affairs on August 6, so reported at page 7047 of *Hansard*, said this:

I must also deprecate, in a friendly way, the implication of my hon. friend's question that there is necessarily any difference of policy in this matter between the United States on the one hand and the United Kingdom and France on the other. I hope that at the conference in question the three governments will be able to work closely together and that at this conference, as in all other matters—and this is a question of the most vital importance to Canada—the closest co-operation inside the commonwealth and the closest co-operation between the United Kingdom and the United States will be reflected once again.

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

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

Surely we may say that this was a most disturbing and unsatisfactory attitude on the government's part when a crisis threatening the very peace of the world had burst upon us. Since the government apparently failed to take note of international political realities, perhaps I may briefly summarize the international factors which should have led them to reach a clear decision on where Canada's

The Address—Mr. Rowe

interest lay in the crisis and particularly what action was called for on their part.

As a member of the commonwealth and as the geographical neighbour of the United States, our membership after the first war in the League of Nations and after the second war in the United Nations, of course extended the security system so that the possible area of operations in which we might become involved was greatly extended. As we all know, we took part in United Nations action to preserve the Korean republic. We have for some years furnished observers to the truce teams in Kashmir and in Palestine. While not directly arising out of our membership in the United Nations, Canada has had an important part in manning the truce supervisory commissions in Indo-China.

Since the second world war, when the menace to world peace of nazi Germany was removed, the principal threat to world peace and security has come from the aggressive activities of the Soviet Union and its associated states including communist China. Our decision to take part in UN action in Korea was part of our realization that the security of the free world depended upon successful collective action to curtail world communism. The prompt and decisive action taken at that time by the United Nations force, including troops from Canada, the United Kingdom and other commonwealth countries, was a frank and wise recognition of the menace of communist aggression. While it was started by the United States with the approval of the United Nations as a whole, it was the only semblance of constructive action since the second world war.

Since the accession to power in Egypt of Colonel Nasser and his regime, we have received many disturbing reports of the growth of Soviet influence in Egypt and the Mediterranean area. Last year armaments, including aircraft from the Soviet Union and from Czechoslovakia, were made available to Colonel Nasser, as well as technical experts from Russia to instruct the Egyptians in the use of this equipment. Our government was probably not the only one to turn a blind eye to the great dangers to world security arising from the increase of Soviet influence in the Middle East. However, after the revelations at the beginning of the last session of parliament, we must regretfully conclude that our government's main concern in the Middle East was to unload surplus Canadian war material on the countries there. In the light of the developments during the past few weeks, this is surely a shocking commentary on the lack of thought, foresight or decision

[Mr. Rowe.]

our government gave to the steadily increasing crisis in the Middle East. No wonder this government, while extending their long trips among peoples abroad, are losing the confidence of our people at home.

It is these facts also which make us so anxious regarding the security of Canada against aggression. Our government appears to have been influenced almost exclusively by the administration in Washington, both in its comments and in its actions in the Middle East crisis. Had the policy of the United States been wiser and more vigorous than our own this might not have been so unfortunate. In this event, however, the United States government seems to have committed a series of blunders in the Middle East which finally left the United Kingdom and French governments with no alternative but to bring force to bear in the Middle East, if their interest in that vital area was not to be given up in the face of rising Soviet power there. Surely our government would not deny that the Soviet union has been aiming at control of the whole Middle East through its policy toward Egypt and the Arab countries and through its consistently unfriendly attitude to the state of Israel.

Right Hon. Winston Churchill, with all his experience in international crises, only a few days ago had this to say:

I am a patron of the United Nations association in this country, but I cannot agree that their rebuke to this government was either wise or helpful.

Would they have preferred us to flounder in impotence and see the whole Middle East gradually slip into chaos and Russian domination?

As time passes, I hope that the association will see with clearer eyes the true interests of the United Nations and the whole world.

These remarks might apply with equal force and indeed with some embarrassment to the government which sits to your right, Mr. Speaker.

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

Whatever the division of opinion within the cabinet as a result of the British and French ultimatum to Egypt and Israel on October 30, the idea put forward by the opposition through the hon. member for

The Address—Mr. Rowe

Prince Albert ten months ago in this house was hastily revived at last in the proposal to send an international emergency force to the danger area, even though it was merely scoffed off ten months ago. I submit it might have been better to organize it ten months ago than to wait until after the trouble had occurred.

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

Canada was one of the first countries to offer troops for the UN emergency force and, as we all know, the Queen's Own Rifles were hurriedly prepared for service in the troubled region. As Canadians I believe we were all proud to know that one of our oldest regiments was to have the privilege of forming part of the emergency force. For ten days we were treated to news stories and radio and television reports on the Queen's Own Rifles preparing for action. Meanwhile, the cabinet and members of parliament like myself were ready on very short notice to come to Ottawa for a special session of parliament to deal with our participation in the emergency force. I think, however, that it would have been preferable for the government to have secured the approval of parliament before the Canadian contingent left our shores for the Middle East. Having regard to the very dangerous situation in which the Canadians will find themselves in the Suez canal area, surely the approval of the people, through their parliamentary representatives, ought to have been sought. The government has taken it upon itself to commit some of our Canadian forces to the international emergency force without explaining in detail to Canadians the extent of the obligations to which they are committed.

I believe it is true that as yet most of them are administrative forces. According to all reports the administrative force is about 10 times the number of troops that has been mentioned. However, perhaps the pen might be mightier than the sword at this stage.

Mr. Sinclair: You know more about it than General Burns.

Mr. Rowe: I am not disturbed by the hon. member's interruption, because later I shall listen to just how much he knows about it.

In any event, as we know, the Queen's Own Rifles were very hurriedly prepared. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that there was some mystification over the delay in securing final United Nations approval of our contribution. No statements were issued by the government to explain the delay or to warn that the sending of the Queen's Own Rifles might be dispensed with entirely. The very silence of the government, always so quick and ready to claim all things that are so great as their own invention, was disquieting.

When it was finally announced 10 days ago that Canada was sending an administrative staff to the United Nations force, there was considerable surprise throughout Canada. This surprise turned into anger and dismay when it became clear that the United Nations, through its secretary general, was allowing the Egyptian president Nasser to dictate or at least to exercise a veto over the exact composition of the United Nations emergency force. Surely the realization that Colonel Nasser was specifying what we might or might not contribute to the United Nations must have brought a feeling of humiliation and embarrassment to the members of this government.

Having ventured to lecture the United Kingdom and French governments on their behaviour in the Middle East crisis, we ourselves must feel abundantly ashamed of the weak and vacillating policy—or shall I say lack of policy—which the government has followed during the last month in one of the greatest crises which has faced world diplomacy in this century.

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

I do not wish to criticize the methods which have been followed by the United Nations secretary general, Mr. Hammarskjöld, in his negotiations with the president of Egypt. My concern is with the fact that we have allowed ourselves to drift into our present position. Let not the government believe it can any longer deceive the Canadian people by creating a fancy halo around the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as if he had already saved the world's peace

The Address—Mr. Rowe

and solved the Suez canal crisis. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, no one knows better than he does that the actions of our government and the claims to fame of our foreign minister have yet to create any practical results in this Middle East crisis.

The events in Hungary offer tragic proof that neither the United Nations nor moral opinion, despite the best hopes of all, can stop communist oppression and the brutalization of whole nations. It therefore follows that the most serious consequence of the developments abroad is that the western alliance, which is the only and best hope of the free world and the only real buttress against communist imperialism, is now endangered. The Prime Minister, according to the press, wrote an angry note to the Prime Minister of Britain. Whether this was approved by the cabinet or whether it was the Prime Minister's personal attitude or whether it was a fit of Irish temper, it has contributed very little and probably done a great deal of harm to the unity and harmony and trust that were essential to the maintenance of a vital alliance with a tried and trusted friend.

It is generally agreed that Russian foreign policy in the Middle East has been consistent, and its aspirations for domination in the Arab world are apparent. Egyptian foreign policy, if not consistent, has at least been understandable. They were willing to accept armaments and war machinery from any government. There can be no secret about Egypt's foreign policy so long as President Nasser heads that government. Like Hitler, Nasser has published in book form the aims and aspirations he has for Egypt. These include the elimination by any means of all British and French influence in the Near East and, as well, the elimination of the state of Israel.

In the case of "Mein Kampf" the western world refused to accept the implications and eventually paid the price of its folly. In the case of Nasser it can be said that the British and French have only done what all the wise men, after the fact, said that Britain and the other western democracies should have done when Hitler first began to carry out the policy he so clearly outlined in his own testament. Even the people of the United States—with the exception of those who are at Washington because I sometimes think those at Washington are like those in Ottawa, and do not always express exactly what the people of the country are thinking—are in substantial agreement that their own policy has been inconsistent. It was a representative of the United States government who gave Nasser his silver pistol. It was the United States government that withdrew promises of assistance in building the Aswan dam. It was the

[Mr. Rowe.]

United States government that prejudiced Britain's oil concessions in Iran to its own self interest.

One of the most shocking things about the developments in Europe and the Near East is that the Canadian government was obviously so ill-prepared for these events. Canada's role, according to the government, has been the interpreter and conciliator between Britain and the United States. It was supposed to be the bridge between these two countries. Instead, in this crisis it has at times almost resembled a chasm.

Since the beginning of this crisis the Canadian people have been consistently misinformed and misled. Whatever the virtue of the government's suggestion, which was originally from the opposition, that a United Nations police force be sent to the Near East, the resultant humiliation suffered by Canada is not easily justified. The *Magnificent*, that beautiful carrier, was brought home at such speed that the ship was damaged structurally. She was then dismantled and refitted as a troopship. The press of Canada and the television screens were constantly portraying soldiers marching and countermarching in this great national effort to keep peace in the world. Created as the United Nations police force, it now looks like a Nasser force composed of whatever elements he deems suitable to go where he tells them.

The last session of the House of Commons was dominated in the early stages by a debate as to whether or not the government was wise in dispatching to Egypt a few Harvard aircraft. During that debate it developed that the Secretary of State for External Affairs was not sure that these aircraft could be armed or could be used as instruments of war. And now, in this session of the House of Commons, we are debating the matter of sending Canadian servicemen to Egypt, and the Secretary of State for External Affairs does not know, or has not told us, whether or not these men are going to be armed sufficiently to defend themselves, or whether or not they are needed; nor does he know exactly any of the conditions under which they will function; where they will be stationed, or how long they will be needed. The colour of their uniforms may not be acceptable to President Nasser. He does not like them called the Queen's Own Rifles.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, step by step, Colonel Nasser and his Russian friends have steadily tried to emasculate the value of the proposed United Nations police force. We condemn this government for not demanding that the United Nations accept a police force in fact as well as in theory. The United Nations

The Address—Mr. Rowe

police force must be an effective force. An ineffective force might well only constitute an invitation to disaster to both its personnel and its purpose.

It now seems clear that Britain and France will not move all their troops out of this troubled area until they are sure such a police force is effective. Who, Mr. Speaker, should ask them to; and who should sit idly by representing Canada while the United States tells them to get out no matter whether or not there is a police force in there? These are issues, Mr. Speaker, that concern the lives and well-being of this country; these are matters on which Her Majesty's loyal opposition have chosen to take issue and to find out where we are coming from and where we are going. This government has not told us. Never have we seen such a complete example of smug complacency and almost humiliating silence as last Saturday night when we refused to vote.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is therefore a primary duty of this government, which sponsored a resolution at the United Nations, to demand that the police force sent to Egypt be in truth and in fact a police force that can maintain the peace. Anything less than that would be a repudiation of the basic principles upon which the United Nations was founded.

I have mentioned the dangers which the free world is facing in the Middle East through Soviet aggression there. I know I need not remind this house that Soviet activities in the Middle East are all part of a pattern with the tragic events which have been taking place in Hungary during the past few weeks. Soviet domination of all its satellite countries is maintained only by force. Those at the head of affairs in the Kremlin are following the practices of Stalin's regime to dominate and extend the Soviet empire. I do not think we need to have been in any doubt in regard to the seeming liberalization of the regime in the Soviet Union since Stalin's death. However, if we had vain hopes that the international cold war was coming to an end, we are cruelly reminded that nothing has changed.

We have joined with the great majority of members of the United Nations in condemning Soviet aggression in Hungary, and particularly the removal by Soviet troops of thousands of Hungarians who had dared to fight for the freedom and independence of their country from foreign rule. It may be that the expression of strong United Nations disapproval of Soviet acts in Hungary will produce an ameliorating effect on the men in the Kremlin, but so far the Soviet Union does not seem to have been much impressed by the United Nations condemnation of its actions.

No matter how strongly we have talked against them they have not even listened, and have only laughed at the suggestion.

I notice that our government has not been claiming very great credit for its role in helping Hungary through the United Nations. I do not know how it could. Having regard to the principles governing our security throughout the world in the past, surely we should realize that the interests of Canada in the Middle East and in Hungary are closely tied together. The attempt by the United Kingdom and France to limit Soviet expansion in the Middle East was crippled through what I believe to be the inept diplomacy of the United States in the role it played in the Suez canal crisis. Are we to expect that whenever some responsible nation such as the United Kingdom or France decides to make a move to protect a most vital sector of the western world from Soviet influence or aggression, it will run the risk of being condemned by the United States and probably Canada? Mr. Speaker, who are our friends? Whom do we trust? Whom do we doubt? This would mean that our action in the future will be limited to mere empty, loud protests, if you like, as in the case of the Hungarian tragedy, through the United Nations, leaving only the communist dictators free to act, ignoring entirely our counsel, advice and every covenant of the United Nations to which they so proudly claim the right to belong.

In the case of Hungary, we are being asked to contribute \$100,000 to the United Nations emergency fund for Hungarian refugees.

Mr. Harris: A million.

Mr. Rowe: One hundred million?

Mr. McCann: One million.

Mr. Lennard: It was \$100,000.

Mr. Rowe: I have it as \$1 million but I said \$100,000 by mistake. I certainly should not minimize it because at first it was intended to be \$100,000, and then the government made the magnanimous suggestion to make it \$1 million. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is still a paltry, shamefully low amount. In fact, if I had been the Minister of Finance I would have been afraid to discuss the difference between those two amounts because the Minister of Trade and Commerce has often said, "What's a million, anyway?" I would have hesitated. Are we to take it that this may be conscience money, in view of the amount being changed, paid by Canada because we seem to have failed to take any other real action of positive value in the crisis which has afflicted Hungary during the last few weeks?

The Address—Mr. Rowe

I understand that many countries have undertaken to accept a specific number of Hungarian refugees. In our own case, how have we agreed to accept Hungarian refugees? When one reads the statement made in Winnipeg on November 16 by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration it is clear that Hungarian refugees would have to pass the rather stringent medical requirements of the Canadian immigration regulations and also satisfy the examining inspectors in Austria that they had a "reasonable prospect" of being able to earn a living in this country. I do not think I need to comment further on the extent of this offer. This is offering nothing, Mr. Speaker, but an explanation of existing immigration regulations applicable to Hungarian people as if nothing had happened. I hope that voices will be raised in this house to urge the government to take a substantial bloc of refugees as our contribution toward the relief of the great sufferings of the Hungarian people in their noble struggle to free their ancient country. Anything less than this would be an insult to the people of Hungary and an embarrassment to people all across this dominion, because people from that country have contributed greatly to the development of this young country of Canada.

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

Austria is pleading with the world to assist her to take care of those people. They have sent out calls to the effect that they cannot take care of any more. Austria is a small country. Canada is a large country and can stand to take many more people. Canada has all too few people. Our whole immigration policy has fallen down in this respect. Surely there is a humanitarian way. We must not hesitate to co-operate with these people and take these refugees. Special regulations should be passed immediately independent of the regular Immigration Act. No country has more room and is more capable of accepting many thousands of these unfortunate people who, with their own relatives, fought such a valiant battle for freedom against cruel and terrible odds. We can do much more for their relief; indeed, Mr. Speaker, we could not have done less than we have to date.

During the centuries history has written of great men dying for great principles. Seldom, however, in the annals of such records has the steadfastness, courage and gallantry of

[Mr. Rowe.]

the common man been so heroically demonstrated. May I remind the government, no matter how complacent they may feel, that the spirit of this young country is not so dead as to be satisfied with their complacency and reluctance to rise to the ringing challenge for more adequate assistance to these poor people.

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

I would be ashamed to stand in this house if in the United Nations I had seen the United States voting as they did to drive Britain and France out of the Mediterranean area. Britain and France did agree they would vacate the area when there was an adequate police force, but to turn around now and tell them to get out and leave the area on which their lifeline depends represents a strange attitude. That is not good enough for the senior member of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move on behalf of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Green):

That the following be added to the address:

That this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers

(1) have followed a course of gratuitous condemnation of the action of the United Kingdom and France which was designed to prevent a major war in the Suez area;

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker: Shall I dispense with the reading of the motion that has just been read and have it considered as being proposed from the chair?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the speech we have just listened to we have heard lots of words. Fortunately there has been an amendment following that speech which does point up some specific facts upon which the official opposition wishes to take a stand different from that recommended by the government to this house.

Mr. Fleming: Facts is the right word.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): There had been previously some similar statements made outside the house and some similar statements made in several newspapers that were in strange contrast with the encomiums that were being heaped upon the Secretary of State for External Affairs by every country other than his own.

Before dealing specifically with the points that are suggested in this amendment to the motion for an address in response to the speech from the throne, I will take up one or two of the things that I was able to pinpoint in the avalanche of words that came from the hon. gentleman who is presently leading Her Majesty's official opposition.

One of them was that parliament should have been called earlier. Well, in order to answer that point I think it is sufficient to recall to those who know what is the constitutional requirement and the constitutional practice and what has always been the constitutional requirement and the constitutional practice. Those who were here in 1939 remember what was done at that time. Those who were here in 1950 when the defence act was amended will remember the discussions that took place at that time. Those who were here in 1950 will remember that it was referred to again in 1950 and in order to avoid the suggestion that I made about the speech we have just listened to, I would refer, for instance, to one paragraph of an intervention that was made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) when we were dealing with the Canadian Forces Act on September 8, 1950.

This is at page 494 of *Hansard*, the second column, and it reads as follows:

From what the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) has said tonight, and from what has been said previously by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and on other occasions by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), I feel they are with me in this, so I do not think I have to argue it. I did think it was possible, however, that the house might be so preoccupied with other matters this session as not to get this issue right into the open and have it made perfectly clear. I hope before we leave—it could be now, or later in this debate, or later in the session, but certainly soon—it will be made perfectly clear just how the matter stands as to the responsibility of the government to

The Address—Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent parliament, which is there all the time, but which is particularly clear and important in this matter of putting our forces on active service.

Well, when that suggestion—I will not say that challenge—was made, I immediately rose in my place and said:

I think the matter should be made perfectly clear at once, so there can be no misapprehension or uncomfortable feeling about it anywhere. When this bill is passed and becomes law it is the intention of the government to comply with the letter and spirit of section 33, in so far as its policy has been announced with respect to Korea.

Section 33 is the section that provides that if an order in council is passed, as the section authorizes in express terms, putting our forces on active service parliament, if it is not then in session, will be called within ten days to deal with the matter.

The intention of the government is that if any other service should be required of this special force, which of course is not being created solely because of the Korean incident, if any police action, for instance, that has a warlike character should be required of it elsewhere than Korea, the government would of course have to make its decision, but it would immediately call parliament, make that decision known and leave it to parliament to approve or disapprove of it. I think that is the only way the Canadian people would feel they were getting the protection they expect from their representatives.

And then further on page 495:

If anything else should be required at any future time in order to carry out similar commitments, the government of course would have to take the responsibility of making its decision, but would certainly have to place itself in the hands of parliament within the ten-day period for ratification or disapproval of that decision.

That has always been the constitutional requirement and the constitutional practice, that the government has to take the responsibility of making a decision and then put itself in the hands of parliament so that parliament may determine whether it will provide the funds to implement that decision or whether it will refuse to provide the funds and get another government to carry out the policies that parliament wants to have carried out. That has always been the position and that will always be the position so long as this party has the responsibility for public affairs in this country.

Just as soon as it was possible to make a concrete decision which we could submit to parliament we made that decision, and on the same day we recommended that His Excellency summon parliament. Parliament is here today because of that summons. We are here today in the hands of parliament, having taken that responsibility of making a concrete decision and asking parliament to authorize the use of public funds to implement that decision.

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

It would have been a pretty strange position for us to take to have invited members of parliament to come down here without having taken our responsibility, and having them taunt us with being afraid to take the proper responsibility and of trying to get an indication from them as to what that decision should be. If that is the way hon. gentlemen on the other side, if and when they ever get the responsibility of government, intend to behave I think it will be a rather sorry spectacle for the Canadian people.

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

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

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

An hon. Member: Why should they?

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

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

Mr. Ferguson: Throwing Canada to the slaughterhouse.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Perhaps the hon. gentleman would do better to listen than—I will not attempt to qualify them—to make that kind of remark. I think it would be better for his own reputation if he did.

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

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

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

An hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Green: What about the Queen of Canada?

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

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

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): No one is going to make me admit that it is not the Queen of Canada's Own Rifles that bear that glorious title.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Now, we felt that the sending of a battalion over into the Sinai desert was not just the right thing to do for men who had the training and who were anxious to perform the service for which we were sending them there. We did not think we should dump 900 or 1,000 men into a desert and think they were going to be looked after properly and were going to be kept in fit condition to perform the services for which they were going there. So we decided at once that in readying the Queen's Own Rifles for that expedition there would be added supplementary forces that could ensure for them the establishment that would be necessary for them to carry out their functions properly and, to make assurance doubly sure, we said we would have the *Magnificent* loaded with provisions, that we would have a hospital unit on it and that it would serve as a floating base so our men would be sure that until proper army services were organized on a land base in Egypt there would be the possibility for them to get the right kind of treatment, the treatment necessary in order to enable them to fulfil their mission. It was pretty effectively demonstrated, in spite of what has been said by hon. gentlemen in some parts of the house about a lot of money having been spent on our forces with nothing to show for it, that within a very short time we were able to move everything required to put a battalion in the field, and indeed, we could put several battalions in the field if it were necessary to do so.

Whether that turned out to be the ultimate requirement of the commander of the United Nations force, we felt that something of that kind would be just as effective and as good an exercise as some of these simulated exercises that are constantly taking place to

keep men in readiness to take the field if the occasion should require, because in this case there was something real for which the need for activity was being undertaken.

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

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

Again I say that, even had the commanding officer not been a Canadian we might have said as others might have said, "Here is our contribution. Make the best possible use you can of it." But it so happens that the man who is going to have the responsibility of command, is of course a United Nations officer but is nevertheless a Canadian, a great Canadian who is regarded as such by the majority of our people, and we felt that it was our moral duty, in addition to our general duty to the United Nations, not to let that great Canadian down. We felt that if there were requirements he was not getting from others and which he needed to put himself in a position where he felt he could carry

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

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

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

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

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

The amendment before us reads in part as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the Prime Minister allow a question?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Certainly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He was answering my friend with regard to the matter of whether or not gratuitous advice had been given. Is the Prime Minister in a position to say whether he will reveal the communication that was sent to Sir Anthony Eden in the same way in which the President of the United States, some three hours after having done so, followed a similar course?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I would be very happy to be able to reveal that correspondence. I noticed in the press the statement made by the hon. gentleman recently to the effect that he was going to ask for that correspondence.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I sent a message to Sir Anthony Eden dated November 21, asking him what would be the attitude of the United Kingdom government in the face of such a request, because a somewhat similar request had been made in the House of Commons at Westminster in respect of confidential correspondence with Ceylon and the answer had been that that correspondence could not be published. So I wrote a letter which perhaps I might read into the record together with the answer I received to that communication.

Mr. Fleming: Has the Prime Minister consented to the reading of this second letter?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If the hon. gentleman does not want to hear them I am quite prepared to leave the matter at that.

Mr. Fleming: I should like to hear them both.

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

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I shall read the two. They are as follows:

Message from the

Right Honourable Louis S. St. Laurent
to the

Right Honourable Sir Anthony Eden

A leading member of the official opposition has stated publicly that, when our parliament meets in the near future, he proposes to ask for the tabling of one of the communications I addressed to you recently in reply to one of yours.

It is obvious that this correspondence between us could not be published piecemeal and that, if one of these confidential communications were published, they would all have to be published.

A similar question arose in our parliament some eight years ago about similar communications between Mr. Churchill and Mr. Mackenzie King regarding the international situation some seven years before that.

Mr. Attlee's government at that time took the view that such communications should not be published at any time because, as they said: "Such telegrams are framed on the basis that they will not be published and the whole system of full and frank communication between His Majesty's government would be prejudiced if telegrams of this nature had to be prepared on the basis that this rule might not eventually be observed".

I would be glad to know what would be your attitude now and the attitude of the government of the United Kingdom with respect to these confidential communications which have recently passed between us.

I would like to read this message and your reply to it into our record of debates for future reference whenever similar requests for publication of confidential communications may arise.

That was under date of November 21, 1956.
The answer is as follows:

Message from the

Right Honourable Sir Anthony Eden
to the

Right Honourable Louis S. St. Laurent

Thank you for your message and for consulting me about the possible publication of the confidential communications which have recently passed between us.

The United Kingdom government's view on such publication remains identical with that expressed by their predecessors on the occasion you mention in your letter. It is, we feel, essential, if there is to be that full intimate and frank exchange of minds between commonwealth governments on which alone policy can be based, that we should all of us be able to proceed on the basis that such correspondence shall be and remain confidential and shall not be published. That is the principle to which we in this country have consistently worked, and, as it happens, it was reiterated so lately as November 15, in answer to a parliamentary question in the House of Commons.

I am sure this is the only possible practice.
November 23, 1956.

I am sorry, because statements have been made or at least have been reported to have been made, not only in this country but in the United Kingdom, suggesting that I had sent a blistering reply to Sir Anthony Eden. I am not free to disclose that correspondence.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You are not free to describe it, either, if it is confidential.

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

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I beg the hon. member's pardon?

Mr. Diefenbaker: You would not be free to describe it either, or give an *ex parte* explanation and so on.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): No, but I am going to say that any such assertion is without the slightest shred of foundation in fact. I am going to say that that is official correspondence which is going to remain of record, and if and when hon. gentlemen opposite are in the position which we now occupy and they choose to look it up to see if I was telling the truth when I said there was no shred of foundation for such assertions about it, they will have corroboration of the assertion I am making here today.

Mr. Sinclair: Would any other leader like to ask questions?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): The next paragraph of the amendment reads:

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

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

The third paragraph reads:

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

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

The next paragraph reads:

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

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

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

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

Dear Mr. Chairman:

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

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

The government and people of Canada have no desire to influence the form of government chosen by the peoples of eastern Europe. Our only aim is

that they should be free to do so, and that the governments so chosen should steer their own independent courses, respecting the equal rights of all their neighbours and bearing in mind only the needs and wishes of their own people in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations charter.

Yours sincerely,
(sgd) Louis S. St. Laurent.

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

Dear Mr. Prime Minister:

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

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

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

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

Yours sincerely,
N. A. Bulganin.

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

That answers this other matter raised by the hon. gentleman now leading the official opposition. He says that \$200,000 was a paltry sum and that we have raised it from \$200,000 to \$1 million. The original recommendation was for \$1 million, of which \$100,000 was to go to the Red Cross and \$100,000 to the United Nations high commissioner for refugees to be used in the alleviation of the sufferings of refugees once they became refugees outside of Hungary. But at that time we were not disposed to ask parliament to appropriate any of the taxpayers' money to be placed in the hands and under the control

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

of any communist controlled Hungarian government to be used for the support of whatever name they went by and whatever democratic qualifications they chose to give themselves. We have had some experience, but not much, in seeing how supplies from other countries have been used in communist countries as propaganda for the regime that was bringing about the misery that we and other free nations were seeking to alleviate. As soon as we heard that supplies could be distributed under proper auspices, we went back to the original sum of \$1 million. The estimate that has been distributed, and that is now before the house, is for \$1 million to be applied, subject to the decisions of treasury board, and that is so treasury board will be able to make absolutely sure that everything coming from the use of that \$800,000—because \$100,000 is going to the Red Cross for the use of refugees outside of Hungary and \$100,000 is going to the United Nations high commissioner for refugees—will be expended either by the Red Cross or by a United Nations agency that will have our full confidence in its desire and its ability to see that the assistance goes to those who have really been the victims of the horrible crimes that have been perpetrated against that nation in the last few weeks, and to no others.

That is why the item reads:

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

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

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

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

be the commander of that force is not let down, if we can prevent him from being let down by supplying him with what he thinks he requires and that he is not apt to get from other contributors to this United Nations force.

Mr. Pallett: Why not?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Well, why not? I hope there will not be any question of why not. I hope everyone will agree that this is what should be done by the Canadian people. I am expressing that hope here and I am rather inclined to believe that even the hon. gentleman would share that hope.

Mr. Sinclair: Hear, hear; we hope so.

Mr. Pallett: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister a question for purposes of clarification?

Mr. Stuart (Charlotte): One more.

Mr. Pallett: "Why not" was meant in this way. Why would the other countries not contribute if it was a United Nations force?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Other countries are contributing but the suggestion was made that their contribution should be—and the original suggestion to us was that the contribution should be—in the form of a battalion, a unit that could serve as a unit. Now other things are required. I have heard some suggestion that we were arming our people with typewriters instead of arming them with machine guns. Well, I think those who have had any experience with the administration of a modern army know that a lot of administration work is required. The hon. gentleman, if he were over there, would find that the administrative forces that General Burns is asking for are not going to be sufficient to take care of 10 times the number of men he is going to have under his command, and I do not suspect General Burns of making extravagant requests. That has not been our experience with him. When he was deputy minister of the Department of Veterans Affairs I do not think it was the experience of representatives of veterans that he was extravagant in meeting the demands that were made for the improvement of assistance, pensions or the like, of veterans. He was realistic. I feel that he was fair, and I think he is going to be realistic and he is going to be fair in the way in which he administers this United Nations force.

I have already spoken too long. Before taking my place I do want to thank the mover (Mr. Legare) and the seconder (Mr. Weselak) of the address. I think they both made appropriate speeches, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe

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

(Mr. Rowe) and I have not been able to follow their good examples and compress our remarks into the space of about 15 minutes for each of us.

(Translation):

I congratulate them most heartily and I regret that circumstances have not permitted me nor the honourable member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe) to follow their example and discuss the important matter which now requires our attention, in the short space of time they found sufficient to express their opinion so impressively on the international situation as they saw it when they took part in the discussions of the General Assembly since it began its sittings on November 12 last.

(Text):

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Speaker, there are three clocks in the chamber and each of them shows a different time. My watch says it is nine minutes to six, and if the house wishes I shall proceed with my remarks.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Coldwell: If the house wishes me to call it six o'clock I will call it six o'clock in accordance with the clock on the government side of the house.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): We will try to see that these clocks are in better harmony than perhaps we may find among ourselves in the course of the debate on this occasion.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

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

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

I say this is what is expected of us. I do not think this country, nor indeed the nations

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

who have followed the lead of Canada in supporting the United Nations force, expect that we shall enter into a debate which will be unreal in the circumstances under which we meet today.

This afternoon I hoped that we might possibly follow the precedent that was established in 1950, when in a grave domestic crisis we set aside the debate on the address and proceeded immediately to examine the proposals submitted to the house by the government. I hoped that we might have followed the same procedure today, and perchance it is not too late even now to hope that this might be done, and then having examined the government's proposals and the appropriations placed before us, we could proceed with a debate if the house so wished following that procedure.

What the country expects, I say, is that we should give immediate and unanimous approval of the United Nations plan for a police force and Canada's participation in that force, and pass the appropriation as quickly as possible to bring relief to the refugees who have fled the terror in Hungary. Instead of that, this afternoon we had an amendment moved which makes declarations that in my opinion and in the opinion of those associated with me who have had an opportunity of examining them are unsupported by any relevant facts. This means that the debate is unreal. The amendment reveals no policy that will assist Canada or the world in the crisis in which we find ourselves, nor will it do anything to further the objectives that I believe the majority of the Canadian people have in mind.

Having said that, of course, I shall say immediately that we neither intend to support the amendment nor do we think it is worthy of our attempting to amend it by introducing a subamendment. Therefore I say, let us get down to the issues that are facing this house and the country at the present time. Let us agree to suspend debate and proceed tomorrow to examine the appropriations and pass them as rapidly as possible. True, the costs of the United Nations force may not be pressing because they can be met out of the appropriation we have already made, but the million dollars we propose to appropriate for Hungarian relief is a pressing matter. If, as the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe) said this afternoon, the million dollar appropriation is inadequate to meet the needs, then I will say that delay and no appropriation is more inadequate to meet the needs of the present situation. A million dollars is a good start. I hope that if and when we meet again in January after the

Christmas recess we find that the situation in Hungary requires a further appropriation—

Mr. Lennard: Why wait?

Mr. Coldwell: —by this house, we shall make it. One of the hon. members of the opposition says, "Why wait?" Well, the amendment introduced this afternoon means delay at the present time—

Mr. Lennard: Oh, it takes only 24 hours.

Mr. Coldwell: If it takes only 24 hours that is not as bad as I thought, but bad enough.

Mr. Lennard: That is not after Christmas.

Mr. Coldwell: In any event, a million dollar initial appropriation is worth supporting and passing as quickly as possible and this should be done not later than tomorrow, in my opinion. Let us all appreciate the urgency of the present situation as far as the refugees are concerned.

I am not going to say a great deal about the situation in Hungary, but I would like to mention one thing. When I landed in this country on October 27 after having been in Europe for some 11 weeks I learned for the first time what was happening in Hungary, and I immediately expressed my opinion in no uncertain terms. As a matter of fact I think what has happened in Hungary, the shooting down of unarmed and helpless people in the streets of Budapest, is scarcely paralleled in the history of the world, and it brands the Soviet union not only as an aggressor but as a cruel and more than dictatorial power.

We could not do anything to help the people of Hungary in their struggle for freedom in that country when they made the revolutionary move, but anything we can do now to relieve them either through the Red Cross or the United Nations should be undertaken by this country.

We are told that we have large surpluses accumulating this year, larger perhaps than they may appear when the next budget is brought down. We do have surpluses, and in my opinion no country is better able to undertake relief of this nature out of the blessings of Providence than is Canada at the present time. I think we should do everything we can to relieve the distress caused by the situation that has developed in Hungary. Nor should we overlook the fact when we are discussing it that this has arisen very largely because we have not had the machinery in the United Nations to deal with situations of this description as they might arise.

May I say that with all our broadcasting to these peoples in the satellite countries,

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

perhaps in some instances they have given false hope that in the event of uprisings in those countries they would be assisted by planes and forces that might be flown in from outside. We know, of course, that was an impossibility under the circumstances, but I think in some instances they looked for support of that description.

I want to turn now to one or two other matters relating to the situation that has arisen in the Middle East. As I said a moment ago, I was in Great Britain for some eleven weeks. I was there during practically the whole of the time when the Suez controversy was rising and at its height. I had the opportunity of talking to many people of different shades of opinion, and I found that the statement that had been made by the leader of the opposition in the parliament of Britain on August 2 was a statement that was generally approved throughout the country. Let me quote what he said:

But we are, after all, members of the United Nations and signatories to its charter.

He was dealing then with a statement which had been made by the prime minister. It was not that the prime minister had foreshadowed the use of force but there had been considerable discussion in the United Kingdom regarding the use of force and so Mr. Gaitskell said.

But we are, after all, members of the United Nations and signatories to its charter. For many years we have steadfastly avoided any international action which would be in breach of international law and world public opinion. We must not, therefore, allow ourselves to get in a position where we might be denounced as aggressors in the security council, or where a majority of the assembly would be against us. If Colonel Nasser has done things that are wrong in the legal sense, the right step is to take him to the international court. Force is justified in certain events, but if there is anything he had done which would justify force at the moment, it is the one thing on which we have never used force—the stopping of Israeli's ships. It would be difficult to find, in what he has so far done, any legal justification for the use of force. What he may do in the future is another matter.

I think we were right to react sharply to this move. If nothing were done it would have serious consequences for all of us, and especially for the western powers. It is important that what we do should be done with the fullest possible co-operation with the other nations affected. We should try to settle this matter peacefully on the lines of the international commission which has been hinted at.

Hinted at, I may say, by the prime minister in the speech that preceded this one.

While force cannot be excluded, we must be sure that the circumstances justify it—that it is, if it is used, consistent with our pledges to the United Nations charter and not in conflict with them.

I think that statement at the time and for some weeks afterward expressed very clearly the sentiments of the British people. I would

[Mr. Coldwell.]

have said that in the middle of October 70 per cent of the people of Britain were vociferously opposed to force. I found that unanimously so in the parts of the continent of Europe which I visited, and where I had the opportunity on several occasions of meeting people in responsible and high positions. There was unanimity, at least I thought, against the threats of force which were being made by some people in the United Kingdom.

Certainly that was so in the United Kingdom. Just look at the press of the United Kingdom. By no stretch of the imagination is the London *Economist* a Labour paper; it is pretty conservative in its general views; nor is the *Observer*, nor is the *Spectator*, nor is the *Manchester Guardian*, nor is the *News Chronicle*. They are middle of the road British Liberal papers. The press, except for the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Daily Express*, were almost unanimous in warning the British government against the use of force. As the Prime Minister said this afternoon, in spite of public opinion, in spite of the opposition of almost the entire responsible press of Britain, the government, with the problem before the security council, took the action it did.

I regret that most sincerely because I have always thought that Britain having perhaps lost her status as a great imperial power, having lost her political influence to that extent in the world, there was one thing she could do in the future and that was to give moral leadership to the world. I believe that in making the move into the Suez at the time she did Great Britain largely forfeited that moral leadership which she had built up laboriously over a number of years.

When we look back over the last 20 or 30 years and see the manner in which British prestige had risen in Africa and Asia; the statesmanlike manner in which India became an independent country without the shedding of any blood, at least the blood of armies of Britain and India; when we look at the establishment of Burma as a free and independent nation; when we look at how Pakistan became a member of the commonwealth, and Ceylon; when we consider her record in recent years in the colonial areas and in Africa where some progress has been made in raising the standard of living and stopping the age-old exploitation of the people; then we find that at one fell swoop African and Asian opinions have been alienated and the prestige and moral leadership which Britain had built up in world affairs has been lost.

I owe my education and birth to the United Kingdom. Canada is my country and my first care, but if I have a second love it is

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

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

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

It will be said that the genesis of the recent moves on the part of Britain and France was the attacks made by Israel on Egypt. As one who has been interested in following the chain of circumstances in Israel over the last several years I for one can understand the position in which that country found itself on October 29. As we know, this was the culmination of a long dispute. Israel had suffered considerable provocation, as we all know. Ever since 1948 Egypt along with the Arab states had refused to sign a peace treaty with Israel, countries regarded themselves as being in a continual state of war with Israel. Consequently Israel's security had been constantly and increasingly threatened by Egypt. Repeated Egyptian raids by small parties of commandos from the Gaza strip and from the Sinai peninsula had made life along the border virtually intolerable. Those of us who have had the opportunity of going there over the last several years know perfectly well that the country was in a state of continuous siege and that life for people who lived on the borders was indeed difficult. Repeated Egyptian raids by small parties of commandos, I say, over the Gaza strip had made the situation intolerable.

Egypt, as I have already noted, had blockaded Israel shipping in the canal and in the Aqaba gulf, and so there was provocation. None the less I am sorry that the action was taken because it did bring about a situation that today is causing grave concern all over

the world. Britain and France issued their ultimatum and they launched their attack. As I said earlier, I believe this was in violation of the United Nations charter, and I have very good reason to believe that not only were the commonwealth prime ministers not notified of the intention but even the opposition in the United Kingdom was not taken into the confidence of the government prior to the event. At least I am fairly certain of this, that the considerations that are sometimes said to have existed but have never been made public were never conveyed to the opposition in Britain, and in the event of the development of danger of this description the normal practice in the United Kingdom was to take the opposition into the confidence of the government in order that the country might present a united front.

Well, what is the result of this? The very things that Britain feared have come about. The clash between the Egyptian and the Anglo-French forces has stopped passage through the canal and blocked the canal probably for months to come. Instead of protecting the canal, armed intervention has had the opposite and very unhappy result. I say "very unhappy result" because I am convinced that these results will be felt for some time in the economies not only of the United Kingdom and France but of the western European nations and of the world.

What have they gained? I think it can be said that nothing has been gained. I am not going to enter into the recriminations that have been prevalent in many quarters, in the press and so on, except to say that I think the results so far have been quite disastrous from the standpoint of the welfare of the whole world, and I believe that Russia, unfortunately, would have entered into Hungary willy-nilly. But I think the fact that there was this form of aggression in the Suez area helped to obscure the aggression in Hungary. I saw a cartoon in one of the British papers that was sent to me which showed a plane leaving for the Suez canal with Mr. Eden in flying garb beside it. Behind it was a tank heading in the opposite direction with Khrushchev standing beside it. Mr. Eden is saying "To Suez" and Mr. Khrushchev, looking around, is saying, "I am off, me too". I thought it illustrated to some extent the lever and argument that had been given to Russia in dealing with Hungary, though of course I am not making any comparison with respect to the loss of life or the manner and the cruelties of these two operations. They are not comparable, and I say that immediately. But at least it obscured the issue to a very considerable extent.

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

I said I did not want to enter into recriminations. I want to say, however, before I come to something that I hope may be constructive, that we are very happy indeed that it was the Canadian representative in the person of our Secretary of State for External Affairs who proposed the establishment of the United Nations force. I think that is something about which every Canadian can indeed be proud and happy.

An hon. Member: They are not.

Mr. Coldwell: Somebody in the official opposition—I did not get who it was—says that they are not. If there are Canadians who are not happy about it, then all I can say is that they do not share in the general opinion of people all across the world. Not only nations that voted for the condemnation of the Anglo-French action but Britain and France themselves are not unhappy that this United Nations force is to be established in order to bring about some measure of peace in the world.

Mr. Ferguson: May I ask a question? Can you say one decent word about the country in which you were born?

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Ferguson: That is meant in all sincerity. You never have.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Coldwell: Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the fact I was born in the country where I was born.

Mr. Ferguson: Why did you not stay there?

Mr. Coldwell: I have many friends and relations there and my only sorrow is that I think in this instance they were wrong. My opinion is shared by many millions of people in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Brooks: They are getting fewer all the time.

Mr. Ferguson: Say something decent about them.

Mr. Coldwell: My hon. friend says they are getting fewer all the time.

Mr. Brooks: As they learn the facts.

Mr. Coldwell: As a matter of fact, if there has been a swing in public opinion in the United Kingdom behind what the government has done it was not indicated in the Chester by-election last week and, in the second place, it is not indicated in any other way.

Mr. Brooks: It is indicated in the very papers that you mentioned a while ago. Those papers are losing circulation.

[Mr. Coldwell.]

Mr. Coldwell: If there has been a swing in public opinion I would suspect that the people of the United Kingdom, like the people of Canada, would rally behind the government in a crisis, and the official opposition should be doing that today in this house.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lennard: Why should they?

Mr. Ferguson: You did not want to help them with any soldiers in the last war.

Mr. Speaker: I must ask the hon. member for Simcoe North to allow the hon. member who has the floor to make his speech without interruption.

Mr. Coldwell: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid I cannot shout down the hon. member. I cannot enter into that competition. What I was going to say was that there are certain constructive things that I think Canada should now be endeavouring to place before the United Nations in order that this whole Middle Eastern situation may be cleaned up once and for all, over a period of time, of course, and peace established in that area. If there is, as we have, a cease-fire and a United Nations force there, then we should endeavour to suggest ways and means to prevent an outbreak in the future.

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

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

But, as I have said, we believe that this police force must be followed by some comprehensive economic settlement. A settlement must provide first of all for the recognition by the Arab states, including Egypt, of the state of Israel, and for the signing of

The Address—Mr. Coldwell

a peace treaty with Israel under which Israel's borders will be guaranteed. The blockade of Israel should be lifted and free passage through the canal, when passage is restored, should be available to Israeli shipping. We feel that no solution to the Suez canal problem can be achieved unless this is done.

We also realize that there are a good many other aspects of the economic situation in the Middle East. Egypt herself, with a population which is underfed and underprivileged, requires help in the irrigation of that area. As a matter of fact, I believe that the United Nations might consider setting up an international authority in agreement with the countries involved such as the Sudan and right down through Ethiopia, Egypt and so on, comparable to the Tennessee valley authority in the United States, in order to use the waters of that area for watering the desert and feeding the people of Egypt and the adjacent countryside just in the same way as I believe that, once peace is attained among Israel, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria, a similar authority might be set up to utilize the waters of the Jordan. Those of us who have seen the waters of the Jordan and know how they could be utilized if only an agreement could be reached among the nations along the river know perfectly well that the waters could be used to bring food, prosperity and so on to the people of that general area. Therefore we say that these are some of the things that need to be done.

Of course, underneath this whole situation to a large extent is the problem of oil; and that problem of oil is being borne in upon us today as never before. Today we realize the extent to which European industry depends upon oil from Saudi Arabia, from Kuwait and from the areas around the Red sea. There you have the largest supply of oil in the world available to the European countries. I do not think it is too much to hope that sooner or later these countries, through international organization, perhaps through the good offices of the United Nations, may be inclined to establish what we have sometimes suggested especially in connection with food in the world, namely a pool—I refer to an oil pool, not a food pool—the profits from which would go to the people to raise the standards of living in that area, and under which the countries would be guaranteed a supply of oil to utilize in the industrial areas where that oil is needed. There are in the Middle East areas where irrigation and conscious economic and social planning could raise the standards of living considerably. We therefore make some of these suggestions and place them before the Secretary

of State for External Affairs and the government in the hope that on appropriate occasions, whenever the opportunities offer, they may be placed before international gatherings and consideration may be given to them.

I am not idealistic enough to believe that these things will be done in the course of a few weeks, a few months, or even a few years. In the history of the world things move slowly, but they move. If we are to have peace and justice in the world, then we must rely more and more on international associations, on collective security. For example, we have NATO. Because the security council failed to act we established NATO, which I believe has been a shield against a possible threat of war in another area.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, while I have made some criticism, I am not without hope that the world will manage to get by this particular crisis without resort to arms and to a world-wide conflagration. I think no one wants such a world war. Russian machinations have upset large areas of the world, but I do not believe that even the Russians would consciously embark on a world war. We can denounce their propaganda; we can remain strong. But our strength will lie largely in the moral influence we can exercise over vast areas of the world, on the good will we can attain and maintain in those areas of the world, and on the extent to which we can assist in raising the standards of living and in removing the causes of unrest upon which communism thrives everywhere in the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to reiterate what I said at the beginning, namely that we have met together in a world crisis, that we have before us appropriations that will enable us to make a contribution in the two fields, first in that of the United Nations police force and second in that of the relief of the suffering which has been brought about by the terror inflicted upon the people of Hungary. May I say that not only must this appropriation be passed so we can give material aid, but that there is one other thing I think we should do. I think we should take all the refugees that we can possibly take into our country. We should let down the barriers. We should not do what we did in dealing with the refugees following the war, namely select only those who are of use to Canada. We should take our share of those who are older. We should take our share of those who are maimed, particularly those who suffered in the conflicts which occurred in the streets of Budapest and in the surrounding countryside. By doing that I think we shall be making a real contribution to the settlement of international disputes and to the welfare of mankind.

The Address—Mr. Low

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be one of the most serious matters that has ever come before this assembly. I look upon the present situation as one that is fraught with grave danger, not only to our own country but to the other countries of the world. Because of the fact that this is a most serious time, I approach the present assignment with some diffidence. I would not want anything that I say to complicate matters, either for our own country or for the United Nations in the tremendous task that faces it at the present time.

I have just come back from about a month of speaking with people in different parts of Canada. I have had an opportunity of getting their views with regard to the world situation, and more particularly with regard to what has happened in the Middle East. I should like to explain briefly what I found the people thinking. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, when the situation became grave in the Middle East around November 1, I found the Canadian people dismayed and shocked. They were dismayed and shocked that it should be found necessary, in a day as serious as this, to have to assert rights and look after one's own affairs through the use of force. I found the Canadian people quite generally confused and very much worried.

However, as the days passed I believe that thinking clarified. The motives behind the various moves have become clearer, and as a consequence the Canadian people today, though they do look upon this as the gravest and most serious situation the world has faced in recent times, feel somewhat different from what they did on November 1. Although there are many vexatious domestic problems that face our Canadian people, problems demanding early solution, yet uppermost in their minds is the Middle East problem; the rape of Hungary and the bestiality of Russia; the about-face that we have seen that country make in these last few weeks. The people in all parts of Canada expected parliament, without delay, to get down to the business of taking action that is carefully calculated to bring peace to the Middle East, to provide the much-needed assistance to the oppressed and persecuted people of Hungary, and to do our utmost to relieve the suffering and uncertainties that have been heaped upon so many of these Hungarian patriots who have demonstrated that they love liberty more than they love life.

I contend that the eyes of the world are upon Canada today, and upon this parliament. Because the eyes of the world are upon us, I think our responsibilities are much heavier than they would be if that were not the case. As the nation that took the lead in moving

[Mr. Coldwell.]

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

My colleagues and I firmly believe that the only way out of the present confused, dangerous and complicated set of circumstances is to seek earnestly for God's guidance to enable us, the parliament of Canada, to find what is right; and then to have the courage to do it when we find it. If ever there was a time in man's knowledge when vision and understanding have to be buttressed by faith and humility, I think that time is now. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention at this session to carp or to be unduly critical or to strain to find fault. We want to be critical where that is required in the interests of good government and good business, but certainly we are not going to inject party political manoeuvring into these proceedings, because this is not the time for it.

Some criticism has been levelled at the government regarding the calling of parliament. Where do we stand in that regard? I said nearly three weeks ago, when the Middle Eastern situation developed into a dangerous and tense situation, that I thought Canada should call parliament just as quickly as it might be possible after it became known what the United Nations wanted of us. I believe we should never have committed our forces to serve in any part of the world, and dispatched them to that theatre of war, without first calling parliament and getting the approval of the representatives of the people. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the Prime Minister did call parliament in time so we can give careful consideration to what the United Nations has asked of us, and so we can get all the information we require in order to make a solid decision. We can either approve or we can withhold approval. My own judgment is that there can be little criticism levelled at the government on the ground of not having called parliament earlier than it did.

The Address—Mr. Low

There are some criticisms that can be levelled at the government in connection with their actions to date. I think it would be unwise for us to withhold them. As I said before, it is not political criticism that I want to level. I think it is a pity that the government did not find it possible to provide Britain and France with moral backing when they intervened in the Middle East. I said so on the very day that Britain and France intervened; on a day when I heard around me in this building on the part of the people who had access to knowledge and understanding and should have known better, a great deal of fuzzy and emotional reasoning. I was surprised at the amount of it; and the criticism that was levelled at Britain and France seemed to me to border on the severe and the bitter.

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

What has the United Nations done to clear away the problems and the provocations, indeed the aggressions, in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker? I remind the members of this assembly that the United Nations did nothing until Britain and France moved to protect their interests and to keep Israel and Egypt apart. It seemed to take a shock to move the United Nations to take any action that was worth while. I would not brand Britain and France as aggressors; I would hesitate to do that. I would have to measure most carefully the motives of those two countries against the provocations, the long line of provocations, they have suffered; and then I would have to be very careful in my assessment of the situation before I could possibly brand them as aggressors, as many have done.

Rather than blame those countries I believe we should seek for the fundamental causes of deterioration in the world situation, and in the Middle Eastern situation that is our immediate concern now in the weaknesses and the frailties of the United Nations. The

Prime Minister said this afternoon that he believed what was happening in the Middle East was used as a shield by Russia to cover its horrible rape of Hungary. I remind the Prime Minister that the Russian turn-about from her decision to remove her troops from Hungary came only when western solidarity was shattered by the bitter and angry rebuke of Britain and France, first by the United States followed by the United Nations. It was only when Russia saw that solidarity had broken down that she decided to move in and to take advantage of it. She has always done so.

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

I repeat, the weaknesses and the vacillations of the United Nations have caused the free world, step by step, year after year, to retreat steadily before a completely aggressive Russian imperialism, one that will not be stopped except by a show of solid force. We are going to have to meet it at some time. I cannot understand, therefore, why we should continue to feel that we should have to put off the evil day. I can understand, Mr. Speaker, why men would not want to loose their grip on the hope for peace in this atomic age.

Of course, too, Mr. Speaker, I contend there are things that are more to be feared than death, and one of them is the loss of our liberty. Are we going to stand by inactive and watch the Hungarians and the Poles give us demonstration after demonstration of the love of freedom which the free world ought to be showing? I think we are guided by fear, allowing ourselves constantly to be bereft of faith. It seems to me that this ought to be a warning to us all.

Well, where do we stand with regard to the proposal of the government of Canada to provide a unit of approximately battalion strength to the emergency police force for the Middle East? I think, Mr. Speaker, it was the only alternative that could be found to action by individual nations, and I have to

The Address—Mr. Low

give the Secretary of State for External Affairs credit for having suggested that the United Nations set up a police force for emergency action in the Middle East.

I see that it is designated as an emergency force for action in the Middle East, and therefore is specifically assigned to that area. Well, that is exactly the way we would want it. I think we must agree that collective action of that kind is to be preferred to unilateral action, or action by any small group of nations outside the United Nations, and I said so, I think, on November 1 when I made a statement to the press. I said I thought we should be giving moral backing to Britain and France on their intervention, but immediately the United Nations should take this matter up and find an effective alternative. When they did find it I felt that Britain, France, Israel and Canada should go along with that alternative. I had in mind a police force.

That is the attitude we have toward the police force, but there is one thing I do want to say in regard to such a force. I would warn the government of Canada never to part with the right to commit or to withdraw such forces, according to their discretion; never to grant to the United Nations the actual sovereignty over this force, and as long as you do that you are going to have our support. But if you ever do part with the sovereignty over them, the right to commit them and the right to say whether they shall be sent to any other theatre of war, then, believe me, we are going to take exception to it. But we do think we must go along with the present proposal, and we have no criticism except what I have recited.

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

So far as the Queen's Own regiment is concerned, I do hope that Mr. Nasser will not be too critical. I hope it will be possible for him to accept the Queen's Own regiment. I think it was the one in rotation that was the best equipped and ready to go, and therefore should go to the east. I have no criticism of what has been done in that regard.

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

[Mr. Low.]

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

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

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

When Israel was established Canada went along with it and, of course, we angered the

The Address—Mr. Low

Arab states right then and there and they determined they were going to destroy Israel. When we did go along with the establishment of Israel I say it was the responsibility of the United Nations to see the thing through, and when I say that I mean this. When trouble arose between Israel and Egypt and the other Arab nations in 1948 and the war of extermination, from the point of view of the Arabs, was visited upon Israel, the United Nations left the problems hanging straight in the air, left them dangling. Nothing whatever was done to bring to a sensible conclusion the outstanding problems and points of dispute between those nations.

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

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

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

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

I hope the police force we are envisioning here today will be set up quickly and sent into position, and will stay there policing that area and keeping the peace until a right good start has been made toward finding a permanent solution to these problems. I think Canada should be prepared to go along with the efforts of the United Nations in finding a possible solution for these problems.

It was fortunate, in my judgment, that something happened to shock the United Nations into action at the time these events occurred, because since that time we have discovered a terrific Russian build-up in the area. We know what are her long-range ideas. Russia needs oil. Russia's vast industrialization program makes her need imperative. She wants the oil in the Middle East. The oil in Baku and other areas accessible to her is not going to be sufficient for her needs. At the same time Russia wants to weaken NATO and destroy it if possible. One of the best ways to accomplish this is to cut off the oil supply from the Middle East. I think there is no question about that at all.

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

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

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

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

The Address—Mr. Low

necessary. I believe the free nations of the world have to be extremely careful in the future in how they encourage the hope of assistance to the peoples behind the iron curtain, and not offer hope that is premature. There is much evidence today that the Hungarian patriots were led to believe they would receive help and they were looking for it, as some of them have stated since they came to Canada. They did not know from where this help would come, but they were certain that it would come.

It is a terrible thing to lead them to believe that help will be extended when we have no machinery through which to extend it. Just as quickly as we can get such machinery we ought to get it and have it ready to send into countries like Hungary. I believe the long-range shortwave broadcasts were mainly responsible for premature hope, and I think we have to be very careful in that regard in future.

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

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

I think that is right.

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

The crisis may have created a situation of great opportunity which may not recur again. A war has been rapidly stopped; an international force has been created; the Russian penetration has been unmasked. The situation can be turned to good account by the free world. Whatever may be the thought of the past let us, the United States and the countries of the commonwealth, now press forward with firmness together and with resolution, to use that opportunity and to preserve the gains. Thus our friendship and co-operation will once more prove the great hope of the world.

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

I would have preferred to have spoken after the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Minister of National Defence had given us their views and the background of this whole matter. There are a lot of things we do not know. Because I have had to speak before they came on I should like to reserve my right to speak again when the resolution which doubtless the Minister of

[Mr. Low.]

Finance (Mr. Harris) will bring in is before us. I wish at that time to ask a number of questions.

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Low) for concluding his speech in the way he did because he gave me a peg on which to hang mine. I may say that I am going to leave all questions of high policy to the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Minister of National Defence and other people who are better able than I to discuss these matters. But there is one part of the amendment moved this afternoon by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe which has a direct relation to one of the functions of government for which I am responsible to this house. The fourth part of that amendment reads:

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

I am going to try, as objectively and dispassionately as I can, to explain the situation as it has been reported to me and as I understand it what is the precise problem. I shall try as precisely as I can to indicate what the government of Canada has so far done about it.

As hon. members know, the Russians moved against Hungary on Sunday, November 4, and they began shooting down people in a frightful manner, not only in Budapest but all over Hungary. Almost immediately there was a stream of refugees across the Austrian border, a stream which has not ceased to flow, a stream which with every day that passes is creating more difficult problems for the government of Austria. Austria has improvised camps for the temporary relief of these refugees, and it is their desire to get the people out of those camps and moved to some other country just as quickly as possible. It is not that they are not hospitable, it is simply that they want to use their limited resources in order to take care of the new people who are crossing the border.

On the morning of November 6 I issued instructions to our office in Vienna that priority was to be given to applications from these Hungarian refugees, that any such applications were to be processed at once, and that if there were other things the Austrian government wanted us to do in order to help in this matter our officers were to let us know what they were. They were to advise as quickly as they could how much extra staff would be required, and they were given full authority to engage any local help that was necessary. They were told that we would transfer staff from any other

The Address—Mr. Pickersgill

office in Europe without delay, and regardless of whether it impeded other operations, in order to cope with whatever flow of refugees there might be.

I think anyone who has stopped to reflect on this matter for two minutes will realize that in the first week or for the most of the first ten days of this movement of refugees very few of them would be thinking about crossing the Atlantic or going to Australia. They were thinking about where they would get their next meal, they were thinking about what had happened to the other members of their families who had not escaped, they were wondering what was going on in Hungary and whether the revolution from which they had hoped so much, was going to be crushed or whether in fact a situation would be created which would enable them to go back to Hungary. I think the majority of them are still preoccupied mainly with those considerations.

But within a week there was an increasing number of people who decided that the best thing to do would be to go to Canada, the United States or Australia, at least to settle down for a while because there was not much hope in Hungary. We discussed with the Austrian government whether we should send teams into the camps and they asked us not to do so. They said, "You cannot send people across the Atlantic or to Australia unless they want to go". That means you have to ask questions and delay their movement. It does no great harm to anyone to be sent to Switzerland, Sweden, Germany or some other adjacent country from which he could go back home without too much trouble and where he can remain while he makes up his mind. They told us that they wanted to move these people from the camps, as quickly as possible, to other countries, where other countries had offered refuge. They told us that what they wanted was to have the United States, Canada and Australia deal promptly with those people who had indicated that they were interested in going to one of those countries. They told us that they would send such people to us, and that is the way the thing has been proceeding so far.

We indicated on the morning of November 6 that not only was priority to be given to whatever applicants there were, not only was the staff to be increased to handle whatever flow there was, but that anyone who wanted to come and who was physically in position to come would be given assisted passage without regard to what means he had. That was the case and it has remained the case. We did not inquire whether the loan would be paid back. We hope it will be paid back in due course, because I believe most of

these people are going to have little difficulty in getting established in Canada in the next few months.

I also made it clear in Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver or wherever anyone asked me about it that any responsible individual or organization in Canada was at liberty to sponsor immigrants, either people they might know about or simply to make facilities available for people whom they did not know. This would include people who were not able to look after themselves and even people who were in need of medical treatment. I also said that if some of these people required medical treatment and therefore could not by law be admitted to this country as immigrants, I would use the powers that parliament gave to the minister under the Immigration Act and admit these people for treatment wherever, whenever and as often as arrangements could be made for that treatment. I also said that every application to any immigration office anywhere in Canada by Hungarians or Hungarian-Canadians for specific people was to be received and every possible effort was to be made to locate these people if there was a reasonable prospect of their being among the refugees or if there was any prospect of their getting here in any other way.

I have been in very close touch with the situation in Vienna. We get reports every day. We have been in telephonic communication three or four times, and the one thing I have been most insistent about is that the flow must not be stopped, that as many cases as come along are to be dealt with regardless of whether that involves not filling out forms, whether it involves cutting out X-rays, whether it involves doing away with almost any other kind of red tape, if you like to call it that, or normal procedure. Every one of these procedures is useful in settling people here and if they are not carried out the problems when they get here are going to be greater, but we will have to cope with them when they do get here. That is the view I have taken, that the main thing to do is to keep the stream flowing. So far there has been no difficulty about doing that.

It also became quite apparent to me when I got back from the Pacific coast at the beginning of last week that the numbers were reaching proportions that were going to be well beyond the capacity of normal transportation to deal with. I took steps at once to get in touch with Canadian Pacific Airlines, Trans-Canada Air Lines and the shipping companies to see what special arrangements could be made, and I announced on Friday that an airlift was being organized. I may say that we got every aircraft that C.P.A. or

The Address—Mr. Pickersgill

T.C.A. could make available, and I announced that publicly. It was given to the newspapers. Some of them did not see fit to give the announcement very much prominence. Perhaps this is not objective, but I do confess that I was a little surprised to read in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday that somebody ought to establish an airlift, and because the federal government would not do it somebody else should. Actually I think we are getting every aircraft we know anything about on which we can lay our hands. We have been able to make arrangements with another air line—

Mr. Fulton: Which one?

Mr. Pickersgill: I do not think I should indulge in advertising.

Mr. Fleming: Can you not give information?

Mr. Pickersgill: We also canvassed the possibility through Trans-Canada Air Lines and the steamship companies of getting enough space to deal with this problem either by air or by sea. On Saturday we learned that between 300 and 400 passengers could be taken on a ship sailing from Bremen at the end of this week, and I gave directions that the whole of the space was to be taken at once. That space will all be filled at the end of the week.

I was a little concerned lest the officer in charge in Vienna was going to be so harassed by the day to day business of the office that he would not be able to look ahead and try to meet the problems that might arise two or three days hence. In consequence I have sent one of the senior officers of the admissions branch of the department to Vienna. He will be there before the middle of the week and he has blanket authority to do everything that is necessary to see that there is no stoppage of this flow.

Of course one can never be sure that all these things will synchronize perfectly, but I have very high hopes that we will be able to take all the people who show any interest in coming to Canada and that in one way or another without too much delay we will be able to find some transportation to bring them here. This is not the problem that worries me. The problem that worries me and that ought to worry every responsible member of the house and every Canadian who is properly concerned about this problem is what is going to happen to these people when they arrive. It is very easy, as the hon. member for Peace River says, to say that we will throw the doors wide open and let anybody into the country, but I hope everybody who advocates that course will be just as anxious to see that some responsible

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

person is willing to look after these people 20 years from now if we get some of the kind of people who need care for that long.

That is the kind of problem that anyone who has any sense of responsibility has to think about and think about seriously when he is tearing up human beings by the roots and moving them to some other place. I intend to follow the advice of the hon. member for Peace River. I intend, and I have the authority of my colleagues to go ahead and do this, to let in the people who want to come here, and we intend to try to distribute them across the country to the best of our ability. I am very pleased that Canadian Pacific Airlines are going to have their flights direct to Vancouver. I think that is a very good thing. When I was in Vancouver the other day I found there was a good deal of complaint that immigrants, because it cost more to get there, never got there, though that is not borne out by the statistics. But I felt that here was one occasion when we would get some of them to British Columbia first.

I have also arranged a meeting between the social agencies that are concerned about immigration and the officials of my department tomorrow to try to co-ordinate reception, because it just cannot be left to purely local efforts any longer. It can this week, but I think by next week the numbers are going to be so great that there will have to be a lot more organization than there now is.

In that connection I may say that I was very gratified this morning to have a telephone call from the office of the premier of Ontario and subsequently a telephone call from the minister of planning and development of Ontario, the department that interests itself, and quite properly under the constitution, in immigration in so far as it comes within provincial jurisdiction. I told them what we were doing and indicated some of the ways in which I thought they could be most helpful. I told Mr. Nickle, the minister, that I would send him a telegram to confirm what I had said, and as it contains a certain amount of information that is of general interest I think I might perhaps read the text of it to the house. It reads as follows:

In confirmation of our telephone conversation, I thank the Ontario government for their offer of co-operation in the transportation to Canada and reception here of Hungarian refugees. The federal government, as I announced publicly last Friday, has already organized an airlift through Trans-Canada Air Lines and Canadian Pacific Airlines and we are negotiating for additional air transport. We also have arranged for a ship to sail from Bremen next week end with about 300 refugees.

I am told it will be considerably more than 300.

The Address—Mr. Pickersgill

Where help will be most urgently needed is in reception of Hungarians on arrival in Canada, shelter and care pending settlement and medical care for those who may require it. This last is particularly important in view of relaxation of normal medical examinations in Vienna. We will especially welcome co-operation of the Ontario government in these fields and you are invited to send a representative of your department to a conference in Ottawa tomorrow with my officials and the social agencies on these problems.

Before coming into the house this evening I was advised that the deputy minister of Mr. Nickle's department will be here tomorrow for that meeting. Up to now I myself have not made any specific approach to any provincial government with one exception. The premier of British Columbia called on me the other day about another matter and at that time I took advantage—perhaps that is the right term to use—of his visit to tell him that I was not only the superintendent general of Indian affairs but also the minister of immigration and that in that capacity I expected to present the provincial authorities and the local authorities in British Columbia with some problems that I hoped they would do their share to meet.

An hon. Member: They will.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Bennett assured me—and he said I could say so publicly; otherwise I would not be saying it—that they would do their share. Personally I hope they will do a little more than their share because they are so obviously wealthier than any of the rest of us. But at least if they do their share it will be a great help.

In that connection I think, at the risk of seeming to be sentimental, I should like to tell the house of something that happened in Vancouver a week ago Saturday afternoon. I undertook to receive the executive of the native brotherhood of British Columbia. I also agreed at four o'clock that afternoon to receive a delegation of Hungarian Canadians who wanted to discuss this refugee problem. The two appointments slightly overlapped and I could see, through the glazed doors of the office, that the Hungarians had arrived before the meeting with the Indians was quite over. I said to the Indians that these Hungarian Canadians were coming to talk to me about the unfortunate refugees in Vienna and I thought it would be a rather nice thing if I brought them in before the Indians left so that the Indians could express their sympathy to these people. They came in and this happened very pleasantly.

Then that meeting ended and I started my discussion with the Hungarians. Within five minutes there was a knock on the door and the president and one of the other officers of the native brotherhood came in and said,

"Mr. Pickersgill, there is one more thing we want to talk to you about". I started to excuse myself to go out and they said, "No; we do not want to go out. We have had a meeting out in the hall and we thought we should not just use words to express our feelings". They put \$50 on the table. I am confident that if other Canadians—all the rest of us who are descendants of immigrants or immigrants themselves—do as much as these Indians, who are not very wealthy, did that day, and if we do our full share to help solve this problem, we shall have no trouble in this country in absorbing all those Hungarians who are willing—and many of them will not be—to come to Canada in the winter.

For my part I think in due course the problem in Vienna will resolve itself, but that there will be another problem after that one. Many of these people who have gone to Germany, to England, to France or to other countries to go into refugee camps are not going to want to stay there. As time goes on and as this most immediate problem in Austria is alleviated, I think the next step we will want to take is to arrange to send teams into these camps and do what we can to get those people to come here also.

I do not want to conceal from the house my opinion, and the opinion upon which the government intend to proceed next year with our immigration policy, namely that we are going to need all the people we can get next year in order to get done the essential work that ought to be done in this country. I am not at all worried about the able-bodied people, the people who are able to take any kind of work and are willing to do it, and who are able to support themselves. But, as I said before, I am somewhat worried about those who are going to come because of the policy we have undertaken and who, over the years, are going to be problems for themselves and for us. I do say that I will welcome, as will my department and the government and, as I am sure all of us will, every offer of co-operation; and by offer I mean a tangible, concrete offer on the line, with details about what is proposed to be done and not just vague expressions to the effect that the government ought to do something. We will do everything we can, but I do not want to be responsible for bringing to Canada people who are going to have to live for very long in our immigration halls. Handsome as they are, I do not think they are going to be very much happier in immigration halls than they would be in relief camps on the other side of the Atlantic.

As I said in Vancouver, I am all for bringing to Canada all of these people who will

The Address—Mr. Green

be better off and happier here. But the government alone cannot make them better off and happier. We are going to bring here as many as want to come and for whom we can provide transportation, but we are going to need all the help we can get from everyone able to help us if this thing is to be a real success and a credit to Canada.

Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra): Mr. Speaker, before going on with the main portion of my speech this evening I should like to say a word about the speech which has just been made by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill). I hope he will not feel that he is doing everything that could be done to get these patriots from Hungary to Canada. After all, the actions of these people have aroused great sympathy in the minds and the hearts of the Canadian people from coast to coast. Furthermore, by their actions in Hungary they have shown that they would make excellent Canadian citizens. We cannot have too many citizens of this kind who have known the tragedies of communism and who are prepared to stand up and fight against it. I hope the minister will have a further look at his plans. For example, why should not Canada extend an invitation to these refugees right in Austria, pointing out to them the advantages of coming to Canada? From his remarks I took it that the minister was just worrying about getting out those people who happen to ask about coming to Canada.

Mr. Pickersgill: I am sure the hon. gentleman is not trying to be unfair. I said that we were asked by the Austrian government not to go into the camps. As long as that is the view of the Austrian government we will not go into the camps; but the day the Austrian government invites us to go there, or the next day, I will send a team there.

Mr. Green: I have one other suggestion which perhaps the minister will take a little more kindly. It seems to me that it would be possible for him, with the co-operation of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Gregg), to set up some scheme of rehabilitation under which these patriots coming to Canada can be assisted to learn skills which will fit them into our industrial life,—and possibly also into our agricultural life.

Then I should like to say a word about the speech by the leader of the C.C.F., the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart (Mr. Coldwell). Unfortunately I was not able to hear that speech, but I understand that he largely followed the line of the Labour party in the United Kingdom which, of course, is what we expect in this house from his party on these questions. I understand also that he

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

said the people of Great Britain were overwhelmingly opposed to the policies followed by the Eden government. It so happens that I have here a dispatch to the *Vancouver Sun* from my neighbour, the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott), who was in the United Kingdom last week. This is in the issue of November 20, and here is what he had to say on that point. I do not always vouch for his accuracy, but probably in this case he is nearly right. He said:

Several factors have tended to push the Suez crisis out of the picture here.

That is in England.

The cease-fire in Egypt changed the public attitude in the twinkling of an eye. Instead of being damned up hill and down dale by half the nation as the man who got Britain into a war, Eden was and is increasingly hailed as the man whose timely action prevented the third world war.

I hope the member for Vancouver South will take the same stand when he speaks in this debate. Then he went on to say:

Several staunch supporters of the Labour party have told me privately that they think the Prime Minister did the right thing in the circumstances.

Feelings on these questions raised by the Suez crisis, Mr. Speaker, are running very deep in Canada, far deeper I believe than the government has the slightest conception. Listening to the Prime Minister I could not help but think he has been living in some other land altogether so far as public reaction to these issues is concerned, and particularly reaction to the attitude of the Canadian government.

This attitude has come as a great shock to millions of Canadian people. In Vancouver the story broke in the headlines on October 31, and I must admit that even I was shocked, although the stand taken was just in line with the stand this government has been taking for the last 10 years. It has been going steadily in the direction of the stand taken on this occasion. This time they happened to get caught. They spoke off the cuff before they had a nice, cover-up explanation prepared. Here we have the headlines, "Canada Turns Her Back on U.K."—it should have been the U.K. and France—"Supports U.S.". This is a dispatch by Mr. Leiterman and it begins this way:

With a wrench that will make history, Canada turned her back on Great Britain Tuesday night . . .

Then he went on to point out the ill-concealed annoyance shown by the minister for external affairs when he was interviewed on this particular day. Mr. Leiterman had this to say:

Mr. Pearson had three possible courses. He could have supported Britain. He could have

The Address—Mr. Green

supported the U.S. or he could, like Australia in the security council, have abstained and said nothing at all.

Hesitantly, almost as if surprised at his own boldness he chose in effect to desert Britain and "associate" Canada with the United States.

That was on October 31.

Mr. Pearson: May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he tell me to what he is referring in reading that newspaper, what vote?

Mr. Green: I am referring to a report of a press conference or an interview by the minister with the press, and the date of the report in the *Vancouver Province* is October 31. This was only the beginning. The minister went down to the United Nations, I believe it was on November 2, after the United Kingdom and France had vetoed the resolution brought into the security council, and he voted with Russia and the United States against the United Kingdom and France to put this question on the agenda of the assembly.

Mr. Pearson: Everybody else did, too.

Mr. Green: Let the minister and the government laugh it off. This afternoon the Prime Minister was very careful not to refer to that. He had not a word to say about that particular vote. He talked about—

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): He very firmly approves of that vote.

Mr. Brooks: That does not make it right.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): And the fact that you say it is wrong does not make it wrong.

Mr. Green: The Prime Minister had an opportunity to make his speech this afternoon, and perhaps he will allow me to make mine.

This afternoon the Prime Minister said that when the vote came up about the cease-fire, then Canada abstained. He did not explain that while the minister for external affairs abstained, in his speech the minister showed very clearly that he was condemning the United Kingdom and France. The Prime Minister should have made that clear. This has been the course followed by this government right down through the piece since this serious situation first arose.

Again, just two days ago in the assembly of the United Nations when the second resolution about the cease-fire was under discussion the minister got up and said that this was all wrong, there had already been a resolution passed and the United Kingdom, France and Israel were complying with it. They had already taken steps to comply with that resolution and this second resolution

should not be passed. Then the Canadian government did not have the courage to get up and vote against it. Only the United Kingdom, France, Israel, Australia and New Zealand voted against that foolish and provocative resolution. The Canadian government, representing the land of courageous people, did not have the backbone to get up and vote against that resolution; they were so busy currying favour with the United States.

The feature of the speech the Prime Minister delivered today, Mr. Speaker, was the anger, almost the hatred he showed in his remarks. I wish the Canadian people could have been here to watch him.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): So do I.

Mr. Green: He made a violent attack on the big nations.

Mr. Garson: It is too bad they cannot hear you.

Mr. Green: He talked about the use of the veto. The veto was written into the United Nations charter because the big nations have to carry a great deal of responsibility. But the Prime Minister pushed that aside and talked about the life of a person in a small nation being as valuable as in a big nation.

Mr. Hosking: Is that not true?

Mr. Green: It is just dragging a red herring across the trail. Then he went on to talk about the United Kingdom and France taking the law into their own hands, and in effect the Prime Minister lumped the United Kingdom and France with Russia in his condemnation.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): How silly can you be?

Mr. Green: Then he made this amazing statement. He said, "The era of supermen in Europe is coming to an end". I suppose he considers that all the supermen are in the Canadian government. If they are not all in the Canadian government, then I presume the opinion of this same Prime Minister is that they are in the United States government. Here you have the prime minister of France and Prime Minister Eden of the United Kingdom. They do not claim to be supermen. I am amazed at the Prime Minister of Canada making slurring remarks of that kind this afternoon. Those men in the United Kingdom and France are simply doing the best they can for their people; they are trying to give good leadership. I suppose the Prime Minister of Canada sneers at Sir Winston Churchill as a superman and includes him in his nasty, biting remarks this afternoon. His whole attitude this afternoon was one of bitterness.

The Address—Mr. Green

Mr. Pickersgill: We have one doing that right now.

Mr. Green: The Uncle Louis kissing babies went out the window this afternoon; so smug, so full of self-righteousness, so hypocritical.

Where was Canada earlier this year when this question was blowing up? This government was washing its hands of the whole problem. Now young Canadians are going to have to go to the Middle East, perhaps to fight in the Middle East, perhaps to stand up against young men from Great Britain and France. There is the situation we may be facing in the near future; yet this spring and summer the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the Prime Minister took the position, well, the Suez is a long way off; Canada is not concerned. They did nothing about it, nothing to try to solve the problem. All the time President Nasser was openly boasting that he was out to destroy Israel and to drive the United Kingdom and France out of the Middle East. He was fomenting trouble in North Africa for the French. The Canadian government was not interested at all.

Then he seized the canal. He had no right to do it. That action was taken in direct and violent breach of the treaty. The United Kingdom and France moved their troops into the Mediterranean area at that time. The Canadian government knew it; the whole world knew it. These two nations had to act to save their own national existence. What did Canada do? I hold in my hand a press dispatch of July 28, headed, "Canada Plans No Move On Suez Canal". The dispatch goes on to say:

Canada is making no representations in the Egyptian nationalization of the Suez canal, External Affairs Minister Pearson told the Journal.

The subject was brought up in the house by the Leader of the Opposition on July 30. He asked the Prime Minister this question:

In view of the developments over the week end, has the government given consideration to the advisability of presenting a formal protest to Egypt which would indicate the position of this government in relation to the events which have taken place there in a manner that is not merely a question of reporting, but would constitute a direct representation from this government?

And here is the answer of this Prime Minister, who is so full of indignation today, reported at page 6655 of *Hansard*. Here is his answer at that time:

The matter has, of course, been under consideration, but we have not decided yet to submit any formal protest.

I do not believe any formal protest was ever submitted. The United States took the same attitude at that time. I hold in my hand a statement by Defence Secretary Wilson. It is quoted on August 8, and reads as follows:

Defence Secretary Wilson today described the Suez situation as a "relatively small thing".

The article goes on:

At another point, a reporter asked Wilson if he looked upon the Suez crisis as a minor upset. He replied: "You described it well".

That was Canada and the United States just a few months ago, absolutely failing to take any stand to try to clear up the situation in the Suez at that time.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

Mr. Green: I move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Green the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Harris: Mr. Speaker, we shall continue with the debate tomorrow.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 27, 1956

The house met at eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR—PRIME MINISTER
OF CEYLON

Mr. Speaker: May I be allowed to draw your attention to the presence in the diplomatic gallery of a distinguished visitor, Hon. S. W. R. D. Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of Ceylon. May I add that although Ceylon lies many miles away from Canada cordial relations exist between our two countries. This is Mr. Bandaranaike's first visit to our country, and we hope that in the future he and his countrymen will find many other occasions to come and see us.

Mr. Bandaranaike is an accomplished parliamentarian.

(Translation):

Coming, as we know, from the parliament of a sister nation, he will be quite familiar with the procedure we are following here. We wish him a very hearty welcome.

(Text):

We wish him a very hearty welcome indeed and a most pleasant stay in our country, which we wish could be longer.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN STANDING ORDERS FOR
PRESENT SESSION

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as arranged yesterday I now wish to move a motion which comprises the four last paragraphs of the motion I read yesterday and which would now read as follows:

That the following changes be made in the procedure of the house for the present session:

1. That the provisions of standing order 42 requiring unanimous consent for a motion in a case of urgent and pressing necessity be suspended.
2. That standing order 65 respecting the appointment of standing committees be suspended.
3. That the provisions of standing orders 75 and 78, restricting bills to a separate reading in each sitting be suspended.
4. That standing orders 81, 85 and 120 respecting the presentation of certain reports and the printing and distribution of a list of statutory documents be suspended.

Mr. Speaker: Have hon. members heard the motion?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I just say a brief
81537—4½

word? I am sure that all of us are prepared to support this motion, since its purpose is to make such changes as are necessary in order that we may deal expeditiously with the business that is before us. However, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a joker in what was paragraph 4 of the resolution presented yesterday and what is now paragraph 1 in the motion made by the Prime Minister. I recognize that this is copied from a similar proposal made in 1950 and that that in turn was copied from a similar proposal made in 1939.

May I ask the house to note this fact. Standing order 41 requires 40 hours' notice of motions and so on. Standing order 42 is a relieving section which provides that in certain cases such notice is not required. It strikes me that if you suspend the relieving section that puts us back to standing order 41 and requires a notice in all cases. I do not blame the Prime Minister for the mistake, because he has copied what was done in 1950 and that was copied from what was done in 1939, but does it not defeat the very purpose of the motion which the Prime Minister has made? I can assure the Prime Minister that if the motion carries I will not insist that standing order 41 be followed in all cases but that, in my view, would be the technical position.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): The hon. gentleman seems to be theoretically right, Mr. Speaker, though in 1939 and 1950 it presented no real difficulty. It perhaps would be better, if I had the unanimous consent of the house so to do, to make it read that standing orders 41 and 42 be suspended for purposes where unanimous consent is required by standing order 42. I think if we inserted the words "standing orders 41 and 42" we would achieve the result which was practically achieved in 1939 and 1950. If that is agreeable to the house, perhaps the Clerk could modify the motion accordingly, and the precedent which was set in 1939 and 1950 would be completed this time and made to conform better with the text of the rules if ever there is another occasion where it is necessary for us to have an emergency session.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): In view of the Prime Minister's statement yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and the fact that there is just one bill, we are quite prepared to go along with it.

Business of the House

Mr. Speaker: Is the house agreeable to the amendment proposed by the Prime Minister?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Therefore the motion will read:

That the following changes be made in the procedure of the house for the present session:

1. That the provisions of standing orders 41 and 42 requiring unanimous consent for a motion in a case of urgent and pressing necessity be suspended.

2. That standing order 65 respecting the appointment of standing committees be suspended.

3. That the provisions of standing orders 75 and 78, restricting bills to a separate reading in each sitting be suspended.

4. That standing orders 81, 85 and 120 respecting the presentation of certain reports and the printing and distribution of a list of statutory documents be suspended.

I think that first paragraph should be further amended to read:

That the provisions of standing order 41 requiring 48 hours' notice and standing order 42 requiring unanimous consent . . .

Is that terminology agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS

INQUIRY AS TO COMPONENTS OF CANADA'S
CONTRIBUTION TO EMERGENCY FORCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Esquimalt-Saanich): May I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence which I think would help clarify the situation and enable us to have an orderly debate on the speech from the throne. Can the minister inform the house as to the composition of the navy, army and air force units of the proposed Canadian contribution to the United Nations emergency force?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): As at present constituted, Mr. Speaker, the Royal Canadian Navy would be providing, if required, 600, and they would represent the present crew of the *Magnificent*. The normal crew of an aircraft carrier is substantially over 1,000, but there will be no requirement for a flight deck crew and various other elements in the *Magnificent's* present role. The crew has therefore been reduced to approximately 600, which would be ample for the purposes for which she would be engaged if used.

With regard to the air force, the over-all number contemplated is 599. This would consist of roughly 130 for aircrew and operational crew; 282 for aircraft maintenance; a

[Mr. Rowe.]

few administrative personnel; 60 supply and engineering personnel and a small medical and hospital unit. The total of the two services would therefore be approximately 1,200 of the 2,500 contemplated in the order in council. The remainder would be army personnel.

Perhaps I might give some breakdown of that element. The army personnel would amount to 1,257, which would be made up of the Queen's Own Rifles, totalling 952, and the Canadian base in the Middle East totalling 305. This base unit will consist of 53 engineers from the Royal Canadian engineering corps; 50 signallers from the signal corps; 63 from the army service corps; 58 medical and dental personnel; 22 from the ordnance corps and RCEME and a few provost, pay corps, etc.

Mr. Pearkes: May I ask a supplementary question? The air force component is entirely for the transport squadron, and no other type of aircraft or air force unit would be sent other than the air transport squadron?

Mr. Campney: The transport squadron will be the air component of the force. A squadron is established at Capodichino near Naples, and it will be running a shuttle service for the United Nations to Abu Suweir in Egypt. In addition to that, the Royal Canadian Air Force will be running, for the present at least, and probably for some time to come, an extensive shuttle service between Canada and Naples with North Stars.

Mr. Alistair Stewart (Winnipeg North): May I ask another question of the Minister of National Defence? With what uniforms are our forces in the Middle East supplied, with battle dress or with summer uniforms?

Mr. Campney: They will basically wear our army service dress. I am informed that all of the troops who go to the UN forces are being supplied with blue helmets, blue berets and flashes on their shoulders, as distinguishing marks.

Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North): Am I to understand that at the moment the dress is battle dress, because that can be a sore affliction in the Sinai desert. I think they ought to be supplied with summer dress, if possible, which is needed there.

Mr. Campney: That is under consideration now.

INQUIRY AS TO COST OF PREPARING CANADIAN
CONTINGENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Could

Inquiries of the Ministry

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO X-RAYING OF HUNGARIAN
REFUGEES

the minister tell us what was the cost of air-lifting the Queen's Own Rifles from Calgary to Halifax and what was the cost of refitting the *Magnificent* in order to transport them overseas?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker, not at the moment. Those costs are being computed but they are not available yet.

Mr. Harkness: I wonder if the minister could obtain that information for us and perhaps give it to us tomorrow?

Mr. Campney: I shall endeavour to do so.

TRADE

INQUIRY AS TO EFFECT ON CANADA OF CLOSER
UNITED KINGDOM-EUROPEAN RELATIONS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the current reports from the United Kingdom as to negotiations for establishing closer trade relations between the United Kingdom and countries of western Europe, what are the views of the Canadian government as to the effect upon Canadian trade with the United Kingdom, and what steps, if any, are being taken by the Canadian government to communicate those views to the United Kingdom in this matter?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, an official statement of the position of the Canadian government was published some two or three weeks ago. I have not it at hand, but I shall be pleased to obtain it and read it into the records of the house. The operation probably will not begin for 18 months and will be completed in 10 years. The purpose of the Canadian government will be to study the situation very carefully as it develops, and we are somewhat confident that the United Kingdom will recognize the Canadian position in case difficulties are encountered.

Mr. Fleming: Am I to take it that there is something further to be communicated apart from the Prime Minister's statement published a few days ago? If so, was there any recent communication with the United Kingdom government expressing the views of the Canadian government in this matter?

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): As I understand it, the text of the statement that was published was the Canadian government's answer to the minister of finance of the United Kingdom.

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. Fraser (Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration. Has the Department of Citizenship and Immigration eliminated all chest X-rays of Hungarian refugees coming in to Canada to make it easier for them to come here, and will these refugees, if they are not X-rayed over there, be looked after by the federal government if they have tuberculosis when they come to Canada?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): The situation is this. Orders have been given not to allow the taking of X-rays to interfere with the flow of immigration. If there is time to take them, they are taken. If there is not time to take them a note is given to that effect, and arrangements will be made for the taking of the X-rays after the refugees get to Canada. We are seeking, in the usual way, to make arrangements with provincial and local authorities for the treatment of people who may need treatment, and I do hope in that connection we shall get co-operation in deeds as well as in words.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): I should like to ask one more question, Mr. Speaker. If those who are X-rayed over there have tuberculosis will they be allowed in as others will be allowed in who are not X-rayed?

Mr. Pickersgill: They will be allowed in as quickly as arrangements can be made for proper treatment. If they are the kind of active cases that might cause trouble to other people we are trying to take sensible measures to deal with those cases.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): That is what I wanted to know. Thank you.

GRAIN

WHEAT—INQUIRY AS TO EARLY INTERIM
PAYMENT ON 1955 CROP

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Will the minister say whether an interim payment on the 1955 wheat crop can be made at an early date in order to relieve the current cash shortage in western Canada, where a majority of the farmers have not been able to meet their 1956 operating expenses?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): In reply to the question, I cannot say.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION FOR POINTS
ON LOW QUOTAS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Can the minister give the assurance that those marketing points that ended the last crop year on low quotas will be given immediate consideration for the supply of box cars to bring them up to those marketing points which ended with a higher quota, which was the assurance given by the minister?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that that is and has been the policy of the wheat board. I have not followed the matter in detail, but I believe that policy is being attended to.

[Later:]

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Kindersley (Mr. Johnson). I wonder if the minister would look into the possibility of ascertaining why a great many of these points discriminated against last year are still being discriminated against. Many points that wound up last year with low delivery quotas continue to have quotas this year which are lower than those at some other points.

Mr. Howe (Port Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into the question.

INQUIRY AS TO ALLOCATION OF BOX CARS

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): May I direct a question, then, to the Minister of Transport. Can the Minister of Transport give the house any indication concerning when a transport controller will be appointed to carry out the recommendations of the Canadian wheat board in the allocation of box cars?

Hon. George C. Marler (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there is a transport controller in office at the present time, and when the office becomes vacant consideration will be given to appointing a successor.

OLD AGE PENSIONS

INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE INCREASE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Now that the Prime

[Mr. Argue.]

Minister has revealed in a public statement a portion of what is in next session's speech from the throne having to do with the Canada Council and university grants, I wonder if he is prepared to make a statement as to what the government proposes to recommend to parliament with regard to increasing the amount of the old age pension?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): That is not something which has been revealed, and I am not in a position to reveal it at this moment.

Mr. G. K. Fraser (Peterborough): Will it be revealed before the election?

An hon. Member: It is quite possible.

DRUGS

PEYOTE—INQUIRY AS TO USE BY CANADIAN
INDIANS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. A. M. Campbell (The Battlefords): Mr. Speaker, has the Department of National Health and Welfare received any indication that the use of peyote is spreading among Canadian Indians? Does the department consider peyote to be a dangerous substance? I would also like to know if steps are being considered to ban the importation of peyote buttons into Canada or to otherwise control it?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Perhaps in the absence of the minister I might say that we in the Indian affairs branch are quite concerned about this subject, and there are consultations going on both with the minister's department and with the Department of National Revenue about this matter. Possibly the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. McCann), who also acts for the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin), will be able to say something about it before the session ends.

FINANCE

REPORTED RESULTS OF INCREASE IN INTEREST
RATES BY BANK OF CANADA

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Erhart Regier (Burnaby-Coquitlam): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Has the minister been made aware that because of the action of the Bank of Canada it is becoming exceedingly difficult for municipal governments to market bonds at suitable interest rates, and is consideration still being given by his government to the question of supplying the municipalities with low interest money for self-liquidating projects?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the question indicates a complete misunderstanding of the money market at the moment. It is not the action of the Bank of Canada which is causing the rise in interest rates, it is the demand on the money supply both in business and in government circles; and the Bank of Canada interest rate is only a reflection of the increased interest rates in the money market.

Mr. J. M. Macdonnell (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question. Does the minister intend us to understand by that statement that the Bank of Canada has nothing whatever to do with the interest rate prevailing at the moment?

Mr. Harris: The answer, Mr. Speaker, was intended to dispel the notion that the Bank of Canada at some time in recent memory consciously raised interest rates in Canada. That seems to be the impression, and that was the impression I thought was in the mind of the questioner a moment ago.

Mr. Fleming: Why do you not answer the last question?

Mr. Macdonnell: May I ask the Minister of Finance if he will answer my question?

Mr. Harris: As I understand it, the question was whether or not the Bank of Canada has any influence over interest rates in Canada. The Bank of Canada discount rate, as my hon. friend knows quite well, is the rate at which the Bank of Canada will lend money to the chartered banks upon request. It is true that they can maintain an interest rate if they like at a certain level, but on the other hand if it became profitable for the chartered banks to borrow from the Bank of Canada at a certain interest rate and then lend that money on short term to the government at a higher interest rate, it would appear that the Bank of Canada was not discharging its duties.

Consequently it has been the policy of the Bank of Canada not to have its discount rate lower than the going short-term money market, that is the 91-day treasury bill rate which is fixed largely by the law of supply and demand in that it is fixed weekly by tenders made by the financial institutions for the lending of an average of \$100 million to \$130 million to the government of Canada. As I have said, the Bank of Canada has maintained its rate higher than that weekly rate for the reason I have given, that it would be extremely unusual to have the bank lending money to the chartered banks which in turn would lend it to the government of Canada, making a profit thereon.

So to the extent that the Bank of Canada discount rate is increased it is a reflection of the higher cost of money in the financial market. When it is said that the Bank of Canada rate was increased and thereby other rates were increased, it is just merely putting the cart before the horse because it is the reverse.

Mr. Macdonnell: I thank the minister for his dissertation, but I would point out to him that he has not yet answered my question.

Mr. Regier: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question, although I realize that the minister does not have to answer anything. Is it the policy of his government that municipalities are supposed to be discouraged from the building of schools, hospitals, roads and bridges in order that investment capital may be made available for the development of private industry in Canada?

Mr. Harris: We have no policy which would say to a municipal corporation, "You shall not construct schools, hospitals, sewers" and all those things which may be needed. As I said in the house last session and have said several times since, we have at the present time in Canada a greater demand for goods, services and labour than it may be within our ability to produce. I have cautioned in every speech I have made against that demand increasing to the point where we shall have inflation of a much more serious nature than we have experienced in recent times.

This has meant that in all sectors of the economy difficulty has been found at one time or another either to borrow money to the extent one would like or to carry on certain construction work. This has affected municipal corporations, as it was said last session that it had affected the housing industry. To some extent it has affected even the government of Canada, because the borrowings which we announced today are at a higher interest rate than we have paid before.

If a municipal corporation finds that as an elected body it has to choose between paying a higher rate of interest and postponing work it has in mind, that is simply a responsibility which comes to all of us at one time or another, whether it be the federal or a provincial or a municipal government, or indeed a business institution.

Mr. J. C. Van Horne (Restigouche-Madawaska): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Has he given consideration to the crippling effect his policy has had on the economy of the maritime provinces, one of the poorest areas of Canada?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Harris: I am not too sure about the precise status of the maritime provinces' economy, but I would not describe it as "crippling" or anything like that.

Mr. J. H. Ferguson (Simcoe North): Is the Minister of Finance aware that in the community I come from it is absolutely impossible to borrow one dollar from the banks to build a home, and that the banks openly and by letter have said that this is due to the ruling of the Bank of Canada or the government? You cannot borrow money in Collingwood today to build a residence, and the banks are openly saying that this is because of the government's action. Is the minister aware of that fact?

Mr. Harris: No, I am not, but I am always ready to learn from my neighbour in Simcoe North.

Mr. Ferguson: It is time you were aware of it.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if there is any truth in the rumour that seems to be current in business circles that interest rates will be lowered by some arrangement between the Bank of Canada and the government before next June.

Mr. Knowles: Why next June?

PRAIRIE FARM REHABILITATION**INQUIRY AS TO POSSIBLE WIDER APPLICATION OF ACT**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. S. Zaplitny (Dauphin): May I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the intention of the minister to recommend to the house at the next session an extension of the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, or to introduce a new act to take its place which will have wider application in Canada?

Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, that matter will be given consideration between now and the time the session opens, and if there is any action to be taken it will be announced.

IRRIGATION**SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION OF DAM**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the statement the Prime Minister made on the rehabilitation of land areas of marginal productivity, can we conclude that an immediate start will be

[Mr. Van Horne.]

made on the South Saskatchewan river dam to correct the situation in those areas?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, that would not be a logical conclusion.

HOUSE OF COMMONS**REQUEST FOR PRINTING OF P.C. 1956/1712 AS AN APPENDIX TO "HANSARD"**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Will the Prime Minister consider asking the consent of the house to include as an appendix to today's *Hansard* the order in council he tabled yesterday, P.C. 1956/1712, which is the order putting certain troops on active service? Perhaps I should have made this suggestion yesterday, but in any event it seems to me this order is of sufficient importance that it should be more readily available than is the case at the present time. I have secured a copy myself, but it seems to me it might well be included as an appendix to *Hansard* of today.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): If it is felt by hon. members that it would be more convenient to have it printed as an appendix and I have the unanimous consent of the house to make such a suggestion, I will be glad to do so. It is possible to obtain copies from the privy council office, but if hon. members feel it would be more convenient for them to have it printed as an appendix to *Votes and Proceedings*—

Mr. Knowles: *Hansard*.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East):—to *Hansard*, the government has no objection to that being done. It will be only a very small item of expense and it can be done if it suits the convenience of hon. members to have it in that form. I suppose it would also be convenient for those who get *Hansard* to have it as an appendix. Perhaps the sense of the house would be that Your Honour would direct the editor of debates to annex it to today's *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: If that is the sense of the house I shall be glad to do so. I am sure the Clerk has already taken note of this and the matter will be taken care of.

(For text of order in council see page 105.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE**CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY**

The house resumed, from Monday, November 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Legare for an address to His Excellency

The Address—Mr. Green

the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra): Mr. Speaker, before the house adjourned last evening I had pointed out how unfortunate it was that the Canadian government had been so little concerned about the situation in the Suez area early in the present year. I went on to trace the happenings in that area and had reached the unlawful seizure of the canal by Egypt. Today I should like to continue along that line by pointing out that throughout all this time and subsequent to the seizure there had been a steady build-up of Russian arms in Egypt. The Prime Minister did not attempt yesterday to deny that fact, and of course he could not. In today's press we read that a similar build-up is going on in Syria.

On October 29 Israel, fearful that she was about to be attacked on all sides, attacked the Egyptians. The United Kingdom and France warned both Israel and Egypt that they must stop fighting within a period of 12 hours, otherwise the canal zone would be occupied. The United Kingdom had a perfect right to occupy the canal zone in the event of it being endangered by war. It had that right under the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian agreement signed, I believe, in October of 1954.

What was the reaction of Egypt? She at once took steps to block the canal, a most irresponsible action. She sank many vessels in the channel, yet is now asking other nations, including Canada, to pay to have the canal cleared. It will be interesting to know how much money Canada is to pay to help in that work. It was very strange yesterday that the Prime Minister of this country did not have one word to say in condemnation of the action of Egypt in blocking the canal or her other actions. His whole attitude to Egypt is unbelievably soft. Yet the minute the United Kingdom and France moved, Canada rushed to condemn them.

The man on the street in Canada is asking today, and has asked ever since the Canadian government took such action, why Canada took the lead in the attack on her friends. The Prime Minister smiles. He seems to think this is a laughing matter.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I seem to think that the hon. gentleman is imagining things that never took place.

Mr. Green: Well, if the Prime Minister will not believe me perhaps he may believe the statement made by a great Canadian

Liberal newspaper, the *Vancouver Sun*. I have here an editorial which appeared in that paper on November 19, 1956.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): That statement is also a laughing matter.

Mr. Green: Oh, I know everybody is wrong but the Prime Minister and his superman cabinet. The editorial is headed: "Ottawa Please Note. U.N. Must Face up to Russia or it has no Future." The *Sun* quotes a portion of the speech made by Sir Anthony Eden in which he uttered these words:

There is too much of a tendency in the world to hound the democracies because it is a safe thing to do, and to condone and even excuse dictatorships because they cannot be coerced.

Then the *Sun* goes on to say:

How true all this is. How fervently the nations, large and small, jumped on Britain and France. And Canada led the way with smug complacency. . . .

Judging from what Ottawa reporters are writing, Ottawa is filled with satisfaction with the eminence it appears to have attained by chastising its friends instead of standing by them in their attempt to save themselves and the free world from a great Russian conspiracy.

Surely the Canadian government could at least have waited. Australia waited in the security council. She abstained from voting. In the assembly Australia, New Zealand and South Africa abstained from voting, but not Canada. Canada had to be right up there in the front rank attacking the United Kingdom and France.

Mr. Ferguson: Tear your friends apart.

Mr. Green: In effect the Canadian government treated the United Kingdom and France as aggressors. When I mentioned last evening this vote that Canada cast with Russia and the United States in the assembly the Prime Minister blurted out with venom "We would do it again". That is his attitude today. It was not only his attitude a month ago but it is the attitude of the Prime Minister of Canada today.

It so happens that hundreds of thousands of Canadians have been associated with the people of the United Kingdom and France. They know something about those two countries and from personal experience they know a great deal about their people. They know that no other two countries have ever done so much to preserve our way of life. In the first war at Verdun hundreds of thousands of young Frenchmen gave their lives. At the Somme the very flower of the United Kingdom was wiped out in order to preserve the democratic way of life. In the second world war France and the United Kingdom stood up against the aggressors when other

The Address—Mr. Green

nations who now talk a great deal were not sufficiently concerned to do the same thing.

France and the United Kingdom stood up against the aggressors. France unfortunately went down and suffered for years under the heel of the Nazi hordes. The United Kingdom and the other nations of the Commonwealth stood alone for a whole year from June of 1940 until the summer of 1941, when Russia was shot into the war. They stood alone and saved civilization. The Canadian people know, even if the Prime Minister does not, that the United Kingdom and France have never been aggressors and are not aggressors on this occasion. Yet the Prime Minister yesterday had the effrontery to compare the actions of the United Kingdom and France with the actions of Russia in Hungary.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I protest—

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I protest against this statement, which is an entire misconstruction of what is the official record of the debates in this house. No hon. gentleman who wishes to remain such should make such distortions.

Mr. Green: The Prime Minister once again is attempting to prevent free discussion in this house.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If that is the kind of thing the hon. gentleman conceives to be freedom of speech, I must say that I disagree.

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Rowe: The hon. member has the floor.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra has the floor.

Mr. Green: Actually the United Kingdom and France by their action—taken, I am sure in the full realization of the tremendous risk involved—prevented a Russian-dominated Middle East, and prevented a major war. The United Nations could never have done it. The United Nations was taking no steps to meet that situation. Now the United Kingdom, France and Israel are co-operating with the United Nations and they are being kicked in the teeth for their pains. I will read again the first paragraph of the amendment:

That this house regrets that Your Excellency's advisers

(1) have followed a course of gratuitous condemnation of the action of the United Kingdom and France which was designed to prevent a major war in the Suez area.

[Mr. Green.]

Could anything more accurately set out the actual facts or more accurately describe the action taken by this Canadian government? Paragraph 2 regrets that Your Excellency's advisers—

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

In the last ten years this government has been currying favour with the United States. Ever since the second world war that has been the policy of the Canadian government. The Prime Minister realizes that the government is subject to attack on this point. Yesterday he made a great flurry about the matter. "Oh," he said, "we did not vote with the United States on two of these resolutions". No; they did not vote with the United States, but they carefully did not vote against them. Canada abstained. I wonder what would happen if the Prime Minister wanted to go and visit the posts on the D.E.W. line in northern Canada? I presume he, like other Canadians, would be obliged to get clearance at New York before he could visit those posts.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Green: I object.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): The hon. gentleman knows that is absolutely false. He knows that no Canadian is obliged to get clearance from the United States authorities.

Mr. Rowe: Page Blair Fraser.

Mr. Green: The Prime Minister is in the same kindly, friendly, Uncle Louis mood today that he was in last night.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): He will remain in that mood as long as there is the occasion that the hon. gentleman is providing.

Mr. Green: Mr. Speaker, I hope you will remember all these interruptions when you are checking my time.

United States policy in the Middle East, as far as anybody can tell what it is, has been this. In the first place, a few months ago they refused to finance the Aswan dam in Egypt. That was the direct cause of the seizure by Egypt of the Suez canal. At that time the Americans were being very tough with President Nasser. Now the policy has been completely reversed because they think he will play along with them, this stooge of the Russians. American foreign policy now is to build him up and presumably to get the United Kingdom and France out of the Middle East. Canada's policy seems to be the same. The Prime Minister yesterday made

The Address—Mr. Pearson

no statement to show that Canada's policy in the Middle East is any different from that of the United States.

The situation is very clearly summed up in one of our British Columbia weekly papers, namely the Agassiz-Harrison *Advance* of November 15, as follows:

Canada and the United States would have been wise to remember that Britain and France were the best friends they had. They have gone a long way now towards destroying both the friends and the friendship, without gaining anything to replace them.

This policy of the Canadian government may well be disastrous to Canada. The United States would have far more admiration for Canada, Mr. Speaker, if this government stopped being the United States chore boy.

Then the third paragraph of the amendment reads:

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

Oh, the Prime Minister was so naive about that paragraph yesterday. Dear old Nasser, he would not do anything wrong. The Prime Minister said Canada has had no dealings with President Nasser. Then he went on to admit that the statements carried in the press about Nasser vetoing the sending of the Queen's Own Rifles to the Middle East were correct. He admitted that President Nasser had advised against it. Then he went on to say that we had to take time because these Canadian troops were going to serve in the Sinai desert. I thought they were going to serve in the Suez canal area, and that some steps were being taken by this United Nations emergency police force to settle finally the Suez canal dispute. Apparently the Canadians are to be sent into the Sinai desert.

All the way through his remarks about this paragraph of the amendment the Prime Minister had nothing but soft words for President Nasser. Why, he said, President Nasser had told General Burns, I think it was, that he was anxious to retain good relations with Canada. Why on earth would he not be; this tinpot dictator, to whom Canada has been a better friend than she has to the United Kingdom and France in this crisis?

This Suez crisis has shown once again very clearly that the present Canadian government has been too long in office. Their actions in connection with the amendment to the Defence Production Act in 1955 showed us how they thought they were supermen, that they had all the answers. This year there was a similar type of action during the closure on the pipe-line debate. Now this government, by its actions in the Suez crisis, has made this month of November, 1956, the most disgraceful period for Canada in the history of this nation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Green: It is high time that Canada had leadership more in line with the forthrightness and the courage of the Canadian people. It is high time Canada had a government which will not knife Canada's best friends in the back.

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): May I begin, Mr. Speaker, by offering my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Legare) and second (Mr. Weselak) of the address. They are valuable members of our delegation to the assembly in New York, and if and when this debate is completed they will be continuing to perform useful service for their country and for peace at the United Nations assembly.

We are facing today a situation of gravity and danger, far too serious a situation to be dealt with from a purely partisan point of view. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat talked about Canada being the chore boy of the United States. Our record over the last years, Mr. Speaker, gives us the right to say we have performed and will perform no such role. It is bad to be a chore boy of the United States. It is equally bad to be a colonial chore boy running around shouting, "Ready, aye, ready". A well-known Conservative newspaper, the *Ottawa Journal*, in commending the policy of the government at the United Nations in recent days, a policy of care and restraint as it was characterized, a policy of consideration for its friends, ended an editorial on this subject on October 31 as follows:

At best, we are going to be in very great danger of all-out war for some time now. We must learn to think before we chatter.

Chattering instead of thinking—if we fail because of idle chatter and not enough thought in our efforts to resolve the problems that face us today in this country and in the world, it will not make much difference who has the halos or who has been humiliated.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have an amendment to the motion. I might as well say at once—and this will be no surprise to the house—that I think it is an amendment worthy of no support at all. It is inaccurate in its facts, as I shall hope to prove, and it is wrong in its conclusions.

Before I deal with the matters referred in the speech and in the amendment on the Middle East, may I say just one word about Hungary. The Canadian government has already expressed its views in Ottawa and at the United Nations assembly on this matter. We have witnessed as brutal and as grim a betrayal of a people as history has ever seen,

The Address—Mr. Pearson

a people who were asking only for freedom from communist colonial domination and the right to run their own affairs. The recent actions of the Soviet union in Hungary throw a lurid light on the protestations we have heard that Stalinism is now dead and peaceful coexistence is here. But there has been no more significant exposure of the underlying, and I am afraid enduring, purpose and methods of Soviet power. Soviet tanks and Soviet guns have killed Hungarian freedom fighters, but they did not and they cannot kill Hungarian freedom.

What can we do here in Canada and at the United Nations? Well, we can help the victims of this terror, and we learned last night of what we are doing in that regard. We can keep, through the United Nations as we are trying to do, the spotlight of world public opinion, the conscience of the world, the moral force of world opinion, on the savage actions of the Soviet union. We can do our best to help Hungarians in that way and to bring the United Nations into Hungary in the role of observers and investigators. We must continue our efforts toward that end; but we would not be helping the Hungarian people—I think we might be hurting them—if we held out promises of liberation by force which at this time we would not be able to fulfil. There is, however, I think, some hope in the growing evidence that eastern Europe is now beginning to free itself from the shackles of Russian slavery and oppression, and that development is expressing itself at the United Nations assembly at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the Middle East. The debate in this house—and we have been meeting for only a few hours—has already shown that a very real difference on policy has developed between the government and the official opposition. The speeches of the Acting Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra, who has just preceded me, have made that quite clear. The official opposition—and I think we can assume that the speakers in question had the support of all the members of the official opposition; they should have, to judge from the applause they received from their colleagues—now apparently support every move made by the United Kingdom and France in their intervention in Egypt after the attack on Egypt by Israel, an intervention brought about with army, navy and air forces after a 12-hour ultimatum. They claim, I have the right to conclude, that we as a government should have approved of those moves at once and should have backed up the United Kingdom and France at the United

[Mr. Pearson.]

Nations even on those matters and on those resolutions where not a single member of the United Nations supported the resolutions in question.

Mr. Green: Some abstained.

Mr. Pearson: I gathered that abstention was not very popular in my hon. friend's mind when Canada abstains.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we did not follow that particular line of policy in this matter, and I shall try to explain why. To do so it is, I think, relevant to give, as other speakers have given, some background which may help us to understand recent events. It is, for instance, important in order to keep things in perspective to understand the policy of the Egyptian government in recent months. That policy has been unfriendly to the western powers. It was arbitrary and was denounced in this house as arbitrary in the seizure of the Suez canal company. That policy has witnessed a gradual increase of Russian influence in Egypt and the Middle East, and it did culminate in the seizure of the canal. We recall that after weeks of effort and frustrations to bring about an international solution by international means no such solution was brought about.

It is quite obvious—it was quite obvious by the summer—that there was no meeting of minds between Washington and London and Paris in these matters. And, of course, the fault was not by any means entirely on the side of London and Paris, and no one on this side of the house has ever tried to take a one-sided view of this situation. The vital importance of the Suez to western Europe is perhaps not appreciated in Washington, and it might have been better appreciated there if this situation could have been related by them to the Panama canal.

Now, our own attitude in this matter was—and we expressed this attitude in the House of Commons and in a good many messages to the United Kingdom government during the summer—that we did not stand aloof and indifferent, and we did appreciate the importance of this development not only to western Europe but to Canada itself. Our attitude was that this question should be brought as quickly as possible to the United Nations and a solution attempted there; that at all costs there should be no division of opinion, no division of policy, between Washington and London and Paris on a matter of such vital importance, and that there should be no action taken by anybody which could not be justified under the United Nations charter; otherwise the country taking that action, no matter how friendly to us, would be hauled before the

The Address—Mr. Pearson

United Nations and charged by the country against which the action had been taken. That is something that has happened, and it is something we tried to talk over with our friends before it happened.

It will be recalled that eventually the matter was taken to the security council of the United Nations, and it will also be recalled that not long before the use of force by Israel against Egypt certain principles for a settlement of the Suez question had been agreed on at the security council. One of those principles which had been accepted by Egypt at that time, was that the canal should be insulated from the policies of any one nation, including Egypt. Therefore at that particular moment, through those conversations at the security council, and what is more important through conversations going on in the secretary general's office, we had some hope that an international solution might be reached which might be satisfactory to all concerned.

At that time, and I am speaking now of a period of only a week or two before the attack by Israel took place, we had no knowledge conveyed to us of any acute deterioration of the situation, nor did we have any knowledge or information about anything which could be called a Russian plot to seize Egypt and take over the Middle East. At that moment, and against that background, the Israeli government moved against Egypt.

Here also, to put the matter in perspective, it is necessary to understand the background. The people of Israel have lived for years in a state of unrest and insecurity against this threat of extermination by their neighbours. With that unrest on their borders, with no stability of any kind, with a military balance changing against them, and in the face of those continued threats on October 29—and it is interesting to realize that that was less than a month ago; events have moved with such bewildering and dramatic speed—the Israeli government took the situation and the law in its own hands and moved against Egypt for reasons which seemed very good to it at the time.

I admit—and I am sure all members in this house must admit—the provocation which may have prompted this move. We in the government tried to understand that provocation; nevertheless we did at that time, and do now, regret that the attack was made at that time and under those circumstances. Then, as the house knows, the United Kingdom government and France intervened in the matter on the ground, so they claimed, that it was necessary to keep the fighting away from the Suez canal and thereby keep the canal open. They wished, so they said

in Paris and in London, to keep a shield between the opposing forces.

That was the only purpose they put forward at that time, or indeed have put forward formally since, to explain their intervention—to stop the fighting and put a shield between the opposing forces. No other purpose was alleged; and when the United Kingdom representative to the United Nations spoke at the first emergency meeting of the general assembly on Thursday, November 1, he explained the purpose of the United Kingdom and French action in these words:

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 the area, no one would be better pleased than we. But police action there must be, to separate the belligerents and to stop the hostilities.

That was their purpose merely to separate the belligerents and to stop the hostilities.

Well, to carry out that purpose, as we know, the French and British governments sent an ultimatum to Egypt and to Israel, a 12-hour ultimatum that was accepted by Israel whose forces at that time had come within ten miles of the Suez canal, but was rejected by Egypt which had been asked to withdraw its forces beyond the Suez canal; and following that rejection the United Kingdom and French forces intervened by air and later on the ground.

At that time far from gratuitously condemning the action the Canadian government said through the Prime Minister, and indeed through myself, that we regretted the necessity for the use of force in these circumstances; and these circumstances, I confess, included an element of complete surprise on our part at the action taken.

There was no consultation—and this has been pointed out—with other members of the commonwealth and no advance information that this very important action, for better or for worse, was about to be taken. In that sense consultation had broken down between London and Paris on the one hand, the commonwealth capitals and—even more important, possibly,—Washington on the other.

Nevertheless, instead of indulging then or since in gratuitous condemnation we expressed our regret and we began to pursue a policy, both here by diplomatic talks and diplomatic correspondence, and later at the United Nations, which would bring us together again inside the western alliance and which would bring about peace in the area on terms which everybody could accept.

Our policy, then, in carrying out these principles was to get the United Nations into the matter at once; to seek through the United Nations a solution which would be

The Address—Mr. Pearson

satisfactory to all sides. In adopting that policy it was obviously impossible for us to act at the United Nations assembly in any way which we could not justify under our obligation as signatories to the United Nations charter.

Mr. Speaker, our policy at that time, at the beginning of this crisis, and which we have tried to follow since was well described by the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Fleming) as reported in the press on November 2 when he said, and I am quoting from the *Montreal Star* of that date:

Canada's attitude should be that of a member of the United Nations, "no more, no less".

Then the hon. member went on to say, as reported in this newspaper:

Canada has not had any part in the conferences preceding the sudden Middle East developments, nor are her interests directly involved. Her obligation, therefore, is that of another member nation of the United Nations, no more, no less.

Mr. Fleming: Would the minister, in fairness, continue with the following sentences of the statement in which comment is made upon the minister's own statement of the previous night at a press conference here in Ottawa?

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no text of what my hon. friend said or I would have been glad to read it all. I read the quotation from the *Montreal Star*. I will be glad to read the next paragraph of that quotation and this is all that is in the report:

He claimed—

This was the hon. member for Eglinton.—the United States had made no contribution of real value to settlement of the Suez question "since it was precipitated several weeks ago by Col. Nasser's action in seizing the canal. The weight of the problem has been thrown on the British and French".

But he doubted any permanent cleavage would result between Britain, France and the United States.

That is the full report that I have been able to receive.

Mr. Fleming: Some papers carried a fuller and fairer report of that statement.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend would be glad enough to send me the text of what he said on that occasion I will be glad to quote all the relevant parts of it when we get into committee.

An hon. Member: Why not read it yourself?

Mr. Fleming: I will be glad to do so in the interests of accuracy and your better understanding.

Mr. Pearson: Our policy with regard to this matter as a member of the United Nations

[Mr. Pearson.]

was to try to stop the fighting through the United Nations. How could we follow any other course without betraying our obligations under the charter? But we were also anxious, as were many other delegates to the United Nations although not all of them, to avoid the creation of a vacuum of chaos in that part of the world after the fighting had stopped; and we realized if that test as well as the test of stopping the fighting could not be met, the United Nations would have failed.

Also at the United Nations we were anxious to make sure—we mentioned this in our statements down there—that the situation leading up to the aggression should be given due consideration and that constructive action should be taken to prevent such a situation recurring again, that we should go deeper into this matter than merely into the facts of military action. I hope that will be done quickly at the United Nations assembly. There are already two resolutions on the order paper for that purpose.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we were also anxious to do everything we could down there to prevent any formal condemnation of the United Kingdom and France as aggressors under the charter, any demand that sanctions be imposed against them, and also to do what we could to help repair the lines of communication and contact between Washington, London and Paris and restore some form of continuous friendly diplomatic consultation between the western allies on these matters after its breakdown last October.

It was certainly a matter of urgent and distressing importance, especially to a Canadian, and I expressed this also in public at the United Nations, that the United States should be on one side of this issue and the United Kingdom and France, our two mother countries, on the other. We were especially distressed at this because there were people down in New York, and they are still there, who are gleefully exploiting this division.

Having mentioned the breakdown of consultation, I think it would only be fair to add that this breakdown of consultation and agreement was not the fault exclusively of the United Kingdom and France over the preceding months. No other member, indeed no member of the western alliance, is free of some responsibility and particularly the United States of America, which is the major and most powerful member of that group. Therefore we felt and we still feel that this is no time nor is this an occasion on which to adopt an attitude of superior virtue or smug complacency over the righteousness of our own position. We felt and we still feel that

The Address—Mr. Pearson

the thing to do is to get out of this crisis without a war and without violating the United Nations principles and charter, and then to draw the necessary conclusions from the crisis so that the western coalition will not collapse again in the days ahead when other problems will arise, as they are bound to do.

Then also, and this was a matter which was very much on our minds, we were anxious to do what we could to hold the commonwealth together in this very severe test. It was badly and dangerously split. At one stage after the fighting on land began it was on the verge of dissolution, and that is not an exaggerated observation. The hon. member for Kamloops (Mr. Fulton) is reported as having said on November 17 that Canadian leaders should bend their efforts toward restoring and preserving the moral and physical unity of the commonwealth which, he went on to say, should have a common point of view on these matters. I could not agree with him more; but if we had followed at the United Nations the policy advocated by the official opposition we would have gone a long way not toward restoring and preserving the moral and physical unity of the commonwealth but toward breaking it up. I am quite sure this is a purpose which no one in this house wishes to achieve.

In trying to follow those principles of policy how were we, as delegates to the United Nations and as the government in Ottawa, to react to the critical situation which arose? We tried to maintain as objective an attitude as possible having regard to our charter obligations, and we certainly did try to maintain as close and as friendly contact as was possible with the United Kingdom and French delegations. We did not automatically support the United States in every move. We thought the United States was wrong at the very beginning of the assembly in rushing a resolution on the record at the outbreak of hostilities recommending that they should be ended at once. We thought they were wrong in trying to rush that through without sufficient consideration. We did not vote for it; we abstained, as I will explain later.

We thought the United States was wrong last Saturday, the last session of the assembly which I attended and which in some respects was a depressing session. A resolution was before the assembly at that time which, with a Belgian amendment, should have received the unanimous support of every member of the assembly. With that amendment the resolution would have received the support of the United Kingdom, but the amendment was defeated and the United States was one of those who voted against it.

As I have pointed out, we were not able to support the United Kingdom in all the moves it had taken, in all the attitudes it had adopted at the United Nations assembly. Distressed though we were, we could not support the United Kingdom, and French stand on this matter although we did try, as Canadians should and as a Canadian delegation should, to give the most friendly consideration to the United Kingdom and French position.

As to the charge that we have been lining up with the Russians, that is just nonsensical chatter. If a resolution is right down there we vote for it whoever may be among our companions in the voting. That seems to me to be the only possible course for a Canadian delegation to follow.

There are those in this country and there are some whose views have been expressed in this house who feel that we should have automatically supported the United Kingdom and France, either because of the ties of friendship, indeed of kinship with the countries concerned, or because they were convinced the United Kingdom and France were right in the course adopted and in the methods followed. Those who feel that way will be disappointed at the action we have taken. We thought it was the right action for a Canadian delegation to take.

It was an objective attitude, it was a Canadian and an independent attitude. Believe me, the Arab and Asian countries, including the Asian members of the commonwealth, were watching us, as they were watching others, very carefully to see if our policy was based on those considerations I have mentioned or whether we were just following automatically any other power. If we had given any evidence that would have justified the impression that we were supporting without reservation the United Kingdom and France in all their tactics and attitudes toward this matter we would not have been of any help to our friends subsequently, nor would we have been able to play the part which we at least tried to play and which I shall refer to later.

If, for instance, we had voted at the first meeting of the special assembly against the proposal to put this item on the agenda when no other member of the assembly voted against it except the United Kingdom and France I think we would have lost any influence which we had at that time and which we may have hoped to use later on for constructive purposes.

Our purpose was to be as helpful to the United Kingdom and France as we possibly could be. Believe me, that attitude has been

The Address—Mr. Pearson

appreciated in London even if it has not been appreciated by my hon. friends opposite. Far from criticizing us in private or in public in London or Paris for our gratuitous condemnation of their course we have had many expressions of appreciation for the line we have been trying to follow, and which has been helpful in the circumstances to the United Kingdom and France.

The sequence of events at the assembly and our relation to those events will show what we tried to do, and why. I should like to give that sequence, if I may, because I feel it will be useful to the house to know exactly what happened and the attitude we took in regard to every stage of development at the assembly.

We met on Thursday, November 1, in the first emergency session of the general assembly under the uniting for peace resolution which had been passed in 1950 and which was designed to get around the veto in the security council by transferring to the assembly matters on which the security council could not agree because of the veto. When this assembly was called and this item was put on the agenda it was objected to on legal grounds by the United Kingdom and France, legal grounds which we did not think had very much validity, and so we voted for the assembly meeting.

That was the occasion on which we were attacked by my hon. friend as lining up with the Russians. We lined up with 62 members of the United Nations in agreeing to the proposition that the United Nations should try to deal with this matter. Immediately after that resolution the United States, without very much consultation or very much opportunity for consideration, introduced the cease-fire resolution.

We felt, as I have already said, that this had two defects. Of course it was designed to bring the fighting to an end at once and it was designed to prevent military aid going to either side in the conflict. It was designed, in one of its clauses, to restore freedom of navigation in the Suez canal for all governments. These purposes we, of course, supported; but we felt that there had not been sufficient time for consideration to force a vote through before others who wished to speak could speak. We also felt that it was inadequate for the purpose which we had in mind because it did not recognize the background, the previous problems which had brought about this situation, and made no provision for the absolute necessity of a peace settlement. Nor did it make any provision for a United Nations police force to supervise and secure the cessation of hostilities. We

[Mr. Pearson.]

were anxious not to give our support at that first meeting of the assembly to a resolution which might seem to bring the fighting to an end but to do nothing else, or even to recognize the importance of doing something else. We expressed that feeling in the first statement the Canadian delegate made.

Mr. Churchill: After the vote.

Mr. Pearson: After the vote because there was no opportunity to make a statement before the vote, in view of the fact that the rules of closure had been applied.

Mr. Churchill: Would you permit a question?

Some hon. Members: Sit down.

Mr. Churchill: Would you explain why you had no opportunity to express before the vote the sentiments you are now putting before us?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, that is an easy question to answer. When the assembly met that afternoon and we were shown this resolution, this being the first time we had seen it, I put my name on the speakers' list at once but I was not quick enough, because there were 21 others before me by the time I got to the secretary general's desk. I took my turn on the list and I spoke in turn. Unfortunately my speech came after the vote and I explained in my speech why I regretted that fact.

An hon. Member: You are No. 1 down there. Would they not let you be first?

Mr. Pearson: I am sorry my hon. friend has not the opportunity to go down there and replace me in that position which he has given to me. I know he would be a magnificent replacement. It is too bad he has not been given the opportunity.

An hon. Member: He has not even got to be No. 1 on the other side.

Mr. Pearson: In the first statement we made in New York around 2 a.m. that morning I ventured to suggest that we would not be completing our work at the assembly if we did nothing about the prevention of a recurrence of the violence which had preceded this outbreak and if we did nothing about the establishment of a United Nations force in this crisis.

This was an idea, Mr. Speaker, that we had discussed in Ottawa before I went to the assembly that afternoon. Indeed, it had been previously mentioned by the United Kingdom representative in his statement as something that might be desirable in the circumstances, and immediately after I made reference to it the United States secretary of state took up the matter and asked our

The Address—Mr. Pearson

delegation if they would put this idea in the form of a resolution. I returned to Ottawa the next day to discuss with my colleagues whether this would be a desirable thing to do, having first had the opportunity of discussing the matter in New York with the secretary general of the United Nations.

We were anxious to keep in close touch with our friends in Washington and our friends in London on this matter, and as soon as it was decided here the next morning that this might be a useful and helpful Canadian initiative under certain circumstances we cabled London and Washington at once and asked them what they thought about the idea; because, while a good many of these things are desirable in principle, there is not much point putting them forward at the United Nations if they are going to be opposed at once by all of our friends or some of our friends. Therefore we were anxious to get the views of both London and Washington in respect of this particular matter.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister say when Sir Pierson Dixon, the British representative, first mentioned this prior to the minister?

Mr. Pearson: He mentioned it in the course of the debate in which I spoke, but he spoke before me and he made reference to the fact that Sir Anthony Eden had referred to a United Nations police force in the House of Commons the day before. I mentioned the fact that he had referred to it when I spoke.

Then on Saturday, November 3, Mr. Speaker, after consultation with my colleagues in Ottawa I returned to New York where the assembly was to meet at 8 p.m. that evening. On that occasion I did produce a Canadian resolution for the setting up of a United Nations emergency force for this particular situation. It may be interesting, though it does take a little time, to go into the background of this idea of a United Nations force. Of course there was nothing new in either this idea or in its proposal, and no one on this side of the house, I am sure, wants to take any credit for having put forward a novel and valuable proposal. I hope it was valuable but it certainly was not novel; except in the sense that it was adopted, but in no other respect.

As far back as October, 1946, the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), at the very first assembly of the United Nations, made a plea for the organization of enforcement procedures under article 43 of the United Nations charter which provides for such enforcement procedures through the security council. Nothing was done, as we know, and nothing

could be done in the security council under article 43 because of the disunity among the big powers.

Then four years later came Korea, and the Canadian response to this challenge to peace and security in 1950 reflected our desire to bring about something more permanent than merely collecting forces for an emergency. As hon. members who were here at the time will recall, a Canadian infantry brigade was made available for United Nations service generally, and I think it was the only force in the United Nations at that time which was offered in those terms, for general United Nations service and not merely for Korea. I do not think any other member of the United Nations went as far as we did at that time. Certainly no one went farther. As I said in the House of Commons when explaining our action in September, 1950:

"We hope that other countries will make their contributions to the Korean force in that form", that is, for use anywhere subject to constitutional procedures, "so that next time this kind of aggression takes place there will be forces in being to deal with it."

On October 11 of the same year I said before the general assembly:

The action of the security council in June showed how unprepared most members of this organization were to implement quickly the recommendations which they accepted. We were frankly not organized for this purpose. We had to improvise. We hope that next time we may not have to improvise.

No progress was made in bringing about this kind of organization for security. The security council frustrated all efforts to that end, and that was why in 1950 we passed a uniting for peace resolution which could transfer to the assembly the responsibility for collective security in these circumstances of frustration and failure in the security council. On that uniting for peace resolution we had this to say at the United Nations assembly on November 3, 1950:

It will not be enough for a few countries to take action. We must all, within measure of our capacities, contribute to implementation of this resolution.

Certain other smaller governments took the same stand but over the years nothing was done, and there was no real organization in being when we were faced with this most recent crisis. A collective measures committee was set up by the assembly but its activities were not very effective.

Then on January 31, 1956, the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) brought up in this house the question of an international police force and it was a very pertinent question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Just for the Israeli-Arab situation.

The Address—Mr. Pearson

Mr. Pearson: Yes, he was limiting the value of this force at this time to a particular situation on the Israeli-Egyptian border. In response to this intervention—I had just come back a few months previously from the discussions in Egypt—I said this in the house as reported at page 777 of *Hansard* of February 1, 1956:

As I said the other day, I have had talks with the leaders of the Arab governments and the Israel government, and I had talks with General Burns when I was out there and at the United Nations. I think there is a great deal to be said for trying to bring that kind of police force into existence in this disturbed area at this time as a provisional measure to keep the armies apart while peace can be secured. If that proposal were made—and I know the Secretary General has been considering it, and from press reports to which my hon. friend has referred I understand that it has been discussed in Washington in the last few days—and if it became a matter for United Nations consideration, I am sure this country as well as other countries would want to do what they could to carry it into effect.

And following that—

Mr. Rowe: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Rowe: In view of the fact, as our representative, did the minister not bring it before the United Nations for consideration?

Mr. Pearson: That is just what I was coming to, Mr. Speaker. I have been looking up the record in the last day or two in order to see what we had been able to do in this matter. We did follow it up. We followed it up with the governments most particularly concerned, namely the Israel government, the British government, the French government and the United States government and with the secretary general of the United Nations and again with General Burns, the truce commissioner.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What date was that?

Mr. Pearson: This began in February and went on for the next two or three months. These were ordinary diplomatic discussions to see whether it could be useful initiative on our part at that time to put forward a proposal for a United Nations force, not a truce commission, to patrol the boundary between Israel and her Arab neighbours in order to try to prevent the incidents which were building up and which had a great deal to do with the ultimate explosion last October. We were discouraged by the response given to this proposal. We received very little support for it from any governments concerned. Indeed, we received no active support from any of the governments concerned, because they felt it was not timely to introduce a United Nations force of that character

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

into Palestine when the boundaries had not been determined, when a political settlement had not been reached and when the parties to the conflict—and it was a conflict—were opposed to such a force.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What countries raised that objection?

Mr. Pearson: There was not a country with which we discussed the matter that actively supported the idea. When we get into committee I will be able to give more details, I hope, with regard to this matter. Certainly in our view it was important to have a police force of that kind operate with the consent and the active co-operation of the governments most concerned.

That then was the situation, Mr. Speaker, when our United Nations force resolution was introduced, and that is the background to our initiative in this matter. At the time our resolution was introduced the 19-power Asian-Arab resolution had already been introduced, which reaffirmed the earlier United States resolution which had been carried by this time and which insisted on a cease-fire and a withdrawal of troops, and which asked the secretary general to report within 12 hours on the compliance with that injunction. That night of November 3 and 4—and the session went on all night—tempers were rather high. The talk was strong and the danger of a rash—as we would have thought it—condemnation of the United Kingdom and France as aggressors was very real. The situation was deteriorating and the communists were working feverishly and destructively to exploit it.

In these circumstances and having, as I have said, canvassed the situation carefully with our friends and having studied Sir Anthony Eden's speech, we moved this resolution concurrently with the 19-power Asian-Arab resolution which was an attempt to get British, French and Israel forces out of Africa.

Mr. Coldwell: Out of Egypt.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, I am sorry; out of Egypt. It was a very short resolution, and it asked the secretary general merely to submit within 48 hours, something we had been unable to do anything about for ten years, namely a plan for setting up an emergency international United Nations police force with the consent of the governments concerned. If we had not put in that phrase "with the consent of the governments concerned" we might not have been able to secure a majority for our resolution. As it was, the resolution passed unanimously, as hon. members know. Steps were taken immediately by the secretary general to report

The Address—Mr. Pearson

back what he was able to do in 48 hours in the setting up of this force to supervise and secure a cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the earlier resolution of November 2, one of which was to ensure freedom of navigation in the Suez canal.

We obtained 57 votes as sponsors for the resolution. There were 19 abstentions. Nobody voted against us. The United Kingdom and France did not find it possible to vote for that resolution at that time but they have indicated, both privately and publicly, their great appreciation of the initiative which resulted in its being adopted and they have also stated their support for it since then. At the same time—and this is related to the first resolution—the Asian-Arab resolution was put to the vote and carried by a large majority, 59 to 5 opposed.

Mr. Churchill: How did Canada vote?

Mr. Pearson: Canada voted for that resolution asking for a cease-fire and a withdrawal of the forces from Egypt. There were 5 opposed. There were 59 in favour, including Canada. Then on November 4 we started to work, and we had something to do with this because we were the sponsors of the resolution and had a certain obligation in connection with helping the secretary general carry it out. We started to work on organizing a United Nations police force or at least to form the basis of the organization and report back in 48 hours.

As it happened the secretary general, who has played a magnificent part throughout all these difficult days, was able to make a first report within 24 hours. Offers of contributions to the force began to come in within that 24-hour period. That Sunday night when we were working on the establishment of the force the United Kingdom and French ground forces landed at Port Said. The situation at the United Nations immediately began to deteriorate. Things became very tense. The security council was called into emergency session and refused to consider a Soviet proposal for Soviet and United States intervention because the matter was before the United Nations assembly. Then in the midst of rumours of Russian intervention, rumours that there would be a determined demand by the Arab and Asian members of the Assembly to brand the United Kingdom and France formally as aggressors under the charter and to invoke sanctions against them, the assembly met on Tuesday morning, November 6. It had before it the secretary general's final report on the organization of the United Nations force. At that time he was able to report progress with regard to the composition of the force. He was able

to lay down certain principles and functions for that force but not to go into detail, for two reasons. He did not have enough time, in the first place; and in the second place if we had attempted to do it in detail, we would still be arguing about what those functions should be. There was however one important detail, namely that the force should exclude contingents from the permanent members of the security council. The significance of that detail is obvious.

A draft resolution was drawn up supporting this report and authorizing the secretary general to go ahead on that basis, to discuss participation with other governments. It set up also an advisory committee of seven members of the assembly to help him in this task. Canada is one of the members of that committee. It is interesting to note in passing that four members of that committee are members of the commonwealth of nations. While we were trying to get this resolution through and get it through quickly and with a big majority—it was finally passed unanimously—another resolution, in the atmosphere of the fighting that was going on at that time in Suez, was introduced demanding the immediate withdrawal of forces, and that the secretary general should report that this had been done in 24 hours. Both these resolutions were being considered together.

In so far as the force was concerned, as I said, the resolution passed unanimously after we had managed to vote down—and it was a very important vote indeed—an amendment to put Czechoslovakia on the advisory committee of seven. The resolution was then passed by 64 to 0, with 10 abstentions.

Mr. Churchill: Would you name the advisory committee?

Mr. Pearson: The advisory committee in this matter consists of Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Brazil, Colombo, Norway and Canada, with the secretary general as the chairman of the committee.

Mr. Fleming: Is Iran not on that?

Mr. Pearson: Iran had been nominated and withdrew in favour of Ceylon.

The same evening, Mr. Speaker, a 19-power resolution demanding immediate withdrawal was passed by a vote of 65 with only one opposed, Israel, and with 10 abstentions. The United Kingdom and France did not oppose that resolution, they abstained on it. We voted for that resolution after having stated our interpretation, which was accepted by a good many other delegations, of the word "immediate". If that interpretation had not been stated and accepted by many we would not have voted for it. By "immediate" we said we had in mind that the United King-

The Address—Mr. Pearson

dom and French forces would withdraw from Egypt as soon as the United Nations forces had been moved there and were operating satisfactorily. By getting our United Nations force resolution through and by accepting this Arab-Asian resolution of withdrawal, which had in it no element of sanctions, we were able to reject extreme demands which were being made, and which would have led us into grave danger indeed.

We think that the resolutions that night were a wise move, and we think also that they helped the United Kingdom and France in accepting the cease-fire, which they did either just before or shortly afterwards.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk, though not very much in this house as yet, as to whether the United Kingdom and French governments were pressed into the acceptance of this cease-fire by United Nations action, and whether we should not have let them go ahead, not pressed them and resisted moves to press them in respect of this resolution on cease-fire and withdrawal. If we had done that, and the United Nations had kept out of this at that particular moment, it is said the British and French forces would have been able to complete the military job of clearing the canal of Egyptian forces from Port Said to Port Suez.

I suggest with diffidence, because this is a matter which is of primary concern to the United Kingdom and French governments, that they were very wise indeed in stopping military operations at the time they did. After all, they had indicated that they were going into that area to stop the fighting at the canal and to prevent the conflict continuing between Israel and Egypt in such a way that it would interfere with the operation of the canal.

By this time both Israel and Egypt had accepted the cease-fire. Therefore the original reason given by the United Kingdom and French forces for intervening had been removed. If the United Kingdom and French forces had continued fighting at that time, after the Egyptian and Israeli governments had accepted the cease-fire, I suggest that the commonwealth might not have been able to stand the strain; that the Asian members of the commonwealth might not have been able to remain in it in those circumstances. There is evidence from New Delhi, Karachi and Colombo to support that statement. I suggest also that a continuation of the fighting, even if it had immediately successful military results, would have created even a deeper and more permanent split between the western European and Arab world. It might well have led to the occupation of Egypt, which was not an original objective of

[Mr. Pearson.]

British-French intervention. It would have been a standing invitation to the Egyptian government to invite in at that time, when the fighting was going on, Soviet volunteers. Whatever the reasons may have been, and I think they were good ones, the United Kingdom and French governments did accept the cease-fire and we entered a new stage of developments.

There were only two more resolutions subsequent to the one I have just mentioned. The one last Saturday asked for withdrawal once again. We did not support it because we felt that the withdrawal had begun. We had confidence in the good faith of the British and French when they told us that the withdrawal would be completed. We felt at that time that to support another resolution of withdrawal would be to assimilate the position of the British, French and Israelis to that of the Russians in Hungary.

Mr. Churchill: Did you vote or abstain on that?

Mr. Pearson: We abstained on that, and the reason we abstained is quite obvious to anyone who has followed developments down there. The resolution in its terms was just the same as the previous one, that the forces should get out and they should get out—this time the word used was "forthwith". As the British and French had already accepted withdrawal in principle it would not have been very reasonable for the Canadian delegation, which had previously voted for withdrawal, to have voted against withdrawal at this time.

Mr. Rowe: You have different conditions.

Mr. Pearson: For the reasons which I have given we were not going to support this resolution, so we abstained. If the Belgian amendment, as I have said, to that resolution had been carried, the British and French had announced they would have voted for it. If my friends opposite get any comfort out of that course of action, they are welcome to it.

Then the final resolution carried Saturday night approved an aide memoire which gave the secretary general further authority to organize the United Nations police force. By a very important paragraph in that resolution he was told to get ahead with the clearing of the Suez canal. In spite of efforts by Soviet and certain Arab-Asian countries to hold up the work on political grounds, he has now authority to go ahead with the vitally important work.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the United Nations force in being and I am sure the

The Address—Mr. Pearson

house, although I have exhausted my time, would like me to say something about the functions, operations and composition of that force, and Canada's contribution to it.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that it is owing only to the indulgence of the house that I am permitted to proceed and finish my statement, because I am well beyond the time allotted to me. But if the house desires I shall be glad to complete the statement now and put on the record certain facts concerning the situation now before it, with which I was not able to deal this morning. I did try this morning to outline the policy that had been adopted by the Canadian delegation to the United Nations in the assembly which is now meeting, and I had reached the point where I was about to describe the operation of the United Nations emergency force which has been set up as the result of a resolution of that assembly.

The function of this force which is now in being is to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities, as I pointed out this morning, and carry out its task in accordance with directions received from the United Nations, not from any one member of the United Nations. The force—and it is interesting to recall that the resolution authorizing this force was passed not much more than three weeks ago—is now in being in Egypt where it will be stationed, or any place elsewhere the United Nations considers it necessary to be stationed, in order to carry out the functions which I have just mentioned. The most important function is, of course, the policing of the zone between opposing forces in Egypt in order to prevent the recurrence, if possible, of the fighting. At the present time the headquarters of the force is along the Suez, but it may of course be moved.

It is not a fighting force in the sense that it is a force operating under, say, chapter 7 of the United Nations charter, which deals with enforcement procedures. It is not a United Nations fighting force in the sense that the force in Korea was; it is operating under a different chapter of the charter dealing with conciliation procedures. Therefore the alarmist interpretation, the alarmist possibility, mentioned last night by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra that Canadian elements in this force might find themselves in conflict with British soldiers is, I suggest, merely a figment of his imagination.

It is not the purpose of this force to be used in fighting operations against anybody. It is not that kind of force. If the hon. member had read the United Nations document concerning the function and organization of this force, which have already been agreed on, he would, I think, have understood that.

This force will stay in Egypt until the United Nations decides that its functions are discharged, or, of course, until the governments participating in the force withdraw their contingents. It must, of course, not infringe on the sovereignty of the government of the territory in which it is operating. That is obvious. But the exercise of that sovereignty in the case of the government of Egypt where the force is operating now must be qualified by the acceptance by Egypt of the resolution of the United Nations concerning the force. Egypt has already agreed to the admission of this United Nations force to its territory; and it seems to me to be obvious, because it is not an enforcement action of the United Nations under chapter 7 of the charter that every effort should be made by the secretary general of the United Nations, and by the United Nations itself, to secure and maintain the co-operation of the Egyptian government in the functioning of this force, and the co-operation of the other governments concerned, including the government of Israel.

But that does not mean, as I understand it—and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, this has been made very clear in meetings of the advisory committee—that Egypt or any other government can determine by its own decision where the force is to operate, how it is to operate or when it must leave. Furthermore, the right of Egypt to consent to the admission of a United Nations force to its territory does not imply the necessity of consent to the admission of, or the right to reject, separate units or elements of that force. That is a stand, Mr. Speaker, which the Canadian representative on the advisory committee has taken. I have already made it clear to the other members of the committee and to the secretary general, and the secretary general has agreed to this statement. I said at the second meeting of the committee—and I quote from the record of the committee—

If their position—

I was referring to the government of Egypt.

If their position is that they at any time could decide that the United Nations force had finished its work and should leave, that, I think, would be quite intolerable; and there is also an interpretation of the United Nations resolution which says that the force must be sent to Egypt only with the consent of the Egyptian government which means that the Egyptian government would exercise a veto over every contingent in that force. That, I think, would be equally intolerable, because what

The Address—Mr. Pearson

kind of a United Nations force would you have? What principle would you be acting on in the United Nations if that country—

I was referring to Egypt.

—which the United Nations was trying to assist in organizing and sending forward this force should decide who would take part in it? That is something, of course, that has to be worked out between the assembly and yourself—

I was referring to the chairman of the committee.

—as the representative of the assembly, and the Egyptian government, but to admit for a minute that the Egyptian government will decide that a force from country A is admissible and a force from country B is not is something, of course, that I could not accept.

We have made that stand clear at other meetings of the committee of seven, That, Mr. Speaker, brings me to the negotiations undertaken by the secretary general in regard to the composition of the force and particularly in regard to Canadian participation in it.

The first resolution dealing with this force was passed in the United Nations assembly on November 4. We had already said by the time that resolution was passed—and by “we” I mean the government in Ottawa—that we were in favour of it and that we would recommend a contribution to it. The day after the resolution was passed I met the secretary general as the sponsor of the resolution and discussed with him the question of putting some United Nations troops into the area at once. He considered it to be a matter of the most immediate urgency. So I said I was authorized to state that the Canadian government was willing to participate, and later in the day I wrote a formal communication to him to that effect, saying that we had decided to make an appropriate contribution subject to the required constitutional action being taken in Canada.

The next day I also talked with the secretary general about the force and he was then also emphatic, for the obvious reason that the situation seemed to be deteriorating, that we must proceed quickly. We discussed the nature of our contribution that afternoon, I by telephone with my colleagues in Ottawa, when the question of a battalion came up. Meanwhile General Burns had been appointed as commander of the force and he will do a distinguished job in that position, I am sure, as he has been doing so in that area in the last two years in the face of very great difficulties indeed.

General Burns was asked to come to New York, and those countries that had already announced their desire to contribute were asked to send military advisers to New York

[Mr. Pearson.]

to discuss the problem with the secretary general, his staff and General Burns. The Canadian Department of National Defence sent three officers down immediately and the next day, Tuesday, November 6, the Prime Minister announced that Canada would offer, and I quote:

Subject to adjustment and/or rearrangement after consultation with the United Nations commander—

—a self-contained battalion group with H.M.C.S. *Magnificent* as a temporary mobile base.

The consultations which we had had in New York up to that time led us to believe that would be a most welcome contribution, and we were urged to press ahead with it. The secretary general told me he was most anxious for us to get our battalion to a place where it could be embarked without delay.

General Burns reached New York a little later than we expected because he had to go to Cairo en route. The possibility then was mentioned that one country might provide all the administrative and air support at least in the initial stages. General Burns had found that difficulties were already developing because the infantry that had arrived, mostly from the Scandinavian countries and also from Colombia, were reaching the base without the necessary services and there was no headquarters organized to receive them.

These reports were sent by me to Ottawa. I returned to discuss them with my colleagues over the week end, and while I was in Ottawa the secretary general through his executive assistant phoned me on Saturday, November 10, about another difficulty that was developing and which has been referred to already in this discussion, namely that the Egyptian authorities were concerned about the possibility of Canadian troops being mistaken for United Kingdom troops and that incidents might take place especially if the proportion of Canadian troops to the total force were high as would be the case if the Canadian infantry battalion had arrived at that time.

We in New York, and indeed in Ottawa on advice from New York, felt that these difficulties would be overcome, and in discussing them with the secretary general he once again asked us to make no changes in our plans pending further discussions and he hoped satisfactory arrangements could be made. So the government went ahead with the arrangements as originally contemplated.

These difficulties I have been talking about, difficulties of administration and difficulties of composition, were not unique to Canada. Indeed they were not surprising, considering

The Address—Mr. Pearson

the fact that the United Nations was starting from nothing in organizing this force; with the political situation so difficult both at the United Nations and in Egypt, and considering also the fact that under the resolution authorizing the secretary general to organize this force he was instructed to work out—the phrase that was used was a “balanced force”—a balanced force militarily for police work and a balanced force, as he interpreted it, geographically and politically, if possible.

Perhaps I should interject at this point, in connection with this particular difficulty, that among the countries that have offered contributions are Rumania and Czechoslovakia. Countries other than Canada have made offers of contributions which have not been dealt with, and they are waiting to hear from the secretary general also. The problem now was a very difficult and complicated one, all the more so as the greatest need at that time was to get more people to the spot.

Well, then, I think it was on Tuesday, November 13, when back in New York from Ottawa that I had another talk with the secretary general in relation to the new difficulties which had occurred, I emphasized to him at that time that we felt it absolutely essential to the success of this effort that neither Egypt nor any other country should impose conditions regarding the composition of the force. I told him that on this matter we would negotiate only with him, the secretary general, although we recognized, of course, that it was right and proper that he should discuss these matters with Egypt in order to avoid, if possible, subsequent difficulties.

Nevertheless, on that Tuesday I asked him again about composition in view of the developing difficulties and whether we should proceed with our plans for moving the regiment. The secretary general said—this was Tuesday, November 13, and I quote from his statement to me which I took down, that he hoped we would go right ahead with our plans.

He also discussed with me the question of composition on the next day, Wednesday. Then later we had a meeting of the advisory committee on the matter and I have already read from the minutes of that meeting. Following that the secretary general flew to Cairo. He left New York in the hope that these difficulties would all be cleared up before he had returned. As we were having diplomatic discussions about them and as it seemed that these discussions might end in a satisfactory way, we did our best, I quite admit, to discourage any premature publicity about difficulties which might be settled and

concerning which, if the publicity were inaccurate, we would have even greater trouble in clearing up. Therefore on Thursday, November 15, the Prime Minister said at Toronto:

Units of Canadian contribution to the UN force are ready and the order in council placing them on active service under UN command will be passed and parliament summoned as soon as we can ascertain from General Burns what elements he needs and cannot get from other countries.

During that week end when General Burns had reached New York and the secretary general was in Cairo I was in touch with the secretary general by telephone and cable through our embassy. I stated to him that I had had word about his discussions with the Egyptians; that while I appreciated the difficulties which had arisen and while naturally we wanted to help the secretary general, already so overburdened with problems, in any way possible, nevertheless we could not accept the principle that any one government could determine what contribution or whether any contribution would be made by a member state in connection with the United Nations force. I am glad to say that the secretary general has taken the same position.

Then we discussed the difficulty on the secretary general's return. I know my hon. friends want to have all the facts in connection with this matter. We have had wild rumours and exaggerations which have appeared in the press about Nasser's farce, as the Acting Leader of the Opposition called it yesterday.

Mr. Churchill: Why keep on repeating those statements?

Mr. Pearson: Why keep on repeating those statements? Because it was a matter of principle upon which we wanted to make our position absolutely clear. As a result of these discussions the secretary general had sent a communication to me from Cairo which I shall put on the record:

The question of when and where ground troops shall be used—

That is Canadian ground troops.

—can best be considered when the UNEF can assess its needs at the armistice lines. The present situation seems to be one where it is not a lack of troops for the immediate task but of possibilities to bring them over and maintain their lines of communication.

That was a message from the secretary general, not from the Egyptian government. He also emphasized that in sending it neither he nor anyone else was laying down conditions for Canadian participation because he felt that that would be improper. On his return and after further discussion with General Burns it was agreed that for the time

The Address—Mr. Pearson

being we should concentrate on getting these other forces to Egypt and hold the infantry battalion in reserve. General Burns himself said he agreed that it was even more important at the present moment to have an air transport headquarters, administration units, signals, engineers, army service, medical units and forces of that type; which were later to be sneered at by some excitable persons as constituting a typewriter army, something that will not I think commend itself to the members of these very gallant Canadian regiments.

We agreed then to this change in plans, although regretting it. It is indeed our desire to fit in our plans with those agreed upon by General Burns and the secretary general and keep the rest of our forces available for transmission to the area; and on Tuesday November 20, the order in council was passed to that end. I ask whether we could or should have proceeded otherwise. I am sure that most members of the house will agree that we would have been wrong if we had not made the offer we did in the first instance without delay, an offer which at that time seemed most appropriate and was considered as such by the secretary general.

To have made no offers or to have made no plans; to have held back our offer until everything was cleared up; to have permitted no movement of troops of any kind, would I think have left us open to criticism, to the charge that we were dragging our feet in connection with a proposal which we ourselves had put forward. I think also that we would have been wrong to have interfered with our plans until we were certain that their implementation or the timing thereof was to be changed.

When we were asked to make that change, not by Colonel Nasser but by the secretary general of the United Nations and the commanding general of the United Nations forces, we could have either accepted or rejected the request. The latter would have meant delaying any action or, as has been suggested in a few extreme quarters, we could have withdrawn from the United Nations force completely. I am confident that if we had taken either of those courses, if we had delayed taking any action or withdrawn from the force, in view of the developments we would have been open to grave criticism and we would have got most of it from some hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken already in this debate. I think the course we took was the right course, and it was considered the right course by the United Nations officials concerned.

[Mr. Pearson.]

It did not seem to me to be the time—I am talking now about the time we were confronted with the necessity of changing our plans, at least temporarily—or the occasion for national pique or peevishness or sneering at this new United Nations force as being Nasser's farce. It seemed to me that the situation was far too serious for that. What was required from every member of the United Nations was to back up the United Nations force to the best of its ability, after receiving the best advice it could. After receiving such advice from the United Nations itself we took that course, and as a result there is now a United Nations force which within between three and four weeks of the resolution authorizing it now includes on the spot—at least this was two days ago and there have been additions since that time—1,700 troops of which 20 per cent or 350 are Canadians. There will be soon more Canadians on the spot. Twenty-three nations have offered contributions to that force and eight of them including Canada, have seen their contributions embodied in the formations on the spot which are now working together under the United Nations blue flag of peace.

May this force succeed in its task. If it does we may have started something of immense value for the future. We may have taken a step to put force behind the collective will of the international community under the law. That is our immediate task, to make this force work, to prevent fighting in the area and to establish conditions there through the operation of this force so that the United Nations itself can work out speedily an enduring and honourable settlement for that area, including relations between Israel and her neighbours and the international supervision and control, if that can be done, of the Suez canal.

While that is our immediate objective we have another objective which is just as important and I suggest just as immediate, and that is to restore unity among the allies. The western coalition, which is essential for peace in these disturbed times and which requires close consultation and co-operation among its members if it is to succeed, especially among London, Washington and Paris, has been subjected to strains and stresses in recent months. This has caused all lovers of peace in the free world great anxiety.

May I in conclusion repeat something I said on this point the other night to the American assembly of Columbia University, when I said:

The inability to bring about a reconciliation of interests inside a coalition has resulted in a collapse

The Address—Mr. Pearson

of western co-operation in the Middle East; a collapse which has brought distress to everyone except those who see in such co-operation the strongest barrier to the attainment of their own imperialist and reactionary power objectives. This collapse is, I am convinced, only temporary; but temporary is too long.

It must be a primary obligation on all of us to speed and make effective the work of repair and restoration. Indeed, we must do more than this. We must strengthen and deepen the foundation for such co-operation, so that a collapse will not take place again in the face of the pull between the requirements of national and international policy. At the moment that is the primary task and responsibility of all who believe in freedom and security.

Then I went on to say:

It is less important at the present moment to dwell on the difficulties of the task than on ways and means of avoiding them in the future. A Canadian may, I think, be pardoned for emphasizing that this is particularly true in the case of consultation and co-operation between Washington and London and Paris. It is imperative, in our dangerous and disturbed world, that the lines of contact between these three capitals be repaired and renewed and reinvigorated.

Apart from the actual preservation of the peace, and indeed, related to it, there is no more important objective for western policy than this, and every possible effort must now be devoted, with understanding, with good will and with energy, to its achievement.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would my hon. friend allow a question at this time? I have mentioned the matter to him in advance. It has to do with the grave situation that arose today in Jordan and also the even graver situation in Syria. Would he, before concluding, say something with respect to the situation over there which today has become so critical, and also whether in view of what is taking place there the United Nations force will have to be increased over and above the numbers provided for under the present arrangements?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was good enough to tell me before I came into the house that this matter was very much on his mind and that he proposed to ask a question about it. I am anxious not to say anything, without pretty careful consideration, about a matter which is of immediate gravity because, as I understand the reports we have received, this is a matter of immediate gravity. I do not want to be panicky or unnecessarily alarming about it, but there are reports that Russian penetration is going on in Syria to an alarming extent and that there are moves inside Syria which might result in the domestic control of that country by a group which seems quite willing to work with the Soviets in this matter. That is not a prospect that can cause anything but alarm. There are the same elements in other Arab countries, but we must hope that these countries themselves will take some steps to prevent that kind of development.

81537—5

As for the other part of his question, whether the United Nations force should be increased to take care of a situation of this kind, the numbers of that force are not yet determined. I suspect that before long we will find it very greatly increased over its present number, but it has been set up to deal with a situation arising out of a cessation of hostilities between Israel on the one side and the United Kingdom and France and Egypt on the other, and its present terms of reference would not authorize it to intervene in any other dispute between any other two countries. But the United Nations assembly is in session, and if we can set up a United Nations force for one purpose surely we can extend its functions and activities for another desirable purpose. I would hope that if the situation began to deteriorate beyond the point which required that kind of extension it would be done at this assembly very quickly.

All I wish to say in my closing words is that the question of strengthening co-operation among the western democracies, especially among the United States, the United Kingdom, France and, of course, Canada, is one which must be deep in our minds behind all the present emergencies that have strained and weakened that co-operation. We must do what we can without recrimination to bring it back.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Speaker, that we shall continue our efforts at the United Nations to find solutions to problems which remain difficult and dangerous and have created situations which, if they are allowed to persist, can indeed be a very real threat to peace.

Mr. Speaker: Do I take it that the hon. member of Oxford wishes to ask a question?

Mr. Nesbitt: Yes. I wish to ask a question of the last speaker; I did not wish to interrupt during his speech. Is the Secretary of State for External Affairs in a position to give us any idea as to the extent to which Russian arms were accepted by Egypt prior to the immediate trouble, and also by Syria?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, I assume that when we get in committee I will have the opportunity of trying to answer a number of questions of this kind, but on the direct question I might say that we knew, of course, as was mentioned in the house last summer, that Russian arms and Russian equipment were going into Egypt. That was well known. It was also known they were going into Syria, though not in the quantities in which they have been going there in recent weeks. It was our impression at that time that the Russian arms going into Egypt were for the purpose of strengthening the Egyptian army.

The Address—Mr. Fleming

It is probably also true that Russian technicians went in with those arms. We did not know and we had no reason to believe that these arms were going into Egypt for any other purpose at that time than to strengthen the Egyptian army for use in military operations.

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): Mr. Speaker, I shall have some things to say in the course of my remarks in reply to the speech just made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, but I make this observation now. I think one reason the house listened to him with interest today is the tone in which he addressed the house. It was in very marked contrast to the petulant, belligerent and provocative manner adopted by the Prime Minister yesterday in relation to this very important question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming: Had the order been reversed I might have commended the example of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in this respect to the Prime Minister.

Sir, we are dealing with a matter of very great importance, a matter in which what we say here may have an effect not only within our own country but may be subject to interpretations outside. For my part I wish to follow as objective a line as circumstances permit. I am one of those who, throughout the length of my time in the house, have sought to encourage the idea of bipartisanship with regard to the external policy of the country, and I had hoped that the day would never come when deep differences of approach on external questions would develop on a party basis in this country. But, sir, it is quite evident that they have, for in relation to many features of the present situation it is evident that deep differences do exist.

We heard some gratuitous calls on the part of the Prime Minister yesterday for an attitude rising above partisanship in this matter. Indeed, he used that expression, that we should rise above political partisanship. I say to the Prime Minister: physician, heal thyself. If ever there was a partisan and provocative approach to a question under debate in the House of Commons it was on the part of the Prime Minister yesterday afternoon in this debate. On the one hand he appealed that we should rise above political partisanship, while at the same time he himself indulged in the most blatant kind of partisanship in his whole treatment of this question. His speech was deliberately provocative as any speech that I am sure any of us have listened to on the part of the Prime Minister in this house.

[Mr. Pearson.]

After that the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell), leading the C.C.F. party in this house, did make a feeble appeal to the house, as he put it, to rally behind the government. What an extraordinary appeal that was, an appeal to rally behind a government which had just expressed itself through the mouth of the Prime Minister in deliberately partisan, provocative and belligerent terms!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming: As long as the government is going to be wrong, as long as the government is going to be partisan, you may be very sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is going to be no rallying behind this government. We have no wish to follow this government into error. This is rather a time, Mr. Speaker, to rally to truth and clearheadedness with regard to a very important issue before the house and before the country. I can assure hon. members that there will be no yielding to any attempt on the part of the government or their allies to stampede the members of this house. With regard to so important a subject the Canadian public is entitled to calm and deliberate consideration on the part of the House of Commons. We have indicated our concern in this matter, and our willingness to sit long hours in this house day by day. But this subject is something so transcending other matters that we propose to give it clear and ample consideration.

Yesterday afternoon the Prime Minister opened on the subject of the reasons why the government had not called parliament together. He talked about everything but the real issue in that respect. He said, of course—and this is undeniable—that it is the government's responsibility to take the decision as to whether Canadian forces shall be sent abroad. But that was not the issue. The issue as to calling the house at a particular time or at an earlier date was not touched by that consideration. All that the Prime Minister was saying in effect was that the government had to take the decision and then refer to parliament within ten days. But that is no reason for not calling parliament together in the days of a critical international situation, when surely there was need for an opportunity for the elected representatives of the people to meet and to deliberate. So we have much to say about what occurred prior to the final passing of the order in council to authorize the sending of Canadian troops abroad, as is seen already in the course of this debate.

Our amendment has pinpointed the matters at issue between the government and Her Majesty's loyal opposition. There are four of them in number and I propose to deal with each in turn. In the first place we condemn

The Address—Mr. Fleming

the government because it followed—and I am now quoting—“followed a course of gratuitous condemnation of the action of the United Kingdom and France which was designed to prevent a major war in the Suez area.” The declared purpose of that intervention on the part of the United Kingdom and France was to prevent a major war and to contain the hostilities that then raged between Israel and Egypt. That was the declared purpose of those countries in relation to that intervention; and no one dare question those motives of the governments of Britain and France unless he is prepared to accuse those governments of bad faith.

The Prime Minister yesterday did not come out deliberately and say that he accused them of bad faith, but he did say that this was aggression on the part of Great Britain and France. If it was, then it seems to me that the Prime Minister has not accepted the statement of the declared purpose on the part of the two countries that carried out that intervention. That is the kind of mentality that goes with the other suggestion that Britain and France were acting in collusion with Israel in this matter, a false and baseless suggestion which has received the most forthright refutation on the part of Sir Anthony Eden.

Here is an area of the world in which Britain's lifeline is located. Sir Anthony Eden had told Bulganin and Khrushchev a year ago during their visit to the United Kingdom that Britain would fight if necessary to maintain her position on that lifeline. Unless, as the government at some stages seems to suggest, Britain and France were not acting in good faith, then certainly the action that was taken was in itself nothing but police action, for the fighting between Israel and Egypt had already come within sight of the Suez canal, that vital lifeline.

I ask the government these questions. Does the government doubt that police action was necessary under the circumstances? Second, does the government doubt that the intervention of the United Kingdom and France was intended as such? It is quite true that that action was taken without the declared approval of the United Nations, but there was the immediate offer on the part of the United Kingdom and France to hand over that police action to the United Nations if and when the United Nations were prepared to take effective police action.

What is the issue before this Canadian House of Commons? I listened with much interest to the speech last evening by the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar. He went about this matter as though this were the parliament at Westminster, and as though we

were debating this issue in the same sense as that in which the parliament at Westminster might have debated it. Mr. Speaker, we are not debating this issue in that sense at all. We are debating here the attitude of the Canadian government with respect to action taken by the United Kingdom government in the name of the United Kingdom and by the government of France in the name of France. We are not debating an issue as between political parties in the United Kingdom. We are discussing the action of the Canadian government with respect to an action taken by Britain and France through their governments. If anybody is interested in the relationship between the action of the British government in this matter and the sovereign parliament at Westminster, he had better remind himself that the government in that country has been sustained by the House of Commons a number of times already over this issue at its various stages. But that is not the point. The point is that this was an action taken by the British government. It was an action binding the United Kingdom.

With regard to the attitude of the Canadian government, we are then discussing a declared attitude with respect to an action taken by the United Kingdom. Did the Canadian government have justification for the critical attitude that it has taken toward the action of the British and French governments? We say emphatically no. It did not take government spokesmen very long to express in public their criticism of the action of the British and French governments. It was on October 30, within a matter of hours after the issuance of an ultimatum by Britain and France, to Egypt and Israel that, in the course of a press conference here at Ottawa, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when asked if he thought that the urgency of the situation warranted the British and French action, said, and these are his words, that he “regretted” that they—that is Britain and France—“found it necessary to take this action while the security council was discussing the matter”. That was a public expression of regret over the action taken by Britain and France. Within a very short time that was followed by a similar expression on the part of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, let us recall that here we are dealing with diplomatic language. The language of diplomacy is not the language of the man in the street. He is much more direct. It is not the language of debate in this house. We are much more direct in our statements here. But when a government, through its accredited spokesmen, says of the action of another government that it regrets that action, that statement in diplomatic

The Address—Mr. Fleming

terms is very strong language, and immensely more so when language of that kind is used by spokesmen of the government of a nation of the commonwealth with respect to the action taken by the government of another nation of the commonwealth. So, Mr. Speaker, his language was in itself a strong condemnation of the action taken by the British and French governments.

We say that condemnation was gratuitous, and we say that it was gratuitous for many reasons. What was the juridical position of Canada when the Secretary of State for External Affairs embarked upon his condemnation of Britain and France on October 30? It was this. This Liberal government has been in office now throughout this long period. This government had assumed no obligation in the Suez area. The only obligation or commitment resting upon Canada was such obligation as rested upon her as a member of the United Nations; that was the extent of her juridical obligation in that situation.

Bear in mind, sir, also that Canada, whether by her own choice or the choice of others—I think it is not unlikely Canada could have had a part in those negotiations if she had pressed to do so—did not take any part in the negotiations and international conferences following Nasser's seizure of the canal last summer. The Canadian government, when talking in this house or when its ministers were talking outside the house as to the extent of this government's concern with respect to the great dangers that threatened in the Suez area, always disclaimed interest in it and said in effect that Canada had no interest involved in that situation. Bear in mind as well, sir, that the British government did not ask for any aid from Canada. Neither Britain nor France asked for aid from any other country in this intervention. Canada, therefore, when on October 30 her spokesman undertook to speak, was not dealing with any request from the United Kingdom or from France for aid from this country. It was, therefore, a completely gratuitous statement that the Secretary of State for External Affairs delivered on October 30.

This morning he read a brief newspaper report of what I said on October 31 in Hamilton at a press conference when I was asked for a comment upon the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs the night before. I should like to give the house a more ample statement of what was said on that occasion. I am quoting now from the fuller account in the

[Mr. Fleming.]

Hamilton Spectator of November 1. I shall read several paragraphs.

Any Canadian declaration on the Suez crisis ought to be confined to that of a United Nations member, said Donald Fleming—

And so on.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming: If you want the words I was omitting, they are these:

. . . Donald Fleming, 51-year old contender for the national leadership of the Progressive Conservative party . . .

I was going to spare the house those words. The next paragraph reads:

"Canada has not had any part whatsoever in any of the conferences preceding the sudden, recent developments in the Middle East," he said. "And until the present confused situation has been fully unravelled, I think Canada should be cautious on what she has to say officially." The Toronto Eglinton member said in a press interview that he considered the United States had thus far made no contribution of real value to the settlement of the Suez question since it was precipitated several months ago by President Nasser's seizure of the canal.

As much of the problems had largely been thrust upon Britain and France, Mr. Fleming thought the Washington administration should be slow to condemn others—"until it has brought forward some worth-while contribution to a constructive solution."

"I cannot believe, however, that there can be any final cleavage between Britain and France on one hand and the U.S. on the other", he added.

Britain and France, he thought, had long standing interests and were closely interwoven—"and Canada should not undertake at this time to read any lecture to any of the parties involved."

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that in commenting directly on the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in Ottawa the night previous I was saying, in effect, that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in my opinion, had no right to make the comments he made. In the language of the amendment that is before the house now that was, on the part of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, a gratuitous condemnation of the British and French action.

Now, the action that was taken by Britain and France did involve risks. It was taken by those two countries on their own responsibility. The risks were serious. The results are not all as one would wish, having regard to the high purposes of Britain and France in intervening there. The issue, of course, was bound to come before the United Nations sooner or later. I say it should have not have come there, so far as Canada was concerned, after Canada had already delivered a condemnation of the actions of Britain and France. The Canadian government had prejudged the action of Britain and France before that issue came before

The Address—Mr. Fleming

the United Nations. When Canada appeared before the United Nations and opened her mouth on this subject, it was as a nation that had already acted as censor and judge upon the action of the British and French governments.

I have said that in many ways the results are regrettable. However, that is not to say that the action was not justified. It was known when Britain and France took that responsibility that there were very serious risks involved. We have seen a number of results. They were catalogued yesterday and are well known. But, sir, one thing that has not been acknowledged as it ought to have been by those who have been taking the government line on this matter is, first of all, the price that has been paid by Britain and France for the action they have taken. Countries, and they include Canada, which had not, through the United Nations, instituted effective police action at an earlier date before this crisis reached its present proportions, must bear their share of responsibility for the results that exist today.

Further, they ought to acknowledge several results on the positive side that have flowed from that intervention by Britain and France and are of the highest importance in reference to the whole world situation today. The first is this, that undoubtedly that intervention by Britain and France did avert the spread of the conflagration. The intervention did head off, it is quite clear, any direct Russian intervention. It may well have avoided a third world war. It is significant also that the intervention exposed the extent of earlier Russian intervention and penetration in the Middle East area; that is something that those who are today speaking for the United States of America at the United Nations ought well to bear in mind. Third, the United Nations assembly has been moved to establish a police force.

With all the opportunities the United Nations had in the face of the great danger, threats and warnings from that area of the world as to the necessity for police intervention, and they having taken no such action, it is very doubtful, if Britain and France had not intervened as they did, whether the United Nations even today would have intervened and taken police action. If the United Nations now is making a belated effort to establish a police force in the Middle East area, then undoubtedly much of the credit should be given to Britain and France for the intervention they made in that area.

We may deplore, sir, the fact that police action was necessary. But we must, in frankness, at the same time deplore that there

existed in that area of the world a vacuum with respect to police action. Police action was necessary. The subsequent developments have demonstrated that beyond all question. Let us be frank and honest with ourselves with regard to the United Nations. All of us had high hopes for the United Nations. All of us have subscribed firmly and cheerfully to the policy of maintenance of the United Nations and the discharge of our responsibilities there, and attempted to make the United Nations an effective instrument for the preservation of world peace. All of us hoped it would be that.

But, sir, the fact of the matter is that the United Nations had been so reduced to impotency in that area that a vacuum did exist. No police action had been taken. The security council, which was established for that purpose and was given powers intended to enable it to take the necessary police action in such circumstances has, as we know, been frustrated and reduced to impotency by the Russian use of the veto on 78 occasions.

As for the assembly, while the veto does not exist in that body, there is, as all know, no standing machinery there for the application of police action when any situation requiring it arises in the world; and in the midst of the abundance of dangers and warnings in the Middle East, with the fires of hostility burning there in recent years and fanned to flames in recent months, the United Nations, whether the security council or the assembly, still found themselves unable or unwilling to take effective police action in that area. Had effective police action been taken a few months ago, as was advocated in this house by members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, sir, there is every reason to believe that the present crisis would not have arisen, that it would have been prevented. But there was not enough determination in this matter—and this includes the Canadian government through its representatives at the United Nations—to press for effective police action in the Middle East. So the danger was allowed to grow until it burst into hostilities, as we know, in those fateful days of late October.

Now, sir, as to the discussions that have occurred since in the United Nations assembly, let us recognize this fact, that to the extent to which the United Nations assembly takes upon itself the task of acting as spokesman of the conscience of the world, that forum is acting far in advance of police power. That form of expression of the attitudes of the world has far outrun its police power, and dangers result.

The Address—Mr. Fleming

Now, sir, the idea of a police force there, belated but commendable, has to be regarded in the light of the responsibilities that have already existed for a long, long time and have not been discharged by the United Nations or by its members, including the Canadian government. We have to recognize as well, in weighing the value of the position of the United Nations here, that the United Nations has faced a very supreme test in recent times in the face of the plainest and most brutal kind of Russian aggression in Hungary. Apart from some talking in the United Nations assembly, it is evident that the United Nations has proven utterly impotent in the face of the plainest of all breaches of the charter of the United Nations. Russia is evidently too strong for the United Nations to handle, and the United Nations has unhappily betrayed the hopes of the Hungarian patriots in the process.

Sir, Britain and France, in the course of the action they took, expressed their willingness to co-operate with the United Nations in withdrawal of their own police force as soon as the United Nations would station effective police forces in the area. The Canadian government has chosen to align itself with those who are not satisfied with the plain statement of purpose and the expression of good faith on the part of the governments of Britain and France in this matter.

The house ought to be aware by this time, I think, that much of the impatience shown by the Prime Minister yesterday over criticism of the government's behaviour in this matter stems from the fact that there is in Canada and in other countries of the western world a growing sympathy with the action that Britain and France felt compelled to take in the situation that arose. There is a growing recognition of that fact everywhere except, apparently, in the minds of the Canadian government; and if they have not yet come to recognize that growing sympathy, then it is because they are so far out of touch with the feelings of the Canadian people.

Now, sir, this amendment of ours—again I stress the issue—condemns the government because it followed a policy of gratuitous condemnation of that action of Britain and France which was designed to prevent a major war arising in the Suez area. A gratuitous condemnation, yes! The Prime Minister yesterday in his remarks derided the suggestion that there had been on the part of the government a gratuitous condemnation. If anything was lacking of gratuitous condemnation on the part of the Canadian government in relation to the action of Britain

and France it was supplied in abundance by the Prime Minister yesterday in his speech.

Now, we have watched the Prime Minister for many years. We have known that he never was an enthusiast for the commonwealth. We remember—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Fleming: Yes, it is a fact. It will be remembered that when he came back from his commonwealth tour two years ago he delivered to the house a report lasting for over an hour. Read that record today and you will not find him saying one word by way of tribute to the commonwealth of nations, or the purpose that this beneficent institution serves in the world today. He went to the commonwealth prime ministers' conference last June. He did not want any discussion here before he went about matters that might be brought before that conference, and when he came back it was quite evident that he had not contributed anything to the agenda for discussion at that conference. We should not have been particularly surprised at the attitude taken by the Prime Minister when this matter arose and when he was expressing his regret at the action by Britain and France.

But let us come down to yesterday. What he said yesterday was as bitter an attack, I am sure, upon Britain and France and upon the leaders of those countries as will ever be heard in the Canadian House of Commons. Listen to these words as they appear on page 20 of *Hansard*. This is in discussion of the very item in our amendment to which I am referring now in relation to the gratuitous condemnation by the Canadian government of the action of Britain and France. In relation to that subject the Prime Minister in his reply said:

I have been scandalized more than once by the attitude of the larger powers, the big powers as we call them, who have all too frequently treated the charter of the United Nations as an instrument with which to regiment smaller nations.

Is that not a gratuitous condemnation of Britain and France?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Fleming: It was in a passage relating to the action of Britain and France that the Prime Minister uttered these words. And further, sir, in the next paragraph he went on to talk about the era when the supermen of Europe could govern the whole world and said this era is coming pretty close to an end. That was uttered in the same context. This is, I think, a reference that the Prime Minister of this country ought to repent in sackcloth and ashes, a reference to the leaders of Britain and France in the action that they felt compelled to take.

The Address—Mr. Fleming

Let this be remembered. We are not sitting here as political parties in the British House of Commons; we are sitting here as parties dealing with expressions of censure by the Canadian government of action taken by Great Britain and France, and I say that the Prime Minister of this country ought to repent in sackcloth and ashes for making such references to a man like Sir Anthony Eden, who showed that high courage on some very conspicuous occasions, when he was prepared to make great sacrifices for the belief he had in the position he was taking when he stood firm against the appeasement of dictators in the world.

This government, apparently, has not very much appreciation of the fact that here was a situation in which, by their actions, they were contributing to the appeasement of the Egyptian dictator, and I do not think the Canadian people will very likely or soon forgive the Prime Minister of this country for bracketing Britain and France with Russia in the references he made in his speech yesterday to powers taking aggressive action.

Mr. Pickersgill: He did no such thing.

Mr. Fleming: He certainly did. There is the babbling brook from Newfoundland again.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): It is another brook which has been babbling now for the last half hour.

Mr. Fleming: The Prime Minister babbled yesterday, and is intervening today. Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about maintenance of the rules of this house I draw your attention to the fact that the Prime Minister considers himself not bound by those rules, because he is bobbing up and down as he sees fit without regard to the rules, not asking questions but throwing in interjections all through speeches that have been made by members from this side of the house throughout this debate.

Now, sir, I come to the second paragraph of our amendment, in which we ask the house to condemn the government for "having meekly followed the unrealistic policies of the United States of America and thereby encouraged a truculent and defiant attitude on the part of the Egyptian dictator". Now, the Prime Minister tried very adroitly yesterday to sidestep this issue by saying that we have had no direct dealings with Nasser. That is not the point, sir. The point is this, that the Canadian government, which should be acting like an independent government in this matter, has chosen to be too closely associated with the policies of the United States; and I say, while we are not the United States congress, nevertheless we are entitled to say of

the policies of the United States that they are responsible to a very considerable degree, a regrettable degree, for the trouble that exists in the Middle East today, for those policies of the United States have unquestionably encouraged Nasser to take the defiant attitude that he has adopted.

It is evident that right from the start the United States curried favour with Nasser in the incident of sending a special representative over from the United States president to make a personal present to the dictator of Egypt; and then the expressions that have come from very high quarters in Washington about driving the vestiges of colonialism out of the Middle East and the well known fact that the United States itself has a very small stake in the Suez traffic. These are factors that ought to have put the Canadian government on its guard against meekly following the policies of the United States government; yet the Canadian government has preferred, when it came to an issue between Britain and France on the one hand and the United States on the other, to go along with the United States policies.

As to the boasted historical role of Canada as the bridge between the United States and Great Britain, the Canadian government as I say has lamentably failed to discharge its responsibility in that regard. The Canadian government has taken sides, and it must bear the responsibility for widening the breach between Great Britain and the United States, a breach one conspicuous feature of which is that the United States and the U.S.S.R. have been aligned in votes in the United Nations. It has not come about suddenly. This is something that has been developing for a long time, and we are now seeing the fruits of a policy on the part of this government opposite of associating itself too closely with the political and economic policies of the United States. And now the United States is wielding the big stick in reference to oil deliveries over the heads of Britain and France.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we have come to this pass in the world. The United States is in no small measure responsible for it and the Canadian government in following the policies of the United States government must bear a shameful share of the responsibility.

In the third place we ask the house to censure the government for having placed Canada in the humiliating position of accepting dictation from President Nasser. Yesterday the Prime Minister, as I said, endeavoured adroitly to sidestep this issue by saying that the government had had no direct dealings with Nasser. That is not going to meet the issue here at all. The fact is that the Egyptian dictator has been laying

The Address—Mr. Fleming

down terms for admission of the police force of the United Nations to Egyptian soil, and if the Canadian government has not had direct contact with President Nasser in regard to this matter at least the Canadian government has had its contact with the secretary general of the United Nations who has had his contact with President Nasser. It is he to whom President Nasser has been laying down conditions in regard to what nations shall contribute and what nations shall not contribute to the United Nations police force, how long that police force shall be permitted to remain, what it shall do while there, what territory it shall occupy and when it shall go out. We did not hear from the Prime Minister yesterday and we have not heard previously from the government any word of complaint about this dictation President Nasser has conveyed through the secretary general of the United Nations.

The Canadian government has claimed some credit for initiating the proposal for an emergency police force in the Middle East; yet when President Nasser tells the officials of the United Nations on what terms the police force shall be permitted to function on Egyptian territory we have not heard protests from the Canadian government that this would be an intolerable weakening of the authority, prestige and dignity of the United Nations.

I say, sir, that if the Canadian government participates in this attempted appeasement of this Egyptian dictator then surely we shall pay a price, as every nation has paid that has attempted to appease dictators. Yet the Prime Minister told the House of Commons yesterday, as recorded at page 24 of *Hansard* that President Nasser—

—was most appreciative of the suggestions the Canadian government had made to deal with this situation.

This dictator in Egypt has reason to appreciate the attitude of the Canadian government. I do not know any more effective condemnation of the attitude of the Canadian government than that this Egyptian dictator appreciates that attitude. What we should be doing is strengthening the United Nations, not contributing to the weakening of the United Nations by accepting for ourselves or as a member of the United Nations dictation of this kind from this dictator.

My time is just up. I had hoped to say something about the fourth paragraph of the amendment, in which we ask the house to censure the government for "having failed to take swift and adequate action to extend refuge to the patriots of Hungary and other lands under the cruel Russian yoke". I have time only to say this, sir, that it will take

[Mr. Fleming.]

a lot more than the attitude shown by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill) in his remarks last night to convince this house and the Canadian people that the Canadian government has done all it could do to afford sanctuary and refuge to these Hungarian patriots who are seeking to flee the terror of the Russian yoke. His attitude was a condescending, superior attitude, and he needs to rouse himself from the easy nonchalance that he seems to adopt with regard to his responsibilities. Humanity and justice demand that Canada do all it can to succour these refugees from the Russian yoke.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. gentleman would permit a question?

Mr. Fleming: The attitude of the Canadian government has been marked by its confusion and uncertainty—

Mr. Pickersgill: Would the hon. gentleman permit a question?

Mr. Fleming: My time is just up.

This country must either strengthen the United Nations to take action with adequate police power to keep peace in the world and to deter and punish aggression, or we must cease to depend largely upon the United Nations to prevent and punish aggression in the world.

I believe that the people of this country wish to see the United Nations strengthened, and it is going to take a lot more in the way of effective action on the part of the Canadian government to that end than has yet been taken. The Canadian government is deserving of censure on the four grounds we have set out with full particularity in our amendment, and I hope the house will express its condemnation of the government for its failures in this regard.

This is a matter of extreme importance. The government's failures are obvious. These failures are not the results of sudden indecision or sudden error. These are the results of policies that the government has been following. They are the results of the failure of the government, of its closing its ears to warnings of danger in the world. These are the inevitable results of the government's own blindness and obstinacy.

Mr. Pickersgill: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Eglinton would now permit me to ask my question?

Mr. Fleming: With pleasure.

Mr. Pickersgill: I would like to know specifically what the hon. gentleman thinks should be done about these Hungarian refugees that has not already been done;

The Address—Mr. A. Stewart

because if he has any good suggestions I am sure the government will accept them at once.

Mr. Rowe: And they need to.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, that is a long story and I am not going to attempt to give a full answer at this time.

Mr. Cavers: Put it in writing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, Oh.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, if the vocal gentleman over here wishes to give the answer I suggest he give it. I thought the minister was asking me for my answer. Now, if it is my answer he wants, I can assure the hon. gentleman opposite that I do not ask for his assistance.

Mr. Rowe: You had better stand up.

Mr. Brooks: It would be the first time he ever did give an answer. Get up and say something worth while.

Mr. Habel: If the hon. gentleman wants me to give the answer in his place I can do so.

Mr. Speaker: May I ask hon. gentlemen to please conduct an orderly debate.

Mr. Fleming: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to attempt a full answer to this question by the minister, but I will say in reply at this stage that whatever has been done could have been done earlier, it could have been done more swiftly and effectively, and more could have been done.

Mr. Pickersgill: What do you suggest we should do now?

Mr. Fleming: That shows the attitude of this government all the way through. They want the House of Commons to forgive the government for its failures in the past.

Mr. Pickersgill: We want to get on with the future, not worry about the past.

Mr. Fleming: I can well understand why the minister wants the Canadian people and the Canadian House of Commons to forget the sorry past and the failure to recognize the seriousness of the situation in Hungary. Let me give him another example of the attitude of this government. We saw the patriots of Hungary rising almost with bare hands in an effort to throw off the Russian yoke. How were those patriots described in broadcasts by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation? They were described as "Hungarian rebels", but I choose to call them Hungarian patriots who are striving to throw off this Russian yoke. It is just that kind of attitude on the part of this government that explains why they were so slow to take action, why their

action limped for so long, and why they are so anxious now that their failures hitherto should be forgotten. I will assure them that they are not going to be forgotten.

Mr. Pickersgill: May I repeat my question. I should like to know what more the hon. gentleman thinks should be done now? What more does he think should be done now? He has no answer. He is giving no answer.

Mr. Fleming: Of course the minister is exercising the prerogative claimed by all ministers of speaking as often as they wish in a debate. The rules do not bind them. The minister has gone far beyond asking a question; he has attempted to make another speech. There is one very good thing that could be done immediately—change the government and get a new minister of citizenship and immigration.

Mr. Alistair Stewart (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, having listened for some time to the hon. member for Eglinton I think one could say in baseball parlance, "one up and one away". We have heard from the Warwicks of the Conservative party and now we have heard from one of the aspirants to kingship. But still we do not know what the Conservative policy is with regard to the Middle East. There seems to be some conflict, because I recall hearing members of the Conservative party asking for police action. What the government has suggested to the house is that we should pursue police action. Apparently there are members of the Conservative party who really do not like police action. Apparently there are those Tories of the old school who would gird themselves with the Union Jack and tear off anywhere to the assistance of England, bellowing loudly, "Ready, aye, ready."

We have heard these colonially-minded people in this country for a long time, but I should like to recall to them that the first leader of their party would not have much to do with that sort of attitude. About 70 years ago, in 1885, England found herself in a bit of a mess in the Sudan. There were Conservatives in this country who thought that, willy-nilly, Canadians ought to give immediately all the assistance they could to England and its problems abroad. Sir John A. Macdonald wrote a letter to Tupper on March 12, 1885, in which he said:

Why should we waste money and men in this wretched business? England is not at war, but merely helping the Khedive to put down an insurrection, and now that Gordon is gone, the motive of aiding in the rescue of our countrymen is gone with him.

The Address—Mr. A. Stewart

It is the next sentence which perhaps should be directed to the attention of my hon. friends:

Our men and money would therefore be sacrificed to get Gladstone and Co. out of the hole they have plunged themselves into by their own imbecility.

Sir John A. Macdonald being dead yet speaketh, and I think speaketh quite loudly. I shall let the matter rest there, but I do hope that some of the other members of the Conservative party who speak will be prepared to lay before this house and country the program which they themselves believe should be followed in the Middle East.

The people of Canada are interested, and one reason they are so interested is due in no small measure to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which performed a public service when it brought into the homes of the people of Canada by television and radio what was happening at the United Nations. The corporation's was the only network of any size in North America which provided that public service, and I think we have reason to be grateful to them for giving it.

It not infrequently happens in the history of mankind that out of crisis an opportunity is given to take a great step forward in human progress. I am convinced that this is one of those times. We have again arrived at one of the crossroads of civilization as we did at the time of the Manchurian crisis, when we deliberately chose the wrong road, as we did at the time of the Ethiopian crisis when we again chose the wrong road, with consequences which were only too clear in 1939.

As far as we of the C.C.F. are concerned there is only one road to follow, and that is the path of collective security. It is only by pursuing that path that we feel there can be any salvation. Without whatever instrument of collective security we can build up in the United Nations, we shall be faced with the inevitability of war in perhaps the predictable future.

In this world we must have either the rule of law or chaos. We either have order in international dealings or we have anarchy. The history of the past 30 years has proved that abundantly. We as a party want to see law and order maintained in this world. We believe that law and order is more important than peace, because peace may be illusory and peace can be negative. Law and order implies that we shall use force if necessary to maintain it. Having maintained it, then peace is a by-product.

We are convinced that our hope lies in collective security. We are a most fortunate country. We are wealthy and our standards

[Mr. Stewart (Winnipeg North).]

of living are extraordinarily high. We have the confidence of a substantial number of nations in the world and we have no acquisitive aims.

We can afford on occasion to be disinterested, but not too much so. There was a tendency when this crisis broke out at the end of October to be too disinterested. It was thought by some that we had no material interest in sight as far as Suez was concerned, but there was something else. We have to be interested because this is becoming an increasingly smaller world. At the time of the Fathers of Confederation it took longer to go from Ottawa to Toronto than it now takes to go half way around the world. The miles are still there but the time has been cut down to a few hours.

Our neighbours are not only those who live in the house next to us or in the street next to us. Our neighbours are those who live in countries far away and of whom perhaps even yet we know nothing. We are not isolated any longer on this continent by mighty oceans nor are we insulated any longer by the Polar icecap. The world is much too small for that. It is a world which is fast becoming a community, and so we had a very vital interest, if not a material one, in what was happening in the Suez area. I take it for granted that the vital interest of this parliament and this country is the maintenance of peace in the world. Anything which threatens that is a blow at our own vital and national interests and peace was threatened there. In marked contradistinction to this lack of action of 20 years ago we have taken action which perhaps may yet lead to the salvation of the whole situation.

There are those who regret collective action. There are those who feel we should still stand by the side of the United Kingdom even at the cost of sacrificing the United Nations. These are men and women who have learned nothing from history. If we destroy the United Nations what are our alternatives in this country and, indeed, in other countries in the world? What would our commitments for defence be, for instance, in a world which would deny law and order, in a world which would scorn justice, in a world which would prefer the barbarism of the jungle to what I consider to be the sanity of co-operative and collective action? The price would be incredibly high, not only at first in terms of money but ultimately in terms of the lives of another generation of Canadians. It is a price which we as a party are certainly not prepared to pay, and we insist that the authority of the United Nations must be maintained.

The Address—Mr. A. Stewart

We in Canada, along with other nations, have, by our sins of omission and commission, helped to undermine the United Nations. We have gone far on the road. Now we have the opportunity to rebuild it and to give that collective security which the world needs if it is going to survive. For that reason we support this policy which the government is presenting to us. We support it because we believe it to be right. That does not mean to say we are going to refrain from criticism when discussing details but in principle we support the policy because it is correct.

It would be a very easy thing to rake over the past and try to assess the blame for what has happened in the last few weeks. It would be very easy but it would be very fruitless. No good could come out of it. Rather I concentrate on what I said earlier. Here we have an opportunity to do something, to build something. What should we be doing? We have got to consider the facts, of course, as they existed in the last few weeks and in the last few years, and one of the most obvious facts which has been clear for centuries is that in a world where jungle law prevails, when a nation feels its vital interests are at stake, that nation is going to fight. Unfortunately there are still those who believe that this is nothing but a world of power politics, a world of the jungle, and there are those who have resorted to force because they felt that the United Nations could not protect their vital interests.

But I call you to witness, Mr. Speaker, that if the United Nations is weak it is precisely because these nations themselves have weakened it. The instrument was there. It is an instrument where for once we see a whole which is greater than the parts but the nations which are members of the United Nations have not used it as the people of the world hoped they would use it when the war ended in 1945. We know because we have virtually been told by the United Kingdom that if they feel their oil supplies are threatened they are prepared to fight to maintain them. Therefore it would be the better part of wisdom, I submit, to use the United Nations to see that as far as possible these oil supplies are maintained.

We have known quite a number of things about Colonel Nasser, especially those of us who have read his short philosophy of life which he published a few years ago in which he told us that there was a role in the Middle East looking for a hero. Unquestionably Colonel Nasser feels himself to be that hero. Unquestionably his aspiration is to lead the people of the Arab world. He has got a right

to his aspirations but that right ceases when his actions run counter to the welfare of other peoples.

We have also known the fact for the Arab states have declared it as a matter of policy that they intend to destroy the state of Israel. That was not hidden at any time. We have known also as a fact that the Arab nations would not enter into peace negotiations with that little democracy in the Middle East. So Israel felt itself in danger, and I think understandably so, because we have also known for a number of years now that the fedayeen, inspired in no small measure by Egypt, have been going into Israel murdering and marauding. I had personal experience of this just a little over a year ago. Every night for the first two weeks that I was in Israel some innocent villager, some member of a kibbutz, was being killed by the fedayeen, and the temper of the people there began to make itself felt. They wanted this stopped because it had not been going on just for a few weeks but had been going on for months and, indeed, years.

Finally, one night when we were in Tel Aviv, five Israeli villagers were murdered in the coldest of cold blood only 15 miles away by Arab marauders. The temper of the people could then be almost physically felt and no government could ignore its people when these indications were abroad. Action was taken, swift and condign. In the Gaza strip Khan Yunis, which was an Egyptian military base, was attacked and wiped out, and for a few hours there were many of us who thought that this was perhaps the beginning of the war which we feared. But no war came of it. We had a cessation of these attacks for a while and then once Nasser felt the Suez was his they started again and the situation became even worse until, with a policy of what I consider to be calculated desperation, Israel went into the Sinai peninsula.

Without question Israel was guilty of aggression, but without question in my mind there are excuses there which are very powerful indeed, and the most important is that time after time cases of aggression—and Israel had been guilty quite frequently as well as the Arabs—had been taken to the United Nations starting with the preventing of Israeli ships from going through the canal, and the United Nations had not acted. So Israel acted on its own and I think in error because small nations cannot afford to indulge in power politics. Even bigger ones cannot afford it, as the United Kingdom and France have found out. Only the biggest nations can afford that sort of luxury.

So we have the situation which confronts us today. The operation conducted by the

The Address—Mr. A. Stewart

United Kingdom and France has been a fiasco. It has been a failure. One good thing which has come out of it is that both the United Kingdom and France have been inhibited by an age-old sense of law and order from going further and defying the United Nations further. I think that is one of the most encouraging aspects of the whole situation, but encouraging though that may be the fact remains that the commonwealth has been rocked to its foundations. NATO has been shaken and two nations which ought to have the regard of the world have now been condemned by it.

Another factor in the situation today is that Russia is now a power of some magnitude in the Middle East and, dependent upon western diplomacy, may become dominant. It has been said, and I concur, that the United States has got to take much of the responsibility for the shambles which exists in that part of the world, but again I say it is fruitless to try to allot the blame.

What can we do to rescue ourselves and the world from this mess that we are in? What are the requisites for peace in that area? The C.C.F. has suggested six points which are proposed as being worthy of consideration. My leader covered them yesterday. The first is that we extend United Nations police action to cover the borders with Syria, Jordan and Lebanon as I for one am convinced that we shall have to do yet if we want to maintain peace in that area. Second, there must be a peace treaty between Israel and the Arab states. This would imply, of course, Arab recognition of Israel, the guarantee of Israel's borders and the lifting of the blockade in the Suez and the gulf of Aqaba. The third suggestion is that a solution to the Suez problem can be found along the lines of India's proposal to the 18-power conference of which the minister and hon. members are aware. The fourth suggestion is resettlement and rehabilitation of the refugees. The fifth suggestion is that a Tennessee Valley Authority type of program be instituted for the Nile valley to replace the scheme for the Aswan dam. The sixth suggestion is a general United Nations economic program for the whole area, providing for the use of such waters as the Jordan to increase the fertility of the desert. The desert can be made very fertile and can be made to blossom as the rose. That is a statement from the Old Testament and not one of mine, although I have heard it attributed to somebody much more recent than an Old Testament prophet. You have two types of sand in that area. You have the sand of the seashore which is disintegrated rock and you have the sand of the desert which once upon a time was the most fertile of earth but which

has been allowed through the years to go to waste and to ruin. The desert once again can be made to blossom, but it needs water; and so far as Jordan, Syria and Israel are concerned, that water is going to come in no small measure from the river Jordan. It is a pity that both Syria and Jordan have adopted in the past such a dog-in-the-manger attitude towards the utilization of that water because by using it as other rivers have been used in Israel, great numbers of people could have been fed who today I fear are in desperate circumstances.

So far as Suez is concerned we ought to have some more definite ideas in mind. I think, of course, that it is the duty of the United Nations to get that canal cleared. But after that has been done, I cannot see where the responsibility of the United Nations lies for protecting the Suez from then on. Surely the Suez canal is something which, rightly or wrongly, Egypt has taken over and which lies entirely in Egyptian territory. The duty of the United Nations force, in the long run has to be to guarantee the borders of the countries in the Middle East, not to protect the Suez canal unless it appears to be completely convinced that Colonel Nasser and the Egyptians cannot protect it. But there are other things which should be done. I believe the United Nations should offer to Colonel Nasser the technical help of men and women who can help him, if necessary, to run the canal. I believe, of course, that when Nasser takes it over, as he has done, he should pay those who are the owners of the canal, and pay them an amount to be agreed upon by some international board or by some board of conciliation. But I think that we must then be in a position where the United Nations can help the Egyptians to run that canal. There ought to be a convention open to all the signatories of the United Nations charter, and to other nations for that matter, guaranteeing freedom of access at all times to the canal; and where there are any disputes or differences, there must be agreement that those disputes or differences be referred to the international court of justice. In return for the promise of peace by these countries in the Middle East, a massive scheme of social and economical rehabilitation should be entered into by all the nations of the United Nations. That will be expensive but it is going to be much cheaper to prevent a war than it is going to be to stop a war after it has started. Of this much I am certain, and I think I know a little of the temper of the people in that area. Unless there is international action, violence is going to start again.

The world cannot afford it and we cannot afford it in this country. We cannot afford

The Address—Mr. Pearkes

the threat and promise of war if there is no international action. I therefore say it is going to pay us to play our part in policing these borders. As far as Israel and the Arab nations are concerned there must be, of course, agreement about borders. If possible, that result should be arrived at on a basis of mutual agreement. If it cannot be arrived at in that way, if there is intransigence on one side or the other, I think the United Nations will be obliged to impose an agreement on the recalcitrant countries in that area. Israel must be prepared—and they have said they are—to pay for whatever Arab property they have taken. They must be prepared to pay their share—and a substantial share—in the rehabilitation of the Arab refugees.

Those of us who know of the situation there know how desperate is the plight of the refugees in the Arab countries surrounding Israel. The Arab nations have done little to help their own kinsmen but the world must take it as part of its responsibility. Then as I said, there must be found an answer to the problem of the distribution of water resources. With that water the refugees can be resettled in neighbouring countries and given a chance to earn a living or to obtain a living which is the right of every human creature. But these things are going to cost money; and that money must come, in no small measure, from the nations which have it. I suggested earlier in this house, namely last January—and my leader suggested it yesterday—that since the root of the trouble in the Middle East is oil, we ought to expect a substantial amount of money from this resource to help to resettle and improve the conditions of the Arabs in the Middle East. If I were an Arab living in Saudi Arabia, I would be quite incensed at the thought that some \$500 million of profit each year was being taken out of my country, half being given to a dissolute monarch and the other half going to private companies in other parts of the world. I made a suggestion earlier. I do not know any other answer. There may be one. If the minister has it, I should like to know it. I suggested it would be in the interest of world peace if the nations which have the companies in there would nationalize these companies, pay the owners of the companies a reasonable sum of money and then say to the United Nations, "We are prepared to give the proceeds from the selling of the oil to the United Nations so that it may be used for the rehabilitation of that part of the world". I admit that it would be expensive to buy out the owners. But nevertheless there would be some \$800 million to \$900 million revenue each year which could be

used for the rehabilitation of which I speak. There are no courses of action we can suggest to settle this problem which do not have dangers. However, I am convinced that we have less danger when we face up to our responsibilities and are prepared to act. I hope that this leadership which is being given by Canada is not temporary because "temporary" is not long enough. This must be permanent. Under the threat of tragedy we have been prepared to take leadership. There is no reason why we cannot continue to take that leadership and assume the responsibilities which leadership will thrust on us. I agree and concur that there will be danger. But I think of what Shakespeare said, "Out of this nettle, danger, we pluck the flower, safety".

Mr. G. R. Pearkes (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the Minister of National Defence would have risen in this debate and given us a clearer picture of Canada's contribution to the United Nations emergency force which is being assembled for operations in the Middle East. The only accurate information that we have been given since this debate started was in reply to a question that I asked this morning with regard to the numbers which were going to make up the components from the Canadian navy, army and air force, contingent, and the rather vaguer information which the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) gave to the house in his remarks yesterday when he made certain references to the battalion which was to be sent and to the ancillary forces which would be accompanying that battalion. I want to make it quite clear at the outset that I realize this United Nations emergency force is going to the Middle East for police duty, but I am not at all clear as to exactly what is meant by police action.

It seems to me this term, which has come into more frequent use during recent years, applies to the sort of garrison duties which the scarlet coated soldiers of the Queen, during Queen Victoria's reign, carried out policing the world and maintaining the pax Britannica. I do recall that when the operation commenced in Korea it was stated in this house on numerous occasions that it was a police action and that there was not war in Korea. That may be so, and the brigade which we sent to Korea may have gone out there believing that they were to carry out police action to stop the fighting or to assist in stopping the fighting between the north and south Koreans, the former receiving assistance from China and Russia. These men soon found they were fighting for their lives and that the police action in Korea had become a very dangerous operation.

The Address—Mr. Pearkes

I think, with that experience behind us, we should examine very carefully to see that these forces which we are now intending to send to the Middle East are so equipped that, in the event of the situation developing in the Middle East into one similar to that which developed in Korea, they have at least a reasonable chance of survival. I also recall the expedition which was sent to Hong Kong in the early part of the war. Japan was not at war at that time. These Canadian battalions were sent to Hong Kong for garrison duty, police duty perhaps, and we know the tragic fate of those battalions because they were not equipped when they arrived in Hong Kong to carry out modern, warlike operations, be they described as police operations or actual fighting.

Well, we will accept the statement that these troops are not going to Suez for the purpose of fighting, that they are not a fighting force as the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) said today. But these men are soldiers, airmen and sailors—men of the Royal Canadian Navy—who have been trained to fight and, if necessary, are prepared to do so. They are going to the Middle East for the purpose, as was said this afternoon, of separating the opposing forces of fighting men. I feel that it is imperative this government assures the country that the force it is sending, and the forces with which it will be co-operating, is an efficient force capable of carrying out the assignments which the United Nations have given to it. It is essential for us, and for the United Nations, to make quite certain that the forces are not only adequate but also thoroughly efficient and capable of doing the task they are called upon to do.

It might be worth while to remember that even a modern police force today is an extremely mobile force. You see the cruiser cars patrolling around any city, equipped with the modern means of communication, because they realize that the gangster of today is also an extremely mobile individual. These remarks apply just as forcibly to the international gangster or the gangster nation as they do to the individual. No longer does the bandit of 100 years ago, who was then merely armed with clubs and spears, represent the international gangster of today. These armies which are now opposing each other in the Middle East, we know, are equipped with modern aircraft, modern tanks and a generous supply of the most up-to-date arms which can be manufactured and bought from the various nations in the world.

It would be well for us, I think to examine for a moment the geography of the area in which our forces will be operating. The

[Mr. Pearkes.]

Suez canal, roughly speaking, is about 100 miles long, running through Egypt from north to south. The approaches from the Egyptian side are extremely limited. They are practically confined to two main roads running into Ismailia and to Suez, with a lateral road running parallel to the canal. The greater portion of the western or Egyptian side of the canal is marshland through which it would be extremely difficult for a force of any size to move. In the past two wars we have seen how difficult it was for the forces who were there to defend the canal, to operate and manoeuvre on the western side. But on the eastern side of Suez is the Sinai desert. As everybody knows, that is a rolling, sandy strip of country with comparatively few obstacles in it, and providing forces can move through the desert, they can reach the Suez canal at almost any point.

It will be recalled that in 1914 a mobile force of Turks crossed that desert, reached the Suez canal and even had some of their men get to the western side of the canal. During the years which intervened between the first and second wars much of that desert land was watched by the Royal Air Force and the armoured corps regiments of the British army. During the second war, if there was one lesson which the armies of the world learned, it was that extreme mobility was required in any desert fighting. You had the examples in Africa, both of the German-African corps and of the British eighth army, both extremely mobile forces, and so I was rather surprised when I heard the Prime Minister indicate yesterday that the contributions that were to be made by the United Nations contributing to this United Nations emergency force would be the sending of a battalion or a self-contained unit. That, apparently, is the suggestion which has been made.

Then, we heard today that the main composition of the Canadian contingent was to be an infantry battalion. Therefore, it seems to me that those forces which are to operate in this desert country, watching a frontier of a thousand miles or so, are to consist of infantry battalions operating in the Sinai desert, apparently based on the various oases that there may be in that sandy stretch of country. It does not seem to me that experience has shown that that is the right type of force to be used.

Reference was made this afternoon to their being a balanced force, balanced from the military point of view and from the geographical or, I suppose, political point of view. But a force composed almost entirely of infantry battalions certainly does not seem to me to be a balanced force. The one type of troops or police force which would be able to carry

The Address—Mr. Pearkes

out most effectively the duties of patrolling that frontier and of seeing that the forces of the two opposing countries did not clash would be light armoured formations, or reconnaissance units, backed up by squadrons of an air force, with a limited number of men distributed either along the canal banks or throughout the desert.

I saw one statement made by what I consider to be an authoritative source that two armoured divisions would be required to patrol effectively the frontier, with a number of reconnaissance squadrons of an air force. Now, it is all very well for the government to shelter behind General Burns and the United Nations. When I heard the Prime Minister making his speech yesterday I wondered whether he was not attempting to create a scapegoat in General Burns in case things went wrong, and to push the responsibility of having provided an adequate force upon him and to make it possible for the government to say that General Burns asked for this, or did not ask for that.

We are not in the position to know what General Burns has asked for; we have to take that secondhand from the government. There is no possible chance for General Burns to come here and to express to us what he considers is the right type of force that he should be equipped with. We do not know whether he is satisfied as to the contingents which are being supplied. He will not grumble about the type of men which is going, and I am certain that the nations will send him their best young men; but whether they are going to be equipped, whether they are adequately trained and whether they have the means of seeing what is going on and of striking back, should it be necessary for them to use force if they were attacked in their duties of trying to separate the contending forces, we do not know. We cannot know unless there is some committee of this house appointed before which General Burns might appear. We are not likely to get that. Therefore, the government does have to assume the responsibility of sending men to join an international force which they must determine is or is not an effective force, and of giving the men that they send every chance of survival. If there is any doubt in the minds of the government, or of the people of this country—and there is doubt in my mind—that this force which is now in being, we were told today, in Egypt, is an efficient force, or if its composition is likely to be able to perform the task that it has been assigned. If the government is not satisfied, then it is the responsibility of the government to make that known quite clearly

to the United Nations and to ask for certain changes; in fact, to demand such changes as it may consider necessary.

This government will not be allowed to hide behind the United Nations, or General Burns, in the execution of its responsibilities to give its soldiers, sailors and airmen a reasonable chance of carrying out the duties they are asked to perform.

We were told by the Secretary of State for External Affairs today that this force is in being in Egypt. I wondered whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs meant that the force was on paper and ready to go to Egypt. And when he told us that that force was composed of 1,700 men—I think he said made up from eight different nations of which 20 per cent was supplied by Canada—I wondered whether he really meant that the force was in being. Now, a force of 1,700 men, even though there may be other forces ready in other parts of the world, can hardly be considered an efficient and effective force to stop the fighting between two opposing countries, unless those two countries are perfectly prepared to stop all operations of raiding, commando activities, and so forth, in which case there is no need then for a police force. If there is need for a police force, then the force must be an effective one. A force of 1,700 men made up of various detachments and services from many countries certainly cannot be considered an effective force to patrol a frontier of 1,000 miles or more and to intervene in that very difficult country.

I would like to know if France and Great Britain have indicated to the United Nations what they would consider an efficient force to take over the duties that they are now carrying out and which they say they are prepared to abandon as soon as this effective force reaches the Middle East. They have already made token withdrawals. Are they prepared to make further token withdrawals on the strength that this force in Egypt of 1,700 men is now available? I wonder.

I would like to know what Great Britain and France consider is a force, adequate to do the task, which the United Nations has told Great Britain and France they will supply and for which Great Britain and France have both agreed to withdraw their own forces as soon as the effective force arrives.

Turning to Canada's contribution, I gather that at present there are only a few hundred men, engineers, signallers, ordnance, army service corps, R.E.M.E., the administrative element of the force, which have actually reached Egypt. We have not been told the exact number of Canadians who have actually

The Address—Mr. Pearkes

arrived but obviously it is the administrative force to provide the headquarters which is necessary for General Burns in order to assign the other troops to their allotted tasks, plus the navy with the *Magnificent*.

For the life of me I cannot understand why it was considered desirable to take the armaments off the *Magnificent*. I admit that the anti-aircraft guns which were on the *Magnificent* were not the most up-to-date anti-aircraft guns which are available but they did offer some protection, protection perhaps against training aircraft and that sort of thing; but to strip the *Magnificent* of all its armaments seems to me to have been carrying things too far.

I know it can be said that they required the ammunition bunkers perhaps for the accommodation of troops, but troops are troops whether they are being carried on an armed or unarmed battleship or on an ordinary commercial liner, and of course could be attacked should anybody try to interfere with their movement.

Then we come to the question of our air support. It is not air support to the force at all. It consists merely of transport planes being used to move the forces into the area in which they are to be stationed. There is no indication from what the minister said this afternoon that any reconnaissance aircraft would be made available in order to watch the movement of the forces and to alert the ground troops of any possible impending danger or any disturbance into which they might be required to move rapidly in order to carry out their police actions. Surely some reconnaissance squadrons of the R.C.A.F. or of some other country—and we have no indication that any other country is supplying them—would be absolutely essential.

Regarding the army contingent which is being supplied there is a reasonable distribution of those services such as the engineers, signals, the army service corps, medical, ordnance and R.E.M.E. The bulk of the force is to be made up of the first battalion of the Queen's Own. I know what the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) said regarding the Queen's Own. He said, as reported at page 20 of *Hansard*;

. . . that battalion having been groomed and being on the point of being called upon to replace another battalion in Europe would naturally be the one which we would consider and which we would think of first to take on this new duty in pursuit of the objectives of the United Nations.

I would like the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) when he introduces his estimates to tell us how that first battalion of the Queen's Own was made up. The impression has been given in this house in the last two days that the Queen's Own were

[Mr. Pearkes.]

ready at a moment's notice to go and carry out their duties, that it was the first battalion which was going.

I happened to say goodbye on the docks at Victoria to some 240 officers and men of the second battalion of the Queen's Own Rifles which were hurriedly dispatched in order to bring up to strength the first battalion of the Queen's Own Rifles which was stationed in Calgary and concerning which the Prime Minister certainly gave this house the impression they were ready to go.

I saw those men leave. Every able-bodied rifleman who was medically fit and who had reached his eighteenth birthday was taken away from the second battalion. There were only the seventeen-year-olds, the medically unfit, the officers and non-commissioned officers left in the second battalion. The second battalion has been cannibalized in order to bring up to strength the first battalion.

It has been stressed here that we have forces ready to move wherever they are required. Here the first battalion which is on the roster for location duty had to be augmented, to my personal knowledge, by something over 240 men and some of those men had been in the unit for only a few short months, less than six months. A large number of them were under nineteen years of age.

Now, I do not know what was the condition of the first battalion of the Queen's Own but I would like to know how many men in the force are under nineteen years of age because it has always been the practice in the past that men who were under nineteen would not be allowed to leave Canada; and mind you, these youngsters, mere boys, are not hardened veterans nor are they men with long training. They are being sent into the desert where conditions will be entirely different from anything they have experienced in Canada.

I feel that this country has been misled as to the efficiency of our forces if the situation as apparently existed in the Queen's Own regiment exists in the other units of the regular army here in Canada. We were led to believe yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) that the first battalion of the Queen's Own was ready to move to Germany, that it was first on the rotation list. Yet when the call came it had to send a large number of 18-year-old recruits with only a few months' training and also had to draw over 240 men from another battalion. I do not know how many other units were called upon to supply drafts in order to build up the strength.

Those are the types of troops which Canada is sending. Are we certain that they are

The Address—Mr. J. B. Hamilton

going to operate with other efficient units? Are we certain that the contributions being made by some of these other countries are in the form of efficient units? The secretary of state did not give us the names of the countries which were contributing contingents, although he did refer to Colombia, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. We know that there have been 100 men or so from Norway, a few Danes and a few Swedes, according to press reports, but I have seen no indication that there has been one single efficient unit sent to this force as yet.

I do feel that it is the duty of this government to assure us that the men being sent out of Canada are capable of surviving the hardships of this police duty in the Middle East, in the desert country, and whether there is an organization behind them to ensure that their welfare will be looked after, and mainly that they will be co-operating with other efficient units and that this force will be capable of carrying out the task to which it has been assigned.

I am by no means convinced and I do not think the country feels happy at the present time or that there has been any assurance that this United Nations force is an effective and efficient force. From what we have been told today, 1,700 men have arrived and are referred to as a force in being. That certainly shocked and surprised me. I am delighted that it has been considered wise to hold back the Queen's Own for the time being. We do not want to see them let down by this government; we do not want them to arrive in difficult country with an extremely difficult task to carry out and be unsupported either by other services from the Canadian army or by the armies of other countries which are co-operating.

I feel that before this debate is over we should have a statement from the Minister of National Defence or the Secretary of State for External Affairs as to the type of force with which our troops are to co-operate. There should be assurance that it is a balanced force, as referred to by the secretary of state, not merely from the geographical point of view but from the military point of view as well.

I repeat what I said at the beginning. I am perfectly conscious of the fact that they are going out there as a form of police force, that they are not to be considered at the present time as an expeditionary force. It is devoutly hoped that they will not have to carry out military operations; but soldiers cannot survive on pious hopes, they have to be prepared for whatever may happen.

Mr. John B. Hamilton (York West): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been a more important occasion during which I have had an opportunity to speak in this house than that which is offered today. I remember the crowded galleries with almost every seat filled when only a few months ago we debated the trans-Canada pipeline. This is a problem which affects not only our pocketbooks but our very lives, but it seems to have created far less interest than did that previous debate.

There is nothing to be gained at this time by wrangling over what was done or should have been done. Nothing that we can say in this house can remake the past. The problem that we face today is what can this country do to serve the cause of peace in the world now, today, on this 27th day of November, 1956. This is not to say that we on this side of the house should agree with what the government has done, but I do believe that the gravity of the situation is such that this matter should be discussed in a non-partisan atmosphere.

If you should say to us that we have contributed in some way to creating an atmosphere not of that kind, then I say to you people opposite that in the first place the propaganda machine which you have used, the attempts which you have made to create the impression that you, the members of the Liberal party, have been the saviours of the world in this instance, have been the causes of any disagreement which may exist. Had you approached this problem as being one where Canada was going to make a great contribution to world peace I am sure there would have been very few differences of opinion in this house today.

Having said that, may I say that for myself there would have been no question about where I thought this country should have stood on October 29 at the beginning of the crisis which we now face. But I do say as well that many people sincerely believe that a larger and broader based organization such as the United Nations was absolutely necessary to deal with this particular question.

I sympathize with their views but I cannot help but think that over the last 20 years the planned program of this government has cut us off completely from the commonwealth. If I needed any support for my views in that connection, I need only remember the questions which I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) when he returned from London a few months ago. I could only get one impression, that he regarded the commonwealth now as being some type of very fine social club. No, this is not the kind of attitude that will go towards solving the situation with which we are faced today. Neither

The Address—Mr. J. B. Hamilton

will we solve it by the ivory tower outlook that I have heard expressed today from my left. I do not think that I need to refer to the question of appeasement, which has taken place so often in the past. What difference is there between a Nasser in 1956 at the Suez and a Hitler in the Rhineland or a Mussolini in Ethiopia? Had these first steps been taken by our friends in those days, as they did at Suez, we might have avoided world war II.

What is to be accomplished from the practical standpoint now? There is no easy way out of this problem, no way of just stepping in between two opposing forces, because the major problems will still exist. First of all at this time we must ensure that the international canal users association is made a fact, is made an effective contribution to solving the problem in the Middle East. Second, there is no use talking about this problem unless at the same time we insist that there is a permanent guarantee of peace between Israel and the Arab states. Third, we can accomplish all other things but I say that as long as the present dictator of Egypt remains in his place we will not have really solved any problem.

I gathered from the remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) that there is an indication in one of the resolutions before the United Nations that this force at the same time that it is to implement the guarantee of the cease-fire is also to ensure that a solution is obtained covering the international use of the Suez canal. That resolution was referred to but we have heard little since as to what plans this government has to ensure that that matter of principle is attended to at the same time that the belligerents are separated. Can it be accomplished with the type of force that we are sending there?

These are questions, sir, that still remain unanswered even after the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and, with the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes), I am still awaiting word from the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) about how he feels about the composition of his forces being able to carry out that duty in addition to the initial duty they are called upon to perform.

But perhaps the most important problem of all three is the question of a permanent peace between Israel and Egypt. What we seem to fail to recognize is that an actual state of war has existed there now for almost ten years. I think we may say that we are fortunate that in this case we have a country believing in the principles of democracy which has the will to resist. In this instance we do

[Mr. Hamilton (York West).]

not have a country entirely surrounded by unfriendly states. We have a country which has the ability to get the supplies of war and preserve its sovereignty and contribute to preserving that sovereignty itself. I think we should be thankful that in this instance a country such as Israel is willing to fight for its own freedom. If we are not prepared to contribute to maintaining peace between Egypt and Israel we will have made a mockery of our work in the United Nations. We will have let the world believe that we, as others, think that passing resolutions alone will do the trick.

It seems to me that the third problem, that of Nasser, could be solved. I think that it might have been solved some time ago by other means but it could be solved now. If we openly insisted that the other two matters referred to be dealt with at this time and that there will be no fooling around with this force unless these things can be accomplished, I think that the dictator of Egypt would be removed by his own people without force from outside.

But what is our force being used for? Last night I listened to a news round-up broadcast on the C.B.C., and I think we can believe the report from Cairo that the Egyptians are adopting the international army as their own. Along with their own forces they are taking them as an indication of their strength and their power to have Britain and France move out of this area. What a mockery it is to the position that this country holds in the commonwealth that such a thing could happen to troops sent from these shores, that they should be used in a force which will remove British and French troops from Egypt!

What are we going to do about it? I heard someone on my left say again today that he did not know what we thought should be done about it. I say first of all that it is still not too late to reinstate behind the commonwealth front the moral and spiritual fibre that this country once contributed so generously. Second, no matter what we thought in the first instance about the policy of the commonwealth or of the United Nations, let us be realistic enough now to know that without British and French intervention nothing would have been done in the United Nations permanently to solve this problem except the passing of resolutions. Third, let us ensure that the force that we are sending is the effective force which the British and French have requested be put into this area. I need say nothing further about that matter because the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes) described fully what an extremely capable army man thinks about the force at

The Address—Mr. Michener

the present time. Let us not put our troops in as a sham. If the principle is important enough to put troops in at all, the principle is important enough for us to say that we want those troops in under the control of the United Nations, not under the control of Nasser. It is vital for us to put them in on the basis that they will solve not only the problem of the separation of the two combatants but also the problem of the Suez canal. At the same time they should help ensure that these nations can be got together and that a permanent peace may be arranged between the two countries.

Here at home, Mr. Speaker, what can we do? Let us realize that we have moved into one of the most critical times in the history of this country again, I think, unprepared physically, from the standpoint of our armed forces, to take care of an extremely serious situation and unprepared from a moral and spiritual standpoint to put behind the forces the power that is needed. Let us ensure that right away—there is no time to lose—a complete survey of the manpower of this country be made in order that, if crises such as this should arise in the future which may spread into world war III, from the physical standpoint, from the army and the navy and the air force standpoint, this country will be prepared. In addition we must know if we can be prepared from the technical standpoint as well. Let us get ready by seeing that the component arms of our army are mechanized, well equipped, mobile and able to handle situations like this in a hurry. As was said by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich, this is no job for infantry men. I rather imagine that at the present time we do not have even one Recce regiment around. Let us get ready by seeing to it that our forces can be airlifted in a hurry not simply from Calgary to Halifax, and then on the basis that we may be obliged to call in the United States Air Force to do the rest of the job but on the basis that when a large force must be moved we have the wherewithal to do it.

I think at this time we might be preparing in one other way. We discussed this matter with the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) during the consideration of his estimates. We have a crisis facing us right now. I should like to know from him how well prepared he is to bring back to Canada the dependents of his forces abroad. If this condition continues it may even be wise for these people to be started home now; because if anything worse could happen to us, it would be to involve the civilian wives and families of the servicemen abroad.

These are the ways in which we can start doing something now to ensure that a permanent solution is arrived at for this problem and in the future be ready to play our full part in world affairs.

Mr. Roland Michener (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, parliament has been called to consider matters which affect our international relationships in all of their important aspects. Briefly, those aspects are our relationships with our neighbour the United States; our relationships in the commonwealth; our relationships as a member of NATO; and our relationships as a member of the United Nations.

The debate to this point has indicated that there are areas of difference and that there are areas of agreement. I propose to begin by dealing with an area of agreement. In his closing remarks the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) indicated that the great need at this time was to close the ranks of the western alliance and to restore and to present a solid front. I heartily endorse that statement and I wish to reinforce it by a brief account of a recent experience which has indicated to me the importance of the restoration of that understanding and co-operation particularly between Canada and her two most important associates in the world, namely the United Kingdom and the United States.

With other members of this house I have just returned from a conference of NATO parliamentarians which was held in the city of Paris at NATO headquarters, Le Palais de Chaillot, at one time the seat of the United Nations before it moved to the United States. Throughout five days some 200 parliamentarians from 15 NATO countries considered the present world situation, problems of defence and international co-operation just as we are considering them in this house today but in perhaps a slightly different context. Those delegations were, I think, reasonably representative and important delegations and give some indication of the attitude of the parliaments from which they came. There was a large delegation from the United States, many of the members being recently elected senators of both parties and congressmen. One of the congressmen was chairman of the conference. I refer to this matter because there—and I think my colleagues who were there will agree with me—the keynote of the discussion, which was at many times frank and pointed, was that although the actions of Britain and France, two of the members of NATO, had involved all of the members of NATO and their international relationships, the time was not one for finely-drawn criticism or recrimination but rather one for the

The Address—Mr. Michener

restoration of complete accord among the NATO countries so that they could proceed to deal with the very real problems that confront the western alliance today. Those problems are not simply military but they have become economic in a very real sense when one considers that gasoline rationing is already a reality in western Europe and that these countries are entering winter with a possible shortage of fuel oil for heat and for industry. It was that note which was concurred in by all parliamentarians from all countries which appeared to develop in recent weeks, and it is that note which I say is the important note for us in the consideration of our international relations in a broader sense at this time, and in the immediate future, because there is the greatest urgency for the restoration of, and the perpetuation of, co-operation not only in the military sphere as we have it in NATO, but on the political side and to some extent in the economic and cultural fields as well.

I was impressed by the fact that NATO, Mr. Speaker, possesses the only international police force in the world today which has a chief of staff, headquarters staff and forces, naval, air and army, capable of dealing with a situation such as that which exists in the Middle East today. Of course, NATO is a regional arrangement under the charter of the United Nations. It is part of the United Nations concept and is not inconsistent with it. This point is made in the charter itself, at the very commencement. If the United Nations were capable today of fielding and using a force such as NATO has, instead of the improvised force which my colleague the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes) has been reviewing and analysing as to its capacity to deal with this problem, we would have a great deal more confidence in the immediate future than we have with the plans which are now laid before us.

We all know in this house, of course, that NATO is a purely defensive alliance which is limited to the defence of western Europe and the North Atlantic area. This was its purpose and will, presumably, continue to be its purpose. It has no power to enter into arrangements or to undertake commitments which are not defensive or which involve territories other than those of the western European countries, the North Atlantic countries and only that part of North Africa, Algeria, which is part of continental France.

It is a matter of conjecture, which is perhaps out of place in this rather specialized debate, to consider NATO as the keystone of our defence: it is the keystone of our defence by the general accord of all parties in this house. We know where the greatest danger

to our safety lies in the present world. We know that the way that danger has been restrained has been by a defensive military alliance which we call NATO, and by the power of NATO forces combined with that of its members to retaliate in the event of a breach of the peace; that is the real assurance for the peaceful existence which we enjoy and which western Europe enjoys and which, for that matter, the world enjoys.

While that clears the main line of defence, it does not deal with the sort of problem which we experienced in Korea and which we now have to consider in the Middle East. It is a problem involving the taking of responsibility for police action by some country or organization of countries in the situation which I think is bound to arise, which has arisen, and which will arise again. I think we must face the fact that in different parts of the world military action will be taken. There will be conflict on a limited scale which does not involve the two great major powers in the world directly but perhaps is the result of the indirect action of one of them acting.

This kind of local disturbance which we have in the Middle East must be dealt with by some effective force if order and peace are to be maintained. It was into that situation that the British and French stepped, in the way they have been accustomed to do, and in the way in which the world has seen such problems dealt with in the past. Whatever may be said or whatever may be thought of the action that was taken, it is the sort of action that was necessary. I believe we are all agreed upon the fact that some kind of police action in that area, not only the policeman who sits in the sentry box but the policeman who is capable of enforcing the law, was necessary. Now, we have departed into an alternative course from the one which was initiated by Britain and France after Israel had attacked Egypt and thereby precipitated the war.

We have before us for approval another sort of police action, and the problem which disturbs me and which I wish to present to the house is whether in changing horses, or in changing policemen in this case, in the middle of the action we are going to achieve the results which we all hope will be achieved, or whether we are not likely to fall between the two concepts of the remedy which could be applied to a solution of this problem in the near East. I think that everyone appreciates this is not a new question. Certainly the government appreciates that this is not a new question. The Canadian government, and it is the same government, has been a party for some eight years

[Mr. Michener.]

The Address—Mr. Michener

or more to the action in the U.N. which set up the state of Israel and which has permitted the uneasy armistice or cease-fire to exist beyond the toleration of the Israelis themselves. Such a question cannot be left indefinitely. I think the government is open to censure on that score, but certainly no more than any of the other governments who were a party to the creation of this situation. They must take responsibility for allowing this thing to come to the point where police action on an individual basis of self-help, if I may put it that way, was necessary.

Now, self-help is not an unknown concept to private law. We know very well that our orderly society exists today only because there is a policeman. We know that there are always disorderly elements, human nature being what it is. Once the restraining force is removed the law is broken. In fact, the law itself, if you are an Austinian as I am, depends for its validity on there being sanctions. The law is not a custom which everybody observes by consent. It is something which is agreed upon and which must be observed under the compulsion of some method of force; that is the situation in local and municipal societies. Even there, it is well known that if you are attacked and a policeman is not around, you have the capacity and the right to defend yourself. You also have the right to come to the rescue of a fellow citizen who is attacked by a law breaker, and the idea of self-help is not one which any reasonable person would repudiate, because it is human nature to help and it is not expected that people will stand idly by when they can help themselves, and when there is no other effective means of preserving their helping rights.

Now, what are we supplying in the place of the self-help which I say was being applied by Britain and France in this area? As help, we are to supply a force which is under the command and direction, not of the security council but of the assembly of the United Nations. That in itself creates problems of organization which we see only too well. We have had explanations in a very clear way from the minister on how those negotiations have been proceeding in the past few days, but it is apparent from the difficulties that arose one after another that without any military organization to begin with the assembly, which is no more than a collection of nations, as we are a collection of members here, will find the greatest difficulty in acting, just as we would find the greatest difficulty in acting if we were not organized into parties and if there were not a government commanding the support of the majority in this house.

Now, that is the problem that the United Nations is attempting to deal with. The assembly have authorized a force and the security council, as I understand it, is not carrying out the decision of the assembly as its executive. The assembly itself, has to attempt to maintain the cease-fire which it has called upon its members to observe and which they have agreed to observe. It has the responsibility of maintaining that cease-fire. Perhaps the force will be adequate and the action will be successful. We all sincerely hope that it will, but we at least have taken the responsibility, and we must bear the responsibility, of having substituted this sort of undefined, novel, international policeman for a force which was certainly competent, at least at the stage that it had reached, to deal with the Egyptian dictator and his forces and to separate the Israelis and the Egyptians and to occupy the canal zone.

The problem for western Europeans is to see that the canal zone is occupied and the canal cleared and that the resumption of traffic enables them to get their supplies through it. That is one of the problems. If no action had been taken by Britain and France, presumably the fighting would have enveloped that area and the canal might not have been simply blocked by the sinking of ships, which the Egyptians were very ready to do, but the installations themselves might have been destroyed to the extent that they could not be rebuilt for years, and that may still happen. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that we have taken the responsibility, and we are taking the responsibility of sending Canadians as an integral part of this amorphous force, this novel and newly created force, to undertake a task which had been undertaken by others, and substituting that force for the efforts of Britain and France. We have undertaken the responsibility to see that it is effective and competent to do the job. There are very grave doubts in our minds that such is the case.

Now, I for one certainly approve the attempt to bring an international solution to bear on these problems. We have been an active member of the United Nations. We played our part there, and I think we played an honourable part, and we have acquired a reputation for being objective in our thinking about international problems. But we are embarking into new waters; we are trying something that has not been tried before, and if the government has thought through this problem, and sees where this international force will go, what its effect will be and what it will accomplish, then I think we should hear more about it in this debate.

The Address—Mr. Michener

We know that there is a small force of 1,700 men already in the zone; we know we are now asked to commit ourselves to the total of about 2,400, some of them now and some later. We do not know what the total will be, but if this force is to do anything more than to act as a sort of referee among parties who are prepared to conciliate and agree, then it seems to me it is entirely inadequate; and, if it is going to be put in the position of trying to operate in this very difficult and explosive situation, it should have the authority and power from the United Nations to call for all the help that it needs to keep the peace. That may involve the use of the very forces of Britain and France which the U.N. force is attempting to displace, and it is not by any means clear that that may not be the turn of events as time goes on.

We have no word from the minister as to this force except that it is not a fighting force. That is all very well. It is all very well to send Canadian troops and other troops under an international banner and under the orders of the assembly to perform some function between combatants; but suppose they are shot at, are they not to become a fighting force when they are involved in hostilities? My colleague has dealt with the problem adequately and I am not going to do more than raise these questions and these views that I think are pertinent to the action we are taking in this house.

I sincerely hope that this action will be successful. It seems to me that it should not be undertaken unless it is undertaken in the expectation and determination that all of the problems which require settlement in this area to maintain the peace in the future are dealt with before the force is required to return.

Two of those problems have been discussed. One is the use of the canal, the clearance of the canal and its use as an international channel of trade. The other is the very difficult question of the relationship between Israel and the Arab states. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the problem of drawing the boundaries and settling these peoples in a permanent way so that Israel will not be subject to attack in the future can be solved by any such force as has been sent and is proposed to be sent to the Middle East under the plans which the government has laid before us.

I do feel a good deal of sympathy for the line of action that has been taken in the sense that it has been obvious to all of us, as we look at the effectiveness of NATO, with its organized international military force, and as we look at the ineffectiveness of the United

Nations, without any organized international force, that there is a vacuum in the world today, a vacuum which it has been beyond our power to fill. It has been beyond our power for the very simple reason that you cannot have agreement to use an international force when you cannot get agreement within the government itself. Now, I am not speaking of the government in this house; I am speaking of the government of United Nations, which is a government comprising two incompatible powers in the world, namely, the United States and Russia. Unless they can be brought into accord you cannot create and use an international force under their joint direction. You cannot imagine the United Nations attempting to police the United States nor can you imagine them attempting to police Russia. It is equally difficult to imagine either Russia or the United States attempting to police each other under the aegis of the United Nations or in any other way without involving the world in a third war of a character that we simply refuse to contemplate.

To my mind these are the realities of this problem of attempting to deal with the trouble spots of the world; that is to say, leaving out the attempt to police either Russia or the United States, attempting to deal with the trouble spots of the world by international action and by an international force. If this action does point the way to an improvement in the United Nations through some means by which the problem of the basic ideological conflict within the United Nations organization itself can be removed, that is to a removal of the problem which has made the veto necessary, if it shows even with some faltering the direction in which we can move to fill the vacuum I have just mentioned, then our action will not have been useless. But in the meantime, in drawing attention to the hazards and difficulties of this course which our government has elected to take by substituting an uncertain and not yet organized international force for the action that was being taken by Britain and France, I wish to say that in doing that we have to take the responsibility for the possibility of its failure and for the necessity of a return to the action which we have disapproved.

In this situation and in a world of the kind we live in I think we are right in drawing the attention of the government to the necessity of preserving at all times the closest of good relationships with our friends.

We know who our friends are. As I said at the beginning, our relationships in NATO are basic to our defence and our friends in NATO are Britain, France, United States and other western countries. In another circle of friends we have Great Britain again in the

The Address—Mr. Nesbitt

commonwealth and these friendships born of history and tradition are perhaps in the long run the best, the truest and most reliable of friendships.

Although we have two cultures in this country, one composed of people speaking the English tongue and the other composed of people speaking the French tongue, we both come naturally by these same friends because they are of the same race and the same European origin and background.

When we speak of the British people I frequently like to think we are speaking not only of the English, Irish and Scottish but that we are also speaking of the people descended from the Norman conquerors who came to England from France. Basically our two peoples are the same and that blood relationship has had its part in history; and, in the course of our long tradition as British people, we have had to acknowledge that our French compatriots played a great part in the preservation of the independent status of Canada not only in the American revolutionary war and in the war of 1812, but today in maintaining Canada's status as an independent country of British association on this North American continent.

These are relationships which we cannot lightly disregard, and in drawing attention to these relationships and the need for preserving them, while we do not take the position that anyone should be asked to approve of actions that are wrong, we do believe that we should remember who our friends are and look upon their actions with every sympathy and should give their actions every possible support.

Various points of view have been expressed here concerning this and I am not going to proceed further with that line of argument, but I intend to close by expressing the hope that a little more light, if possible, will be thrown by the minister concerned and by the members of the Canadian government on how they expect this difficult and large problem in the Middle East to be dealt with by a small force of the proportions which have been suggested.

If the force is inadequate, will we have to have another session of parliament called to permit another force to be sent? I have been looking at the order in council and I observe that it authorizes the commitment of not more than 2,500 men. I do not want to raise legal technicalities—parliament is sitting and parliament has the power to act—but I have been looking at the National Defence Act and I notice that section 32(1) provides:

The Governor in Council may place the Canadian forces . . . on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof.—

We have not been told that this action is for the defence of Canada. I am not going to argue that point. This action is in response to our duties and our participation in the United Nations as a member. We have taken this action as a member of the United Nations and we have committed ourselves to supply a force and we have also passed an order in council for 2,500 men. If that is insufficient, must parliament be reconvened to approve the commitment of a larger number? To my mind that number may very well be found to be insufficient in the course of a very short time.

Let us deal with the problem as a whole while we are dealing with it and let us hope that as we are confirming our participation in this action the government will not be again caught in a position of this kind, that it will see to it as a member of the United Nations that the difficulties of the Israeli-Arab armistice which have been outstanding far beyond any reasonable limit will be cleared up without delay. Let us also hope that by having taken this action which is unusual and path-finding in a way, it will have set a precedent or found a means by which an effective police force for the future can be established either by an extension of NATO or by some other means within the charter of the United Nations. I do not propose to suggest the means but I do say the obvious vacuum in the world which we are trying to fill is a problem for which I hope a right solution will have to be found because of the experience of these unhappy weeks.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, there have been a great many remarks made in the debate thus far and I do not care at this time to make any attempt to repeat anything that has already been said and therefore I shall make my remarks as brief as possible. I would like to say, though, there are some things which I think in all fairness ought to be brought to the attention of the government because they reflect the opinions of a great many people in this country.

It would seem possible that the government has been somewhat shielded from the viewpoint of many Canadians, and I mean by that the government has been shielded particularly from the up-to-date viewpoint, because I think there is little doubt since this unfortunate affair of the Suez canal developed as well as events in other parts of the world that public opinion has changed very greatly in the last few weeks despite a recent editorial in the newspaper known as *Le Devoir*, which says everybody in Canada is 100 per cent behind the present government's policy. I do not believe that is so. I am the first member

The Address—Mr. Nesbitt

who has spoken in this debate coming from western Ontario, a very populous and important part of this country. During the last couple of weeks I have inquired on numerous occasions into public opinion in regard to this matter and I must say that I have had expressions of opinion from members of the party to which I belong, from those who belong to no political party and also from those who affirm allegiance to the Liberal party.

The thing which seemed to bother people most in this regard, and I think this is something the government should have brought to its attention, is the apparent anti-French and anti-British attitude of the government. This has caused considerable concern in the part of the country from which I come. I must say that the very capable and able remarks this afternoon of the minister of external affairs somewhat reassured me and I am sure reassured the people in the part of the country from which I come, that this attitude is not what the people thought it was. The minister's remarks will be very helpful in that respect. Unfortunately the explanatory and conciliatory remarks of the minister of external affairs did not seem to be borne out by the somewhat more inflammatory remarks yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent). However, there may be further explanations forthcoming.

Of course, in all matters such as this, hindsight is always better than foresight, but I cannot help but feel that the government has a considerable responsibility for some of the unfortunate events which have taken place in the Middle East and Suez. The government is in a position, through its Department of External Affairs and other advice which it receives, to know things which the rest of us do not know. I contend that the government should have known or ought to have known what was going on in the Middle East, during the last year at least. The government should certainly have known that the situation was dangerous, particularly after the deal Colonel Nasser made with the Soviet union in 1955 to receive arms. It should then have become apparent that Colonel Nasser was a dangerous enemy of the democratic countries. I bring these things to your attention, not necessarily in any mood of recrimination over what has gone on in the past but as a warning to the government that better attention should be paid to these facts in the future so we will not have a recurrence of what is happening at the present time.

We all recall that at the last session of this parliament there was considerable debate and many questions were asked with regard to arms shipments to Egypt and Israel. Without

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

wanting to rehearse the events of those days I think all hon. members will recall that the government seemed to be vague, to say the least, about what was going on. Apparently some ministers did not know whether arms were going to Egypt or whether they were not. Other ministers seemed uncertain as to whether the arms that were going were dangerous, it being contended that they were only training planes. As this went on we had various changes in government opinion. I believe it was on January 24 last that the minister of external affairs pointed out that if we sent arms only to Israel and placed an embargo upon arms to the Arab nations that would be considered an unfriendly act toward states with which Canada normally had friendly relations. That was the reason given for arms going to both places. Under normal conditions that would be a reasonable explanation but I cannot but feel that, in view of the soviet arms deal with Nasser, with Nasser's avowed intention of exterminating Israel and driving the French and British out of the Middle East and Africa, a continual supply of arms was a very dangerous thing indeed.

Later on March 9 the minister of external affairs stated that the situation in the Middle East had eased and that Mr. Hammarskjold had said, "We have moved away from the brink". No one would suggest that the arms which Egypt received from Canada could affect the military situation in any way. Apparently what arms Egypt did get from here were given away because last fall the French government seized a shipload of arms going to Algeria from Egypt and among them were Canadian rifles. But the fact remains that Canada, the senior member of the British commonwealth, provided arms to Colonel Nasser whose avowed intention was to destroy Israel and to drive the French and British out of the Middle East. I cannot help but think that Colonel Nasser could not have received anything but moral encouragement for his activities when he received arms from this the senior member of the commonwealth.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, before the dinner recess I had made a number of remarks to the effect that I was a little concerned that the former policies of the government, well meaning as they may have been, were responsible to a considerable extent for the present unfortunate situation in the Suez.

To recapitulate what I have already said, I should like to point out that in the past we have often referred to the United Kingdom foreign policy as "muddling through", but I rather think that in some respects at least the foreign policy of this government has been a case of "blundering along". As I mentioned before, it was well known after the Egyptian-Soviet arms deal in 1955, and if it was not it should have been, that Colonel Nasser, this would-be two-bit pharaoh, was going to be a very violent enemy of the democratic countries. Knowing that full well, Canada, the senior member of the British commonwealth, last January and on into the spring, sold arms to Egypt.

As I pointed out, these arms probably had little or no effect on the military situation but they certainly could do nothing but give Colonel Nasser the greatest possible moral encouragement. It was the avowed intention of Colonel Nasser to overthrow Britain and France and throw them out of the Middle East and Africa and here he was receiving at least moral encouragement from the senior member of the commonwealth. In addition, I say that at the same time it was well known that Colonel Nasser was doing his very best to defy the United Nations: he had not allowed Israeli ships to go through the Suez canal for some time.

Another thing that I think should be brought to the attention of the government is something that is also worrying a great many people in Canada; in fact, I would say the majority. That is the attitude of our neighbour to the south of us, the United States. This attitude has been the cause of considerable dismay to many people in Canada. You know, there is a well known advertisement "even your best friends won't tell you". I think we are about the best friend the United States has. I certainly consider myself a very good friend of the United States. But sometimes you have to be frank even with your best friends and I think that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) might be well advised to pass on to the United States government the attitude which I know is in the minds of many Canadians with regard to the smug piety exemplified in certain United States publications and again reflected, I am sure, in the government of that country.

I refer particularly to an editorial in a well known United States periodical which has a wide distribution in this country, *Life* magazine. The editorial appeared a week or two ago. I believe it was under the title, "Eden's Tragic Blunder in the Middle East", and the sum and substance of it was that when the United States was faced with a choice

between its friends and principle it chose principle. The words were very high sounding indeed and I am sure many of us would agree with the sentiment expressed, but I am also sure that a great many people in this country have asked themselves this question. What would the United States government have done if an anti-American government had seized control in the Republic of Panama, had conspired with neighbouring South American states to cut off oil to the United States, had received Soviet jet bombers and, to cap it all, had seized the Panama canal? I wonder whether we would see such pious sentiments reflected in the attitude of the United States government. I do not think so, and I do not think that anybody here seriously expects that the United States would not have taken very prompt action if such a situation had arisen in Panama.

For that reason I say that I think some of the sentiments expressed publicly by the United States foreign office have a certain hollow ring. Apparently it seems that the United States is trying to ride three horses at once. She is trying to be friendly with the Arabs and to be friendly with Britain and France and her other friends and allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and apparently some people also seem to think that the United States has a more than casual interest in the oil in the Middle East. I think it would be well if the United States government would decide which horse it is going to ride.

There is one thing about which I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs might have been a little more explicit today when he was making his very long and most informative address. I refer to why there was such a one-sided line-up in the United Nations opposed to the United Kingdom and France. On the face of it this line-up seems very imposing indeed, but I think there are one or two things that should be remembered. First of all, the greatest evil to all the Asian and African countries, the only bogey they are really afraid of, is western colonialism. Indeed, I emphasize the word "western" because some of the activities of some of these countries are rather devious. The path India has followed indicates somewhat less concern about Soviet colonialism, particularly in Hungary. It is true that just recently a certain group of southeast Asian premiers condemned the Soviet union for its activities in Hungary but they certainly did not act that way in the United Nations on various occasions.

In addition to the fact that the Asian and African countries, which constitute a very large number in the United Nations, have

The Address—Mr. Nesbitt

this great bogey and fear of western colonialism, which they consider to be the only danger in the world, when the United States votes in the United Nations she usually takes along with her all the Caribbean and South American countries. On practically every occasion they vote with the United States. Therefore when you take out these two groups there really were not many other countries in the world to vote any other way. I draw this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, because I think it is something that may not suggest itself to many members and which might bring about a different impression when it is given consideration.

It would appear that Britain and France are indeed vindicated in the action that they took. In fact, more and more every day this appears to be the case. It would seem that it was not necessarily the Egyptian activities or the stopping of the Israeli-Egyptian war which was the chief concern but that possibly the main objective of Britain was to scotch a Russian plot in the Middle East, a plot to satisfy what was an ambition of the old imperial Russia and is now an ambition of Soviet Russia, namely to control the Middle East and its oil. In this regard I was very interested today in the reply that the Secretary of State for External Affairs made to a question of mine concerning the extent of Soviet arms in Egypt and Syria. I was particularly interested when the minister said that until recently it had been thought that Soviet arms in the Middle East were being supplied only to strengthen the Egyptian army. I would be delighted if the minister would elaborate further when we get into committee, if not now, but the implication was quite obvious that the Soviet had sent arms to Egypt not only to strengthen the Egyptian army but for possible use no doubt by Soviet volunteers in the future. Apparently it was just this about which Britain and France had warned.

I think all of us in the house will agree that the police force is a very fine thing provided of course, as has been well pointed out by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes), that the force is effective and is independent so far as orders are concerned except from the United Nations itself, and also provided it is properly composed. Assuming these qualifications, I think that probably we will all agree with it.

Finally, I should like to refer briefly to a small portion of a recent editorial in the *New York Times* with reference to the present Suez situation. The editorial reads in part as follows:

No doubt two wrongs do not make a right. But when the judge has no means to enforce his judgment [Mr. Nesbitt.]

ment the aggrieved party is tempted to take the law into his own hands. And the United Nations has been unable to enforce its decisions because one of the principal provisions of the charter, calling for a ready United Nations force under a military staff committee, has consistently been blocked by Soviet opposition.

It may be, Mr. Speaker, as I believe the Secretary of State for External Affairs suggested earlier, that possibly the present dark cloud may well have a silver lining and that because the situation in the Middle East has been brought to a very acute crisis something at last may be done. I think people are beginning to realize just what has been pointed out so effectively by the *New York Times*, namely that the United Nations is not effective unless it has means of enforcing its decisions. You can pass all the resolutions you like but if large powers are intent on going their own way, and often with every reason for doing so, unless there is some method of enforcing its decisions the U.N. is not accomplishing very much. It is to be hoped that out of this extremely dark and indeed extremely dangerous situation at the present time we may get in the future a permanent force of some sort or other.

(Translation):

Mr. Raoul Poulin (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the house very long, and shall be content to make, as simply as possible, a few brief personal remarks on the events being reviewed in this debate.

First of all, I believe that an act of faith in Providence would be fitting under the circumstances, and would surely help nations if only they would do so in true humility and sincerity. Indeed nations, like individuals, must recognize that God is their supreme master and that it is never good to forget the changeless principles which derived from His sovereignty over mankind.

The great Bossuet once said:
Man frets and God leads him.

If that great sacred orator could now come back and see how men are acting today, he would undoubtedly paraphrase his own words as follows: "Man is still fretting but God no longer leads him".

In fact, it may be that the great tragedy of our times is that God seems to leave man to his fate, allowing him perfect freedom to indulge in all imaginable errors, so that man may be made to realize for himself the immensity of his aberration, if not his stupidity.

In my humble opinion, after we have put our confidence in God, we must base it on a man-made organization, that is the UNO as a means reasonably capable of insuring the happiness of mankind. In spite of its shortcomings, its errors, its weaknesses, its

The Address—Mr. Poulin

delays, which all can be explained by the fact that this organization is made up of very imperfect human beings, this association of nations has helped humanity. As long as we cannot find anything better, I am ready to support it.

I therefore approve the decision of the United Nations to send, in the troubled area, a police force which will try to re-establish order; I am glad that such a proposal was made by a member of the government, the hon. Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson).

I am just as much in favour of our contribution to an international police force as I was against our sending troops to Korea in 1950, and I can tell you quite frankly that I have never regretted the stand I took then. That is not to say that we do not run the risk of bringing a hornet's nest about our ears later on, but this, to my mind, is a calculated risk, and much less dangerous than letting the great powers act in the way we all know and which was so well branded by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) in the speech he made yesterday.

I also approve, not with pleasure but out of duty, the hard, tragic and painful move of the United Nations in reproving the action of our allies, Great Britain and France. There is no justification, at least I do not see any, for the action of those two friendly countries. If the action of Nasser in taking over the Suez canal was ill-advised, childish, provocative and dangerous, the action of England and France was also unjustifiable, arbitrary and no less dangerous.

Nothing, either in the spirit or the letter of the United Nations Charter, or in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, justified such action which I do not hesitate to brand as aggression. Is it possible in all decency to condone in our friends and allies what we condemn in our opponents? Oh, far from me the thought of drawing a comparison, which, besides, would be most odious, between the action of our friends in the Suez area and the hideous crime committed by the Russians in Budapest and throughout Hungary. To condemn the latter, we have only to let our feelings run free; it is so easy that we deserve no credit for doing so. But to deprecate the former's behaviour, we have to bottle up our feelings and listen to reason; to do that is a meritorious deed that makes all the difference between man and beast.

It has been asserted that the entry of Israel, followed by the entry of Britain and France, into Egyptian territory, was intended to prevent the arrival of the communists.

Fortunate are those who can read the mind of the Kremlin leaders, or who are able to draw such correct conclusions by merely watching their actions. Could this statement be based on the fact that the Russian communists have supplied Egypt with arms? What about Canada who did the same thing, in a smaller way, with regard to Egypt and Israel? Could it be that our country has been scheming and preparing a landing somewhere in the Middle East? It would be pure folly to deduct anything of the sort, and we have here merely an excuse after the deed.

However, while approving Canada's contribution to the patrol force which is being organized, I consider this contribution too extensive. The maximum possible figure of 2,500 men, against a total of 8 or 10,000 or so, is, to my mind, not in keeping with our population, nor with the fact that we have quite a few other international commitments.

I refer to the expeditionary force and to the equipment we maintain in Europe. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we can reasonably say that there is danger of a world war in the situation created on the one hand in the Middle East by Egypt, Israel, England and France, and on the other hand in Europe by the actions of Russia in Hungary.

What then would befall our troops in Germany? Despatches sent out by various press agencies these last few days, and to which I refer from memory, quote General Gruenther, retiring NATO commander in chief as saying that should Russia attack, Europe would be invaded. It will readily be realized that, if this should happen, our Canadian soldiers and their families would be the first victims of the onslaught of barbaric hordes descended from the Russian steppes. We must not forget either that, in such a case, hostilities would not be limited to Europe, and that all our trained personnel would be required at home to see to our own defences.

Therefore while it is only fair and reasonable to take part in the formation of an international police force charged with the responsibility of keeping peace, it seems to me to be no less fair and reasonable to bring back immediately the whole of our expeditionary force at present in Europe.

As regards the million dollars that the government is asking us to vote in order to help the unfortunate Hungarian refugees, I do not think it is an unduly large amount. Canada is bound to do all in its power to relieve the martyrdom of that people. Let us not forget that all men are brothers and that Christian charity commands us mutual assistance. I know that some people in Canada, including a few in the fine constituency I represent, will

The Address—Mr. Girard

hold that we must first relieve the hardship of our own people. They are right to a certain extent. However, as one writer stated in the *Gazette* this morning "charity may begin at home but it should not end there". Besides, could there really be found in Canada a few dozen individuals in a state of physical or moral destitution comparable to that of the Hungarian refugees?

I do not think so. If such were the case, we would have to admit that we are failing lamentably in our Christian duty towards our own people, but we would not be justified just the same in failing in that Christian duty towards other populations.

For the reasons I have just mentioned, I will vote against the amendment moved by the hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Rowe).

Mr. Fernand Girard (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, after the remarks of my colleague from Beauce (Mr. Poulin), may I add a few words to explain other reasons why I cannot support the Conservative amendment.

We are sending today a corps of Canadian soldiers to Egypt to serve on the international police force of the United Nations.

Following the tragic events of the last few weeks on the international scene, the Canadian move was made necessary in order to stop the threat of a third world-wide conflagration.

I believe it is my duty to support the government for having thus given the United Nations their first opportunity to play a truly efficient part.

It is not however without deep misgivings that we are making this move, especially if we attempt to explore the uncertainties of the future and the possible consequences of the presence of our forces in the Middle East. It is dangerous to do the policing when you are weaker than the delinquent who needs to be brought to reason. To police anything where Russia is involved may often mean an attempt to wed decency to bad faith. The prominent part Canada is playing in this police force may appear honourable, but our country may thus become the main victim if the situation deteriorates. It would seem wiser that each country make a smaller contribution, but that participation be extended to more members of the United Nations.

Since the beginning of this short session, several hon. members have tried to impress upon our minds that the regrettable intervention of England and France in the Middle East was meant to prevent a larger conflict. If by this action, those two nations had tried to step legally between the two conflicting parties, i.e. Israel and Egypt, we might have tried to forget their interests in the canal

[Mr. Poulin.]

and in the oilfields of Iran, and to credit them with generous intent.

As a result of their inconsiderate action, France and England must now withdraw from their own canal, at the risk of being thought aggressors, and they have almost immediately thrown the Arab nations into the arms of the Russians.

Their gesture provided the barbarous Russians with an excuse to order the Hungarian massacre. True, the Russians do not need any invitation to wholesale murder. Communism is revolution-born and is maintained by bloodshed.

The aggression committed by France and Great Britain has set to say the least, a very bad example to these Asian and African nations which hesitate between our democratic regime and Russian dictatorship. It has also caused the leftist commentators on the C.B.C. to make preposterous and cynical though misleading comparisons.

Let us hope that Canada's intervention will help great nations to understand that colonialism is dead and that they must gradually extend self-government to these small nations before the Russians manage to extend their own terroristic regime over the whole Orient by exploiting the nationalistic feelings of those people who are looking to self-determination.

In the numerous speeches heard in this house since the beginning of the debate on the address in reply to the speech from the throne, it has been clearly indicated that imperialism is not dead in this country. It is no proof of love of the mother country to condone her mistakes, unless one is still a very small child, tied to its mother's apron strings, and incapable of independent action.

There was talk of president Nasser's rebuffs in connection with our troops' uniform and their flag. It was not the first time that Canada was mistaken for England in the military field. Such incidents teach a good lesson to Canada. If we play a foremost part on the international scene, such considerations show other nations that we still lag far behind in our awareness of national entity. If Canada does not hasten to assume a truly Canadian look, other countries will still have serious reasons to mistake its true identity. Besides, after listening to some speeches made in this house, one could still be readily mistaken.

The tragic events in Hungary have opened the eyes of those nations which were inclined to be the pawns of hypocritical Russian diplomacy.

Let us hope also that those events will serve as a profitable lesson to those democratic peoples on our side of the fence who

The Address—Mr. Dinsdale

too often speak of co-existence with those murderers and who seemed too ready to accept the dominion of the red star over millions of human beings, claiming that some nations might well have freely chosen to live under the barbarian dictatorship of communism.

In this cold war Russia has an advantage over us, because in addition to providing millions for economic aid to certain nations, she also works in the ideological sphere, which democratic nations do not do. If we extolled our christian civilization, we might be able to succeed better. But how can we do that when the United Nations has omitted the name of God from the charter of the organization?

However we must support the excellent work of the Canadian representatives to the United Nations because truly, there did not appear to be any other means of avoiding a world war.

(Text):

Mr. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have followed this debate with extreme interest, as have all other hon. members in the chamber. I feel that we are dealing with the most critical situation in international affairs that we have had to face as a nation since the end of hostilities in 1945. I have been of two minds whether I would take part in the discussion, but since I have come some distance to attend the special session of parliament I would be remiss in my duties if I did not explain my own attitude on this problem, inadequate as it might be.

We all hesitate to enter into a discussion in a situation that is so fraught with dangers, particularly when we have not been as close to the circumstances as we feel we ought to be. I waited until the Secretary of State for External Affairs had made his presentation today before I decided to make some small contribution.

I detected in the minister's observations a tendency to regard the attitude of this group as a ready, aye ready policy so far as the intervention of the United Kingdom and France in the critical Middle East problem is concerned, and I rise mainly to refute that suggestion made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

The immediate world reaction when France and Britain took it upon themselves to try to localize the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East was one of moral shock. Since the end of world war II we have been obsessed with the notion, particularly since Nagasaki and Hiroshima, that it was one

world or none. We have seen the thought constantly brought home in the responsible press of the world that today there is no alternative to peace; and whenever hostilities threaten or, in this case, when hostilities had actually broken out as a result of the action of Israel, with all that preconditioning in the minds of the public, namely, one world or none, the danger and the threat to civilization in the event of warfare, the immediate reaction of the public was one of moral shock.

Of course, this sentiment goes back much farther than the end of world war II; it actually goes back, I suppose, to world war I and the feeling that arose out of world war I that it had been a war to make the world safe for democracy and freedom, and never again would we suffer the horror of modern full-scale war. That attitude was widespread in the 1930's during the rise of Hitler, when the spirit of appeasement almost paralysed the western world into a state of inactivity. Young men, particularly in the mid 1930's—and I was young in those days—without any reservations, without any hesitancy at all, subscribed to resolutions that under no circumstances would they take up arms. I remember the famous Oxford resolution of those days that circulated through the universities and colleges to the effect that under no circumstances would we take up arms for king and for country. That was in 1936, and many of the young men who conscientiously and sincerely signed that resolution found themselves projected into world war II in 1939.

There is a moral problem involved in the issue that we have before the house at the present time; but unfortunately there is also another aspect to the problem. There is the moral issue; there is the issue that stems from the idealistic approach, and there is also the issue and the aspect that stems from the realistic approach. There are the circumstances of practical power politics operating in the world at the present time. I do not think it is possible to suggest that anybody in this house or, for that matter, in the western nations involved in the present critical circumstances, would try to justify their action from the standpoint of high level idealism and high level morality and adherence to the principle of collective security as they are spelled out in the charter of the United Nations. Not even Britain and France themselves view the problem from that point of view. It is not a black and white problem, and as I listened to the Secretary of State for External Affairs this afternoon give the comprehensive view of the events that have

The Address—Mr. Dinsdale

taken place since the outbreak of hostilities in the Middle East I readily saw that he himself was aware that there were two aspects to this matter.

He was very careful to explain for example, Mr. Speaker, that when the United Kingdom delegation at the United Nations first explained its stand in this situation it emphasized that its sole purpose in going into the Middle East with a military force was to stop hostilities, and as soon as Israel and Egypt agreed to a cease-fire then the United Kingdom and France likewise were willing to agree to a cease-fire. They had no other purpose than to attempt to stop hostilities before they could get out of control in that part of the world. In other words, it was a police action unauthorized by the United Nations. In the circumstances they felt there was no other possible course whereby the threat of world war III could be stopped. Well, now the immediate moral shock, the moral reaction, the shock to the violation of the principle of collective security that swept upon the world, that was indicated in the press observations of that time, has modified somewhat. It seems that public opinion today, again as reflected in press comments, is swinging to the viewpoint that from the standpoint of pragmatism, from the practical standpoint, from the standpoint of power politics, this was the only possible course of action. The United Nations was helpless to deal with the situation.

Here was a situation in the Middle East that has existed as a powder keg for the past few years, that has been under discussion constantly in the United Nations, and it seemed impossible for that body to take any real or positive action that would bring the threat of renewed outbreak of hostilities—because there already had been a war in that area between the two sides involved—to an end.

Actually the principle of collective security that is supposed to have been violated in the action of the United Kingdom and France has never really operated through the United Nations on a world-wide scale. I think the fact that we had to establish a regional defence alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is very eloquent testimony to the fact that we in the West realized there was no safeguard of the principle of collective security being observed within the framework of the United Nations and we had to move toward a regional alliance where we tried to get this collective security principle operating at least so far as the western powers were concerned.

We tried to organize a western alliance and unfortunately in recent months particularly in reference to events in the Middle East the

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

western alliance, rather than assisting in the stabilization of the power situation as between Israel and Egypt and the other Arab nations, has wasted its potential through disunity, confusion and a lack of cohesion.

As a result of the vacuum existing in the Middle East, as it now appears with the further information that has become available since the United Kingdom and France moved into that area, the Russians were moving in very rapidly, far too quickly for the security of the West; to occupy the power vacuum that had been created by the confusion in policy of the western powers.

It seems obvious to me, as I read of the reports of the situation, the Soviet was deliberately fanning the ambition of Nasser to a fever pitch until within a very short time it was anticipated that Nasser would have moved to take over the whole Middle East area with the assistance of Soviet arms and, as he had threatened, completely wipe out Israel as a nation.

I have said—let me repeat this—that the unilateral action on the part of the United Kingdom and France cannot be justified from the standpoint of high moral principles. But, facing that situation as it now becomes evident, world opinion is beginning to realize there was no other practical alternative.

I would like to suggest that the real criticism which can be thrown at the government in this respect is not necessarily sins of commission but sins of omission, particularly in reference to the confused situation that had prevailed in the western alliance. It is becoming increasingly obvious, for example, that United States policy was placing the western alliance in a very embarrassing situation. There has been a lot of criticism thrown in the direction of France and the United Kingdom, but actually very little criticism has been directed toward the United States of America.

The hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell), for instance, yesterday said the United States was not without blame in all these matters but he left it there and said there was not time to enlarge upon that aspect of the problem.

The Alsop brothers in a very recent editorial—and they have been rather critical of United States policy in the Middle East—made the observation that highly placed United States officials had expressed the thought that they were glad to see the United Kingdom and France out of the Middle East. That, of course, leaves a vacuum and the question automatically arises, who is going to fill the vacuum?

Perhaps the United States should have filled that vacuum but it was paralysed dur-

The Address—Mr. Dinsdale

ing the critical period by the fact that it was in the throes of a revolution—or rather an election.

An hon. Member: You were right the first time.

Mr. Dinsdale: In that country, it seems to me, they are torn between the double appeal of the large Zionist vote on one hand and the situation where they have a huge financial stake in the oil of Saudi Arabia on the other. As a result, after assisting in minimizing the influence of France and Great Britain, who had acted as a stabilizing force in that area in recent years, they did nothing to fill the vacuum and the Russians, of course, like nothing more than a power vacuum of that kind and were moving in as rapidly as they could to take over the situation.

The kindest thing you can say about the United States in this regard, I think, is to realize in world affairs they are always motivated more by ideologies than by the implications of power politics or the implications of the political situation.

The great American ideal is to spread the principles of freedom and the principles of democracy that have been so highly developed in that great country since it was settled some few centuries ago. Since its settlement the great purpose of the people of the United States has been to spread that democracy throughout the world. Unfortunately there has been a somewhat naive attitude in the ability of the United States to export their particular brand of democracy. They look at a situation and they make a judgment off the cuff and place the finger of moral scorn upon the powers in the western alliance which seem to have ignored the high and exalted principles of democracy as they exist within the confines of the United States.

But on the other hand it would be possible for us to suggest that there are some circumstances and situations to which the United States have given assistance where perhaps the same high moral principles which they demand from other nations have not been necessarily adhered to in their own international policy. For example, their attitude towards Spain might come under criticism if we were to apply the judgment of high moral principles.

I do not know how far Canada went in attempting to sort out the differences of opinion which obviously existed among the members of the western alliance. Today the minister of external affairs told us that since the idea of a United Nations police force had been suggested in this house last January various attempts have been made to negotiate

with governments in an effort to interest them in implementing that suggestion. It is one of the big weaknesses of maintaining the principle of collective security in the United Nations. We have received no details of the nature of those negotiations. Perhaps when we get into committee we may have a further explanation as to exactly what Canada attempted in practical terms, in concrete terms, not only to deal with that situation but also to try to heal the breach that was growing wider between the western alliance and which unfortunately has grown even wider and dangerously so during the events of the past month.

There is another aspect to which I should like to refer briefly. The minister of external affairs hinted that that commonwealth association was seriously threatened by the recent events. I can well imagine that that was the case. Unfortunately there has been confusion in our commonwealth policy. If we are really serious in our desire to maintain high principles of morality in our external affairs policy there is no better framework, there is no more effective framework within which to carry out that particular policy than the framework of the commonwealth of nations.

The commonwealth of nations has tended to be minimized in Canada. Since 1945 we have given precedence to NATO and to the United Nations, whereas it seems to me that with the new and broader concept of the commonwealth which contains voluntary members from the Asiatic nations we have something which we have neglected to use to full effect in carrying out our external affairs policy.

Here we have a group or community of nations trying to carry out their respective national affairs on the basis of democratic ideals, on the basis of parliamentary systems, on the basis of free institutions which have their sources in the mother of parliaments at Westminster. If during this critical period the commonwealth almost foundered because of the cracks which appeared in the policies of the participating members, perhaps one reason was that we have not emphasized the commonwealth idea as we should have since the end of world war II. We have not seized upon the opportunity which is provided by a situation where we have eastern and western nations within the framework of a voluntary association of commonwealth nations working toward the preservation of the democratic ideal.

Democracy, as we all know, is a difficult form of government to sustain and particularly difficult to enlarge in the kind of world we have at the present time. This is perhaps hindsight and perhaps not very helpful in

The Address—Mr. Dinsdale

dealing with the contemporary situation, the situation that we have at the moment, but I do hope that if we are going to meet the upsurge of the power of world communism in a realistic way we close the ranks of the western alliance as quickly as we possibly can. Certainly we have to see to it that the commonwealth becomes a vital force in world affairs, able to withstand the impact of crises as great as the one through which we have passed.

This brings me to my final thought. In recent years Canada has played the role of mediator in world affairs. We like to regard ourselves as an intermediary power between the great world powers. We regard ourselves as a mediator between the United Kingdom and the United States. We also have had a certain beneficial role to play in preserving the bridge that connects the commonwealth east, the commonwealth of Asia, with the commonwealth west. I think one of the lessons which come out of the recent crisis is that for the first time Canada was faced with a choice at the United Nations which she hoped she would never have to face because it meant an intolerable choice. When acting as intermediary between so many diverse forces she had to choose between the United Kingdom and the United States on these basic issues. That placed Canada in an intolerable position. I also think it is reasonable to suggest that we moved much more rapidly to support the United States viewpoint. Notwithstanding the manner in which it has confused the situation in the Suez and the Middle East from the standpoint of the western alliance, we moved to aid and abet the United States much more quickly than we did the United Kingdom. We are swinging back towards the commonwealth viewpoint now in the light of second thought.

Another tragic aspect of this whole business, and we might have been carried away by the idealism that I outlined in my opening remarks, is that it would almost seem that we had tried to mediate between Russia and the western world too because the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) told us yesterday that he sent a letter to Mr. Bulganin, the premier of the U.S.S.R., and had received such a reply as could only be expected from that source. That is, I think, carrying idealism a little far when we think that we can negotiate with a dictatorship as cruel and as amoral as the communist dictatorship has proven itself to be not only through the evidence that has accumulated from the western nations but from the evidence that has accumulated particularly since the de-Stalinization program.

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

I remember reading a book—I have forgotten the name of the author—"The Crimes of Stalin" and discussing it some few years ago. Those with whom I discussed it said that it was to a certain extent fictitious, but the Soviet leaders themselves have demonstrated the amoral nature of their imperialistic power. I think that one of the unfortunate emphases that have come out of this thing is that we have had a naive attitude. It might have been the Geneva spirit. It might have been that we were fooled by the smiles and chuckles of recent months, but I think it is unfortunate indeed that Canada, through its Prime Minister, has given the impression that we were equating the United Kingdom and other European powers who might have been involved in an aggression which was precipitated by the delicate situation in the Middle East with the barbarous aggression carried out by the dictators of the Kremlin.

I am all for collective security, Mr. Speaker. It is the only way that our modern world can be preserved. It is the only way that we can avoid the horrors of world war III. Unfortunately we have not been able to obtain collective security on a world-wide scale through the instrumentality of the United Nations. You do not have to be at the United Nations very long before you realize that there is no common morality motivating the various delegations there. One of the tragedies of the United Nations as an organization is that the old game of power politics is being played within the framework of that organization.

The United Nations has been described as the world's best hope for peace. It is the world's best hope for peace, and it is the earnest desire of the members of this group that the emergency police force that has come out of the recent crisis will be continued to meet any contingencies or emergencies that may occur in the future. We hope too that it will be able to stabilize the situation in the Middle East long enough so that we can really deal with the vital problems in that area. The United Nations police force can do nothing towards ensuring peace or bringing the conflicting groups together. That has to be worked out through the United Nations organization itself. But at least we have the police force, and if the United Nations is going to mean anything as an organization that can actually preserve peace it must have some teeth of this kind in the machinery.

While collective security has broken down on the United Nations level, we have the possibility of getting it within the western alliance. We have the possibility within the

The Address—Mr. Churchill

commonwealth of nations. It needs enlarging. It needs the enthusiastic and not the grudging support of this government. The problem that Canada as a nation must set its hand to now is to restore the unity of the western alliance just as rapidly as we can and to do away with prevailing confusion. Only the present Canadian administration can do that.

I repeat that our criticism, at least as far as I am concerned, is more from the standpoint that we have been guilty of sins of omission rather than sins of commission. Canada has an important part to play in world affairs. Let us carry it out on the three levels I have indicated with the utmost enthusiasm and the utmost vigour.

Mr. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take part in this debate because of the importance of the subject. I should like to draw to the attention of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) for the third successive year that this is the type of debate for which his department should provide in advance that very useful compilation of material called a white paper setting out the chronology of events, setting out the various resolutions passed at the United Nations and the background of the Suez crisis. The production of a white paper preceding a debate of this nature would be of immense advantage to members of the house. Without a white paper the minister has to read off dates to us. On Thursday, such and such a date, something happened, on Saturday, such and such a date, something else happened, and so on, whereas a proper chronological statement issued in a white paper would have saved him a great deal of trouble and would have made the matter much clearer to the rest of us. But a fog was produced rather than a clear statement.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs is of course in a very difficult position. He has observed the collapse of his policy with regard to Israel and Egypt. We discussed this subject last winter at some length and the minister advanced his plan for maintaining peace between these two countries. He now has seen the collapse of that plan.

It has been a long dispute between the two countries whose action has brought us to the present crisis. The dispute between Israel and Egypt has been going on certainly for eight years following the war between those two nations, and the problem of the Suez canal has been a matter of serious concern to the state of Israel for all that time because Egypt has refused Israel the passage of ships through the canal. What

has happened to correct that situation in all these years? The security council has had about 200 meetings in the last eight years to discuss the problems between Israel and Egypt. Resolutions have been passed condemning Egypt for this, that and the other thing as well as resolutions condemning Israel. Yet despite all that and despite an observer corps under General Burns for the last two years and under other people before him, war broke out between those two nations. Yet the most important purpose of the United Nations is to prevent war. It did not prevent war on this occasion.

The importance of this issue was clear much earlier in this year, as we pointed out in the house. The *Christian Science Monitor* on January 20, 1956 indicated what was being done. The heading says this:

UN Censure of Israel Spurs Drive for Peace
in Mideast

That censure came about by a unanimous vote on January 19 of the security council condemning Israel for an attack against a Syrian military post. Second, there was a diplomatic move. The Secretary General of the United Nations arrived in the Middle East to begin, so the article says, a period of intense exploration of the possibilities of a peace settlement. On February 7, 1956, the *Winnipeg Tribune* published a Canadian Press dispatch with regard to the conference that was held with Prime Minister Eden who in that conference suggested as follows, and I quote from the article:

. . . if the 50-man truce team in Palestine under Major-General E. L. M. Burns of Ottawa is enlarged, it is the British view that the observers be recruited from "all sorts of nations".

He thought that an enlarged observer corps might be of some value. On February 8, the *Winnipeg Free Press* published an article dealing with the meeting between the English and the Americans concerning the trouble between Israel and the Arab states, and that conference led to an agreement on two broad policies for preventing the present unrest from exploding into war. Here are the two broad policies, and I quote:

Under the first principle, Egypt and Israel would each withdraw its armed forces for one kilometer to create an agreed demilitarized zone.

The second policy was this:

In this demilitarized zone would be assembled an enlarged corps of observers . . . These observers would be unarmed and therefore would not be regarded as a force capable of turning back any military assault. However, they would be able to fix the guilt of aggression promptly, and in addition the very presence of this enlarged corps might produce greater restraints in the troubled area.

The Address—Mr. Churchill

So much for that. Then the Secretary of State for External Affairs, speaking here in the house on February 7 in discussing the question of Israel and Egypt, laid down the policy of the government at page 942 of *Hansard*, and this is what he said. He was speaking of the policy followed with regard to arms shipments by the big three who are now under condemnation, of course, by the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent). However, he said this:

We will continue to follow the policy that has been outlined previously, and to follow it in a way which will not be conducive to aggression or conflict but which might help, by the way it is controlled, to preserve peace by removing the temptation to an aggressor to attack an unarmed country opposite or close by. There is no greater temptation to aggression than the certainty of an easy victory. A policy, if it were adopted by all free countries, of refusing to send any arms to any country except under the conditions which have been outlined by hon. members opposite, would leave some countries weak and defenceless, and other countries which did not have any scruples about receiving arms from behind the iron curtain in a position to attack those countries. If we had followed this policy, we might very soon have cause to regret it.

So the Secretary of State for External Affairs thought it wiser to supply munitions of war to both sides in order to maintain a balance and thus keep the peace. I suppose he is now aware of the fact that the peace was not kept.

Following that endeavour during the winter and early spring to preserve peace in the Middle East came rather alarming events this summer. We recall that about two years ago Britain was persuaded by the United States to vacate the Suez canal zone, thus leaving a vacuum in which in this troubled world anything might happen. This summer Nasser seized control of the Suez canal and Britain and France reacted vigorously immediately to that threat to their lifeline. Let us never forget that that international waterway, as it was always considered to be and should be, represents an economic lifeline to Britain, France and western Europe. It is not just a mere matter of keeping open a canal for commercial advantage or anything of that nature. Britain and France, for their very existence, are dependent upon the fuel supplies which have been shipped through that canal. It strikes me as odd, Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago, after the second world war, it was considered to be advisable to rehabilitate western Europe and, through that magnificently generous Marshal plan, to provide aid for countries that had fought during the second world war and had suffered

[Mr. Churchill.]

so severely. If it was advisable to build Europe up again at that time and if it has been wise—as I think it has been—to protect western Europe by NATO forces during the last few years, why would it not be wise at the present time to continue the support to western Europe by protecting their economic lifeline through the Suez canal? What has happened now to change the picture? Is it no longer advisable to keep western Europe strong? Is it no longer advisable to maintain NATO at great strength or must we now, for some reasons not yet disclosed to us, cut away the ground from under western Europe and particularly those great allies of ours in the past, namely Great Britain and France?

Britain and France were not greatly encouraged by what happened during the course of the summer and early fall; and when they attempted, through the United Nations, to get a resolution passed with regard to the Suez canal, brought forward by the users of that canal, the resolution was vetoed by Russia. What hope did they have, in any future emergency or crisis, of getting consent from the security council to any move that they would have to make? So things drifted on towards a crisis, obscured naturally on this North American continent by the elections in the United States. Unfortunately the world cannot stand still while elections are being held in the United States, although it would seem to some of our good friends there that that would be a wise course to follow. However, the world still continues to move, and the crisis mounted very rapidly just about the time that the critical period occurred in the United States election.

It was because of that I imagine, with attention being diverted to these stirring events south of the border, that people were not as well informed with regard to what was going on in the Middle East. Hence, we were taken by surprise. Even the Secretary of State for External Affairs, when interviewed by the press early in this crisis if I recall the interview correctly, expressed surprise; asked for time, and wanted more information. Well, I would have thought that his department, which has burgeoned out into an immense organization all over the world, would have supplied him with sufficient information about what was going on in one of the sensitive areas of the world. He has 34 sensitive areas marked up on his chart, and this was one of the worst.

The minister was very well informed concerning this sensitive area in January and February, but at the end of October and the

The Address—Mr. Churchill

early part of November he wanted more information. Apparently, he wants more information now about Syria, Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon. I do not know what his sources of information are, but I think they should be improved if he cannot give us quick accounts of what is going on in these troubled areas of the world. The policy of the government with regard to keeping the peace between Israel and Egypt collapsed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the United Nations? I think everybody has been looking hopefully to the United Nations for many years to maintain the peace of the world just as, for many years, we looked to the League of Nations to maintain the peace of the world. It has been a discouraging outlook for mankind for these many years. This 20th century is exceeding in bloodshed, in my opinion, any preceding century, and the history of the world has been a history of much bloodshed. But in so far as I can recall during the course of my life we have had nothing but wars in this world.

I have some faint recollection of the South African war and the Russo-Japanese war, succeeded by the Balkan war and then the first Great War. After that was over Turkey attacked Greece; then the civil war in China lasted for a generation and in 1927 British troops crossed this continent to go to Shanghai to protect their holdings there and in Hong Kong. There was the Spanish civil war in the thirties; the attack by Italy on Ethiopia and the outbreak of the second World War. In the 11 years that have succeeded that there have been wars or rumours of wars all the time. Someone may be able to remind me of some period in the last 56 years in which men have not been engaged in war or have not been killed by bullets, but at the moment I cannot recall what particular year or years might be mentioned in that connection.

It has been a shocking century of turmoil and upset. No wonder we have looked to organizations like the League of Nations and the United Nations to save us from this terrible blood letting. I think that we must profit by experience. We found during the twenties and thirties that the League of Nations, lacking the support of that great power the United States and having plenty of trouble amongst those who were members of the League, failed to maintain the peace. Then, after the second world war our hopes were raised once again by the formation of the United Nations, comprising in its membership the great powers of the world. We

thought this time we were assured of peace because this time the United States was a member of the United Nations. I think that we have been justified in having hopes that peace would prevail in the world and that war would subside and disappear. Our hopes have been disappointed year after year. By the time the Korean war broke out we saw clearly that the aims of Russian imperialism were the same as they have been for centuries and that Russian imperialism was causing the trouble and the upset in the world and was bringing about war, not a third world war in its great magnitude but these smaller wars.

Little by little this Russian imperialistic policy has increased the control of that country. The United Nations has been relatively helpless under this strain. We cannot now be soothed any longer by resolutions passed at the United Nations or by speeches there breathing fire and brimstone and condemning this country or that and numbering the number of nations who vote in favour of a resolution. You cannot get peace by resolution or by resolutions at the United Nations—at least, we have not reached that stage yet. We have had experiments made with corps of United Nations observers scattered here and there in various parts of the world. In this difficult area of the Middle East we have had a very efficient corps of observers, but it has not resulted in the prevention of war.

I say then, Mr. Speaker, you cannot keep peace merely by an observer corps. You have to have something else. Plenty of experiments have been tried. I think a great deal of patience has been used in the United Nations in these years. I will give credit to our representatives who have been there trying to exercise the power of moral suasion in these difficult times. I am not here to condemn them for everything that has been done. The effort had to be made. Everyone wanted that effort to be made, and even now people say, do not relax your efforts but sit down and bargain with these people who are proving so difficult. Whatever you do, try to stall for time and perhaps world war III will be avoided. A great deal of that has been done through the United Nations. It has been a worth-while effort, a very frustrating effort, but all credit to the world's statesmen who have laboured so long and so hard at the United Nations.

But let us not be too sure that we are not being lulled into a state of inefficiency through false hope. These resolutions of the United Nations are, I imagine, now innumerable. I

The Address—Mr. Churchill

do not think we could begin to count up the resolutions that have been passed during the last 11 years in an endeavour to maintain peace. Many of them have been ignored. They have been like the peace treaties and agreements that Russia has executed with the various countries of the world during the last 39 years. It is estimated, I think, that 1,000 such arrangements have been made between Russia and other countries and most of them have been broken. It is a long, difficult and tortuous path that mankind is taking in these days to profit by experience. But, profiting by experience, we know that the League of Nations failed because it did not have an effective force behind it, and the United Nations has been failing because it has had no effective force behind it. The smallest attempt to form that effective force has now been made in the suggestion of this emergency force to serve in the Middle East. Well, Mr. Speaker, when the crisis developed and when Canada was faced with the necessity of reaching a decision at the United Nations just a few days ago, what was the reaction of our government as reflected by the votes or the abstentions by the Secretary of State for External Affairs? We are critical of the action of the government in those circumstances. Here was a crisis which involved the link between the members of the western alliance; it involved Britain and France, other members of the commonwealth, Canada and the United States. Those countries have been united together against the Russian menace. In this critical moment, when war broke out between Israel and Egypt and Britain and France intervened and the United Nations considered the matter, Canada was faced with the most serious decision that has faced the government in recent years, and certainly the Secretary of State for External Affairs was placed in a very embarrassing position. Because it happens in any assembly that the time comes when you have to stand up and be counted or abstain. To abstain from a vote in the United Nations is a much more serious matter than to abstain from a vote in the House of Commons and so at the crisis Canada abstained from that vote with regard to the cease-fire and left Britain and France, Australia and New Zealand on the one side and those other nations on the other. We found ourselves then with this great western alliance split by a vote and an abstention at the United Nations.

No matter what fault can be found with Britain and France—and I for one do not

[Mr. Churchill.]

think they always make correct decisions; I think they are subject to criticism from time to time—when an issue develops to this extent at the United Nations, of all places, where we have been hoping and trying to present a united front of the western powers as against Russia and the communist bloc, why in the world should we not have stood by our friends and allies and those two great countries from which Canada has sprung? But no, in their hour of need we stood on the sidelines.

I think that the stand the Secretary of State for External Affairs had to take on that occasion was unfortunate for Canada. I would have liked the minister to have made his speech on that occasion before the vote was taken. He can correct me if I am wrong. If he had declared at the United Nations that he was going to vote he would have had a place on the program, but since he was among those who were going to abstain there was no opportunity to make the speech before the vote; it had to be made in the wee small hours of the morning after the vote was all over. Had he made the speech before, had he indicated that he was going to vote, he could have introduced his suggestion of an emergency force and it might have affected the position of the powers there and it would have raised the stature of Canada. But no, he was instructed, I presume, to abstain, and let public opinion be marshalled against Britain and France. And yet, he should have known, the government should have known, as a great many people did know, that the situation in the world would require quick and effective action, and from past experience no action could be expected from the United Nations except action by resolution or action by an observer corps, and both of these had failed to prevent war or stop war when it had begun.

Mr. Pearson: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Is he suggesting that I should have voted against the cease-fire at the opening session of the assembly?

Mr. Churchill: Well, he abstained. I myself, in similar circumstances, would vote against a thing like that, along with the members of the commonwealth, when I was faced with the terrible dilemma. I admit it was a dilemma.

Mr. Pearson: Three members of the commonwealth on one side and four on the other side.

Mr. Churchill: Well, the commonwealth, of course, is a difficult problem for all of us to understand, and I know the activity

The Address—Mr. Churchill

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

Mr. Lapointe: How childish can you get?

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

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

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

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

Mr. Pearson: I like them all.

Mr. Brooks: He does not indicate it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Et cetera.

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

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

Our commonwealth of nations—

He said.

The Address—Mr. Churchill

—for instance, has evolved from an imperial centre through the transformation of colonial dependencies into free states who have chosen to remain in political association with each other and with the parent state. Evolution without revolution has been of unique value not only to the nations most directly concerned, but to the world at large. That world should not forget what it owes to the United Kingdom for originating and directing this process—which, of course, has not been completed.

Just imagine the applause in London in response to those words.

I can assure you that Canada is happy about its position in the commonwealth and has no desire to see that position weakened. To us it means independence to which something else has been added.

And yet, in this recent crisis, although I do not think he has been happy to see the commonwealth weakened, he has been a laggard in strengthening the commonwealth as we would like to see it strengthened.

Mr. Brooks: It is the company he keeps.

Mr. Churchill: In the two or three minutes left to me I would just like to say this. My good friend and colleague, the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes), dealt very effectively with the military aspect of the emergency force in his speech this afternoon and he dumped a bucket of cold water on the head of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney), who should have entered the debate at that time and made some reply.

The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich pointed out all the weaknesses and the ineffectiveness of the type of force that is being produced at the present time. Even if it is raised to 6,000 men they have to guard a frontier of 1,000 miles and we would have approximately one man per mile and no armoured force, no airborne force and no artillery; and yet do we think that men armed just with rifles are going to be able to effectively defend themselves against any raiding force employing armoured cars or tanks or an attack by aeroplanes?

It is a great risk that is being run and I hope the Minister of National Defence will deal with this problem in order to assure us that our Canadian forces will not be endangered unnecessarily.

Mr. Speaker, I would close with these words. I think we are living in a state of fear and I am tired of this state of fear that is being held over our heads day after day. We live in the fear that we must not say a harsh word against Russia and we must not criticize the United States with regard to its [Mr. Churchill.]

policies because there will be a third world war.

We heard about the fear of a second world war all throughout the thirties. We were treated to pictures showing the destruction and horror of the first world war and men with torn bodies hanging on barbed wire. I can see those ghastly pictures even now. Book after book told us what would happen if the second world war developed and we were told how poison gas would ruin every nation of the world and the cities would be blotted out in 24 hours. We lived in that fear and the fear resulted in the rise of dictators, in a weakening of the democracies, and brought about the second world war.

At this present stage we are living in fear of a third world war. We are told that if we do anything to annoy Russia she will rattle the rockets and we will have to scurry for cover. And yet, at the same time, I do not think Russia is going to risk a third world war. However, with the democracies shrinking back in fear Russia can gain more power here, there and elsewhere and in another ten years we will not require a third world war to drive us into subjection.

We are selling our souls. We are selling our birthright at this time just through fear, fear, fear. This fear is being produced by statements all the time and we have to be mollified. Our leaders of the government here from time to time in response to queries have to say, "We do not think there will be any war this year," and then we are greeted by a great headline in the press and we relax.

But, Mr. Speaker, when the crisis comes we have to be ready and the time has come for us to stop living in this state of fear and prepare for the worst and stand fast on all occasions and keep strong the British commonwealth of nations and by force of argument to compel the United Nations to become an effective force in the world for peace. Let us not be deluded by resolutions and by observer groups. We must have some power and some sanction behind the United Nations if we are going to prevent the small wars that occur from time to time and if we are going to prevent even greater wars.

Some hon. Members: Time.

Mr. Rowe: You do not like that because it is too true.

(Translation):

Mr. J. Wilfrid Dufresne (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of delaying this

The Address—Mr. Dufresne

important debate by discussing the situation in the Middle East. On the government's side, we have heard speeches from the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) and from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson), while on the side of the opposition, several members more qualified than I am in the matter have spoken, and others will probably follow. I shall therefore limit my few remarks to the recent tragic events in Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, the free world was horrified during the past few weeks by Russia's cowardly and treacherous attack against the valorous Hungarian people. In Canada, we live in a country where liberty and democracy still have a meaning. We have been particularly dismayed on reading about the bloody events which have happened to this heroic people whom the Russians are trying to destroy because it has long rejected communist slavery.

I believe that we cannot but be moved by the nameless atrocities indulged in by those who would like to destroy forever the freedom of nations and to trample people under their infernal domination.

When the happy survivors of this agonizing drama and this indescribable butchery will be able to tell us in detail all that the Hungarian people have had to suffer in those tragic weeks, I am convinced that Russia will go down in history as the most barbarian and the most dissolute nation that we have ever known.

I hope that those who offered themselves as victims for the cause of freedom have not done so in vain and that their supreme sacrifice will serve as a salutary lesson to all those who possess enough influence to achieve, in all the countries of the world, the restoration of true peace and of human freedom.

I do not think it is necessary to remind this house of the different phases of the Hungarian revolt, and of the bloody results that followed. But let me say this. The military intervention of the Kremlin was aimed not only at preventing the formation of a democratic Hungarian government, but more particularly at destroying all those who believe in the divine power of a Supreme Being.

On that subject, I would like to repeat a few sentences from the speech I had the honour to make in Paris last Wednesday, November 21, at the second conference of the

parliamentary members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

This is what I said:

The greatest danger facing us today, the free people of the West, is to witness the realization of the ambition of the communist conspirators of the Kremlin, which is to conquer us and to destroy our democratic freedoms. They seek to destroy our basic principles: patriotism, loyalty, family life. Above all they wish to remove from the face of the earth the teaching and practice of religion, which is the very basis of our civilization. The basis of our life as Christians is the worship of a Supreme Being. You will understand that when I speak of "Christians" I refer to the various teachings concerning a supreme deity—by whatever name it is called by our various peoples—imply, in their broadest acception, all the virtues that in my own country and many others are designated by the word "Christianity". This general term comprises the two great principles: "Love one another" and "Do what is just". It is the cornerstone of my own faith, a faith which is shared by a large number of citizens of those countries represented today in this assembly.

Quite probably, it is also the cornerstone of other beliefs prevailing among us. And that cornerstone of all our beliefs is the basis of our free and democratic way of life.

Because religion is the foundation of our civilization, the Soviets want to destroy it in all our countries, and wipe it off the face of the earth. That is the foundation which, as we have seen, was purposely destroyed in Hungary in the last few weeks, because the communist conspiracy led the Hungarians to cease loving one another and, instead of love, to kill one another. And, in this same Hungary, those who fought for freedom had nothing but their naked flesh to oppose to Soviet steel. Then, when, unavoidably, they were crushed, these soldiers of freedom were deported to Siberia. Do the Soviets respect the religious principle of "Doing what is just", when they intervene with force in the affairs of another country?

In this cold and brutal war against christianity, NATO acts as a shield against Soviet imperialism. I believe that NATO is the only organization in the world to offer this protection. The United Nations has failed to halt the progress of communism. Individually, our nations, lacking unity among themselves, have likewise failed to stem the tide of communism. Wherever we look in the world today, we see that communism is openly trying to permeate everywhere, by force or otherwise. Even in the Middle East, under the very eyes of the United Nations cease fire commission, Russia made plans, and prepared to bring in a vast new territory within its sphere of influence.

In the world today prospects are deceiving and alarming. But there is one and only one shining star before us. It is NATO. Not only is there no communist infiltration in NATO, but in several of those nations that make up that great alliance, communism is rapidly dying out. In many of our countries, citizens who have long been active in local communist cells, now disillusioned, are resigning from the party.

That is what I said at that time.

Mr. Speaker, with the unanimous consent of the house, I could finish my remarks in about three minutes—

Mr. Dupuis: What does the hon. member for Quebec West think about the intervention of England and France in the Middle East?

The Address—Mr. Dufresne

Mr. Dufresne: In answer to my hon. friend's question, if I may be allowed to answer, I shall repeat what I said at the very beginning of my remarks, that I did not intend to deal with this subject since other members, more qualified than I am, have spoken on the matter. However, if the house wants to know my personal opinion, I am ready to express my views. As it is now ten o'clock, I reserve my answer for tomorrow morning.

(Text):

On motion of Mr. Dufresne the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Green: Would the Minister of Finance tell us the business for tomorrow?

Mr. Harris: I had hoped that tomorrow we would be in committee of supply with this debate concluded. Apparently the official opposition do not feel that way about it so we will continue this debate.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

Order in Council P.C. 1956-1712

APPENDIX

P.C. 1956-1712

AT THE GOVERNMENT HOUSE
AT OTTAWA

Tuesday, the 20th day of November, 1956

PRESENT:

HIS EXCELLENCY

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL IN COUNCIL

Whereas by a resolution dated 4 November, 1956, the general assembly of the United Nations established a United Nations command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East:

And whereas member nations were invited to contribute self-contained battalion groups to which Canada agreed, as a result of which preparations were made to assemble such a force for dispatch in part by air and in part by H.M.C.S. *Magnificent*:

And whereas the United Nations commander has now indicated that the most valuable and urgently required contribution that Canada could make to the force at present would be to supply an augmented transport squadron of the R.C.A.F. and administrative and technical elements of the

army contingent to help in organizing the administration at the base of the force in Egypt;

And whereas the United Nations commander has also advised that the dispatch of the battalion should now be deferred until consideration of the detailed requirements of the force permits him to determine where and when the battalion can best be used.

Therefore, his excellency the governor general in council, on the recommendation of the Minister of National Defence, is pleased, hereby, to make the following order:

Order

Authority is hereby given for the maintenance on active service of officers and men of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, not exceeding 2500 in number at any one time, as a part of or in immediate support of an emergency international force organized by the United Nations to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East.

Certified to be a true copy.

R. B. BRYCE

Clerk of the Privy Council.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 28, 1956

The house met at eleven o'clock.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATE ON MONEY BORROWED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Bryson (Humboldt-Melfort): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Is it the intention of the minister to comply with the recent request of the western wheat pools that the interest rate on moneys borrowed exclusively for the handling and movement of grain be reduced from the present rate?

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I suppose the obvious answer is that the intention will be translated into action, if it is, and announced at that time. However, I must say that I did not hear the precise wording of the question and I will take it as notice.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LEGISLATION RESPECTING SHORTAGE OF CASH ON PRAIRIES—ANNOUNCEMENT OF ADJOURNMENT TO JANUARY 8

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. R. Argue (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister inform the house whether, before this special session ends but after the business announced in the speech from the throne has been completed, the government intends to introduce any legislation of any kind to alleviate the extremely severe shortage of cash on the prairies? That is a grave emergency out there today.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): If the emergency becomes as grave as the hon. gentleman seems to suggest, we might perhaps have to meet again. But I have put a notice of motion on the order paper that I intend to move tomorrow to adjourn this session to January 8 at eleven o'clock in the morning unless, in the meantime, events would appear to be such that Mr. Speaker, after discussing the matter with the government, decided that an earlier meeting was required.

81537—8½

Mr. Argue: I wonder if the Prime Minister is aware that thousands of farmers on the prairies have not enough cash on hand to buy winter fuel supplies or other necessities or pay their accounts, taxes or anything else?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that and I would not be able to accept the hon. gentleman's impression as establishing that as a fact.

Mr. Argue: I should like to ask the Prime Minister this further supplementary question. Is he aware that the Saskatchewan wheat pool, in annual meeting a couple of weeks ago, passed a resolution to the effect that if its demands were not met in the way I have suggested a march on Ottawa was being contemplated?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I would hope, if that were contemplated, that wiser counsel would ultimately prevail.

[Later:]

Mr. Donald M. Fleming (Eglinton): May I ask the Prime Minister if his statement with reference to his motion to adjourn the house to January 8 means that the present session will be continued on that date or that the present session will be prorogued and a new session opened on that date?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): If nothing now unforeseen happens it would be the intention to have prorogation on the morning of that day and a new session started immediately the same day.

[Later:]

INQUIRY AS TO DELIVERY OF MESSAGE FROM EMPEROR OF JAPAN

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Daniel McIvor (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. house leader a question. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe) has had a successful visit to Japan and he received a message from the Emperor of Japan addressed to the government and the people of Canada. Will the Minister of Trade and Commerce have an opportunity of delivering that message to this house?

Mr. Macdonnell: Question.

An hon. Member: There is a friend.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I know that all Canadians were delighted that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was able to pay a visit to Japan and I am sure we are all looking forward to his report on that visit. I would assume that he would deliver that report and the message in the course of the debate on the address during the next session, but of course that would be something for him to decide.

NATIONAL DEFENCE**CALGARY—INQUIRY AS TO FIRE IN MILITARY BUILDINGS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. K. Fraser (Peterborough): I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence. I wonder if the minister would say something about the million dollar fire that took place in military buildings within the last 24 hours, damaging equipment, and why the water in that place was turned off?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): I am aware of the fire to which the hon. member has just referred, but I have not been provided with any details as to the cause of it or the measure of damage. We have sent the fire warden to Calgary and also a RCEME team to estimate the damage. The statement that the water was turned off has not been verified as yet, and until I have the facts I would rather not comment.

VETERANS AFFAIRS**BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE TO VETERAN FRUIT FARMERS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. O. L. Jones (Okanagan Boundary): Will the Minister of Veterans Affairs tell the house what assistance, if any, will be given by the government to the veteran farmers in the tree fruit area of British Columbia operating under the V.L.A., particularly the Cawston area? These veterans suffered heavily during last winter's severe frost, some losing as high as 70 per cent of their trees.

Hon. Hugues Lapointe (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I believe at the time the departmental estimates were being considered last session this matter came up and I indicated to the house that a survey would be made of the veteran settlements so affected. This survey was initiated at the end of the summer. We had four or five fieldmen make a thorough survey, and a short time ago the reports reached the office of the director of the Veterans Land Act. These reports indicate, as my hon. friend has mentioned, that most

[Mr. Macdonnell.]

of the veterans affected are in the Cawston area. I believe there are 49 in that development who are affected and whose losses vary from 10 to 70 per cent. The director of the Veterans Land Act is studying the reports received with his officials and he will be making recommendations to the minister.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**EGYPT—REPORTED THREAT TO JEWISH COMMUNITY**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. D. Crestohl (Cartier): Since press reports indicate that the Jewish community of Egypt totalling 50,000 persons is threatened with the gravest disaster in contravention of the Geneva convention of 1949, can the minister tell the house whether our government is making any representations to the government of Egypt, or to the United Nations, to take effective steps to safeguard these people against illegal and inhuman treatment before it degenerates to nazi proportions?

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have already sent a telegram to our ambassador in Cairo asking him to inquire into this situation.

UNITED NATIONS—REFERENCE TO STATEMENT BY MR. KRISHNA MENON

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs arising out of a reported statement of Mr. Krishna Menon at the United Nations yesterday, which apparently was most critical of Canada. Has the minister any observations to make on that statement, and when he is elucidating his answer to that question will he indicate an answer to the question that he himself propounded yesterday that the commonwealth stood in grave danger of dissolution? Which were the nations that had threatened in any way to remove themselves from the commonwealth?

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the question, I have already seen the text of what Mr. Menon said yesterday at the United Nations assembly, and it does not warrant the interpretation given to it by my hon. friend. Mr. Menon was told by a member of our delegation that some uneasiness might well be aroused by a wrong interpretation being given to his observations which dealt with the initiative of the Canadian delegation with respect to the United Nations force. Mr. Menon said that he would

Inquiries of the Ministry

be very regretful indeed if such an interpretation were given; that he did not intend it to be read that way, and it was no reflection of any kind on Canada's initiative in this matter, which he approved. So far as the other part of the question is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it was well known that at the time fighting began at Port Said the governments in Karachi, New Delhi and Ceylon were considering the effect of this action on their membership in the British commonwealth of nations. It undoubtedly placed an immediate stress and strain on that membership at that time.

FISHERIES**NEW BRUNSWICK—INQUIRY AS TO LEGAL ACTION FOLLOWING DESTRUCTION OF SALMON FINGERLINGS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. C. Van Horne (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Has the legal action which has been taken against Forest Protection Limited for \$5,700 for a couple of barrels of pin fish been settled?

Hon. James Sinclair (Minister of Fisheries): The case between the government of Canada and Forest Protection Limited because of the destruction of 800,000 salmon fingerlings is now before the exchequer court.

Mr. Van Horne: I should like to ask a supplementary question of the minister. Is he trying to give the impression to the house that these were 30-pound salmon instead of being fish one inch long?

Mr. Sinclair: If the hon. member had listened to me a moment ago he would have heard that I said 800,000 salmon fingerlings. Most people in New Brunswick understand exactly what a salmon fingerling is.

Mr. Van Horne: We had no idea that you were trying to sell salmon fingerlings for such a low price.

HOUSING**REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION TO ENCOURAGE HOME CONSTRUCTION**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Claude Ellis (Regina City): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works arising out of the answer given to the house yesterday by the Minister of Finance to the question asked by the hon. member for Burnaby-Coquitlam (Mr. Regier). In view of the admission by the Minister of Finance yesterday that recent increases in

the interest rate have had a serious effect on home construction in Canada, will the Minister of Public Works assure the house that necessary legislative action will be taken at the next session to encourage an increase in home construction in Canada.

Hon. Robert H. Winters (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the obvious answer to that is that the government does not announce matters of policy until decisions are made, and when they are made they are announced in the appropriate manner.

Mr. Ellis: Is the minister now prepared to admit that home construction has fallen off in Canada, which is something he would not admit a few months ago in this house?

Mr. Winters: Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to predict that this year will see the highest level of house completions in Canada's history.

INDUSTRY**AIRCRAFT ENGINE REPAIRS—MCLENNAN'S FOUNDRY, CAMPBELLTON, N.B.**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. C. Van Horne (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Last spring—

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Van Horne: Has anything been done by the Minister of Trade and Commerce with reference to an indication he gave last spring that action would be taken to divert aircraft engine repair work to McLennan's foundry at Campbellton to prevent that industry from being wiped out and to provide more employment in that area, which is a depressed area at the present time in regard to employment?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, aircraft repair work in that locality is distributed in accordance with business practice. I have not heard anything recently about McLennan's foundry but I presume that firm gets the same chance at the aircraft repair work that any other maritime firm obtains.

DRUGS**PEYOTE—STATEMENT AS TO USE BY CANADIAN INDIANS**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. J. J. McCann (Acting Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as Acting Minister of National Health and Welfare I wish to answer some questions

Inquiries of the Ministry

that were asked on November 27 by the hon. member for The Battlefords (Mr. Campbell). They have to do with a drug that is known as peyote.

The first question was as follows:

Has the Department of National Health and Welfare received any indication that the use of peyote is spreading among Canadian Indians?

The answer is that the Department of National Health and Welfare has received reports which would indicate increasing use of peyote in parts of northern Saskatchewan and Alberta. Its use seems to be diminishing in southern Manitoba.

The second question was:

Does the department consider peyote to be a dangerous substance?

The answer is yes. Peyote buttons contain at least nine alkaloids which in large quantities can be harmful and indeed have caused deaths among the Indian population.

The third question was:

Are steps being considered to ban the importation of peyote buttons into Canada, or to otherwise control it?

The answer is that peyote has been declared a drug and as such must be accurately labelled in conformity with the requirements of the Food and Drugs Act. Some shipments of peyote have been seized and returned to the shippers because of improper labelling. The food and drug directorate have intensified their efforts to enforce compliance with the Food and Drugs Act and regulations with respect to the correct labelling of peyote. The situation is being carefully watched.

IRRIGATION**SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER—INQUIRY AS TO CONSTRUCTION OF DAM**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture arising out of the minister's prophesied and apparently hoped-for drought in western Canada. Will the minister recommend to his colleagues an immediate start on the South Saskatchewan river development project to take care of this prophesied situation?

Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have never prophesied a drought in western Canada and I pray that one will not occur, but the fact is that we do have droughts out there occasionally. The only kind of drought we are prophesying and praying for in Saskatchewan at the present time is a drought of C.C.F. votes.

[Mr. McCann.]

The South Saskatchewan river dam is in very good hands and is being given consideration.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE**NEW BRUNSWICK—ALLEGED DELAYS IN SETTLING CLAIMS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. C. Van Horne (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Is the minister now taking steps to prevent a repetition of the 7,000 delays in settling unemployment insurance claims in northern New Brunswick last year and would he make sure that this will not occur again?

Hon. Milton F. Gregg (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the hon. member's question as notice and reply when my estimates are before the house.

IMMIGRATION**HUNGARY—INQUIRY AS TO RESULTS OF CONFERENCE**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. F. S. Zaplitny (Dauphin): I should like to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he is in a position to report to the house on the results of the conference held yesterday in connection with Hungarian refugees. If not, will a report be made to the house in the near future?

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as it would take some little time to deal with this matter perhaps it would be preferable to do so when the estimate for Hungarian relief is before the house, I hope later today. There is one thing I should like to say and that is that it was a good conference and there was excellent indication of co-operation from everyone, including the representative of the Ontario government who was there. In that context perhaps I should explain that the only reason a representative of the Ontario government was invited and not representatives from other governments was that the Ontario government had directly approached the federal government with respect to this matter. We would hope to get the same kind of enthusiastic co-operation from all provincial governments that we received from Ontario, particularly in connection with the reception, care and maintenance of these people and the providing of whatever assistance in medical care may be required.

If there are any provincial governments prepared to co-operate in this matter I would be delighted to hear from them as to precisely what they are prepared to do.

The Address—Mr. Dufresne

SMALL LOANS

INQUIRY AS TO FURTHER AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. L. E. Cardiff (Huron): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Has the government given any consideration to further amending the Bank Act to eliminate to some extent the hardship which now exists with respect to the person borrowing under \$200 due to the amendments passed last year?

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my hon. friend would permit me to correct him. The amendments last session were to the Small Loans Act, not to the Bank Act. If I understand his question, it is based on the possibility that a borrower would not be able to borrow from a small loans company.

Mr. Cardiff: The trouble is that a man borrowing a small amount must pay interest by the month; he cannot borrow for two or three months or so, as farmers would like to borrow. He must come back at the end of each month and renew his note.

Mr. Harris: That is true only if he borrows from a small loans company, so-called. He can borrow from a bank, if the bank chooses to lend to him, for one month or six months. There has been no change whatever in the practice of banking nor has there been any change in the practice of borrowing through a small loans company. There was an alteration made in the interest rate to be charged by small loans companies.

While I am not sure that there are any small loans companies in the area represented by my hon. friend, I am sure the banks in that area would still lend to a farmer on a normal promissory note for whatever term might be agreeable, assuming that the credit of the farmer was satisfactory.

Mr. Cardiff: I understand that the money can be borrowed only by the month and that the interest must be paid at the end of each month; I understand that the loan cannot be made for five or six months.

Mr. Harris: I have not been informed about that. If my hon. friend has a case relating to a chartered bank I would be glad if he would give me the details so I can look into it.

THE BANK ACT

REPORTED AMENDMENT TO RAISE CONSUMER INTEREST RATES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. John Pallett (Peel): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the report correct that it

is the government's intention to introduce legislation at the next session to amend the Bank Act to raise consumer interest rates? If that report is correct, will the government reconsider its intention?

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, the speech from the throne is the place where the intentions of the government with respect to legislation are normally disclosed, although, of course, they are disclosed in public announcements in the meantime. I would not want to make any answer beforehand, for reasons which I think will be obvious to everyone. However, consumer credit is one of the matters that is under constant consideration, having in mind present conditions. I would not want to go beyond that.

TRADE

INQUIRY AS TO ACTION RESPECTING UNFAVOURABLE BALANCE

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. O. White (Middlesex East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. What steps are being taken or are under consideration to correct Canada's very unfavourable trade balance?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): No steps are being taken. Until we see harmful effects from the unfavourable trade balance, we are not prepared to cut off supplies of capital goods which make the present expansion program in this country possible.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed, from Tuesday, November 27, consideration of the motion of Mr. Legare for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Rowe.

(Translation):

Mr. J. Wilfrid Dufresne (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, last night at 10 o'clock, before I resumed my seat on adjournment, the hon. member for St. Mary (Mr. Dupuis), who apparently does not wish to take part in this important debate, for reasons of discipline, perhaps, or for other reasons upon which I do not have to pass judgment, has asked me to tell the house what I thought of the Anglo-French intervention in the Middle East and more particularly, I suppose, in the Suez canal area.

As I am not in the habit of shirking questions that are put to me, and being a member of a political party in which due respect is

The Address—Mr. Dufresne

held for differences of opinion I will give my honourable friend the benefit of my personal opinion in the matter.

Britain and France decided to intervene after Israel had invaded Egyptian territory. Some people consider that action as an aggression because, they contend, it is contrary to the principles of the United Nations charter, which condemns aggression against any nation by one or several countries, whatever be the purpose of that violation. On that point, and if it is truly an aggression, personally I therefore find it impossible to approve the action of Britain and France. On the other hand, however, events have shown that the intervention of Britain and of France in that conflict,—an intervention which I would call preventive,—aimed at preserving and protecting the vital interests, not only of the two great powers concerned, but also of all the nations of the western hemisphere.

By now, we all know something that we did not know at the time of the Anglo-French intervention. The Russians had already built up in Egypt a very considerable amount of war material, ready for use as soon as Soviet troops could be rushed to the scene to take over the control of Suez, thus dealing a mortal blow to the economic life of all the nations of the western hemisphere.

We are now aware of the true situation, and it is obvious that if England and France had not taken action, all this vital area would by now have fallen into the hands of the Russians, aided and abetted by their faithful servant, president Nasser of Egypt.

One by one, all the Arab states would have had no choice but to submit to the infernal dictatorship of the Kremlin. My statements are surely borne out by this morning's news. As the United Nations could not tolerate such an invasion and, knowing that Moscow is bent on world domination and wishes to enslave people by resorting to the most despicable means,—the facts are there to prove it,—we would have had to face a third world war, even more dreadful than the first two, a war which not only would have caused untold destruction but would have doubtless annihilated mankind.

If on the one hand I cannot approve the violation of a pact which forbids all form of aggression, on the other hand, being acquainted with the facts and aware of the fatal results which would have inevitably followed without this intervention, I will refrain from berating or even criticizing the action taken by England and France, in the Middle East, in such circumstances.

I would have liked, however, to have access to the sources of information available to the government through the United Nations. I

[Mr. Dufresne.]

would have hastened to warn the United Nations, whose noble task it is to preserve world peace, and I would have used all my influence, as a member of that important world organization, to prevent any aggression from either side.

In conclusion, I will simply add this: I leave to the future and to history the task of passing judgment on the countries concerned.

Reverting to the matter I was discussing yesterday just before adjournment, I said I was glad that the parliament of Canada had been called into a special session to discuss the situation in Hungary and to offer a generous contribution to help that valiant nation.

The amount of one million dollars which we are being asked to vote for this purpose is certainly not exaggerated. It seems far more appropriate than the amount originally suggested.

There is no one here, I am quite sure, who will refuse to help this courageous people. While it will not benefit those who laid down their lives for liberty, we must not forget that, because of their sacrifice, widows and orphans are left behind, and that Christian charity, no less than a simple sense of duty, makes it imperative that we extend a helping hand to them.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) informed us yesterday of the terms of a letter which he had written to premier Bulganin, of Russia. I am not sure whether he did this in his own name or in that of the government which he heads. It would seem to me to be far more important, in the present circumstances, now that the house is gathered together to discuss this most difficult and serious matter, for us to adopt a resolution to condemn the barbarous conduct of the Russians, in Budapest more particularly.

Last week, at the Palace of Chaillot, in Paris, the fifteen member nations of NATO unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the inhuman treatment meted out by the Russians to the unfortunate Hungarian people. I would like to acquaint the house with this resolution.

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty have asserted their determination "to safeguard the freedom of their peoples, their common heritage and their civilization, based on principles of democracy, individual freedom and the rule of law"; and

Whereas the events which occurred in Hungary in the course of the last few weeks have demonstrated conclusively that the Soviet union will not hesitate to use force to crush human liberty;

By this resolution, the second Conference of Parliamentarians of the member states of NATO:

1. Express their profound indignation at the use of brutal force against the Hungarian people who sought to govern itself according to the best traditions of human liberty;

The Address—Mr. Brooks

2. Assert their conviction that, because of these measures, the unity and solidarity of member states of NATO are more essential than ever for the maintenance of peace and collective security against all aggression.

Mr. Speaker, because various standing orders of the house have been suspended for this special session, I am prevented from moving a similar resolution. But if the right hon. Prime Minister so chose, he might move the resolution himself, asking the house to pass it, and it would certainly be unanimously carried. This would once more prove that the Canadian parliament is determined to rebuke those who, by every means, would destroy human freedoms. I hope the right hon. Prime Minister will accede to my request, and I thank him in advance for doing so.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the few remarks I had to make and, before resuming my seat, I would like to know the position of the right hon. Prime Minister with regard to the resolution I just read out to him, and of which I have sent him copies in French and English.

(Text):

Mr. A. J. Brooks (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to say a few words in connection with these extremely important matters which are before this house and, as a matter of fact, before the country and the world today. I think that this is the third special session that I have attended since I first came to parliament in 1935. Our first special session had to do with the second world war. The second one had to do with a railway strike which was settled in a very short time. This third one has to do with another military matter which is greatly disturbing not only us but all other sections of the world today.

I wish to congratulate the mover (Mr. Legare) and the seconder (Mr. Weselak) of the address in reply to the speech from the throne. The speeches were short. They were to the point and, from their point of view I would say, very good. The speech from the throne itself was very short, as was to be expected. While it was very short, it was very important. It dealt first with the international situation connected with hostilities in the Middle East and secondly with the situation in Hungary. Both of these situations are connected. They are the results of the work of our communist friends in different parts of the world. As a matter of fact, the trouble in all parts of the world today I think could be very well left on the doorstep of

Russia and the communists throughout the world. I hope, before this debate is over, we will hear more opinions from members in all sections of this house. There seems to be quite a difference of opinion in Canada, and I think the House of Commons is the sounding board upon which these opinions should be expressed and where definite decisions should be made so the people of this country may feel their best interests are being looked after. I hope that we may have an expression of opinion on the situation from our sister province of Newfoundland, because I do believe the people of that island are becoming quite disillusioned with the situation they have found here in Canada since they first joined.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say this is a very important debate. It is a very delicate situation. I cannot help but express disappointment in the speech of the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) the other day. We look to the Prime Minister, who is our leader in matters of this kind, to give us a lead. We look to him to lay down definite policies. We look to him to review a situation of this kind, not with prejudice but coolly and collectedly, so that the people of the country may know just what is taking place. But, as has been pointed out by previous speakers, we heard first a long dissertation from the Prime Minister concerning the name of the battalion which has been selected to be sent to the Far East. There is no one in this country who objects in any way to the name of the battalion that is being sent. The Queen's Own Rifles is an old and honoured battalion, one of the finest battalions that Canada has ever produced. We know of its record down through the years; its splendid record in the first great war and in Hong Kong in the second war. So far as the people of Canada were concerned, there was no necessity to speak with reference to the Queen's Own.

Nor do I believe, Mr. Speaker, there was any necessity for the Prime Minister to indulge in what was a gratuitous criticism—no question about it—of Great Britain and France for the action they have taken. As some of the newspapers have said, I believe the people of Canada felt that if the Prime Minister did not agree he could have, more in sorrow than in anger, spoken his mind and given the people of Canada his opinion. It is very unfortunate now that not only this

The Address—Mr. Brooks

country but all the countries of the world today, after having passed through two world wars, are faced with the possibility of another. We recall that we were told the first great war was a war to end wars. Then, along came the second world war, almost as devastating as the first. Now, again the peoples of the world fear that they are under the shadow of the sword.

I think, Mr. Speaker, so far as the situation with regard to Great Britain and France is concerned, there has been a lot of misunderstanding—possibly that is an understatement. There has been a great deal of muddled thinking, not only in sections of this country but, more important, in the great country to the south of us. When Britain and France intervened in the Israel-Egypt fight, their announced goal at that time was to protect the Suez canal. I believe every reasonable man or woman in this country believes that today. The purpose was to protect it against war's destructiveness by occupying the canal area and using this line as a means of keeping the warring armies of Egypt and Israel apart until, as it was hoped, the United Nations was capable of taking over the policing of that area. This was their avowed intention. I believe that people will understand that was the reason they went there when all this muddled thinking and misunderstanding in the United States, Canada and other parts of the world is cleared away and the facts are known.

President Eisenhower himself, speaking of the Middle East some time ago, described it as the region most strategically vital on the face of the earth. It is the lifeline, not only of Great Britain and France but of practically all the nations of Europe. Great Britain and France saw that their lifeline was in real danger and they acted quickly, as they had to do, because there was no United Nations force to take over at the time.

Why is this area so important? Well, geography explains that to us. The Middle East is the crossroads of the world. It has been, not only for the past few years but for hundreds of years, one of the most important sections of the world. In addition to being the crossroads of the world it is where Europeans, Africans and Asians meet. It is also the greatest producer of oil in the world today. The economy of any country would die if it did not have access to oil. Great Britain depends to a great extent on the oil that she gets from the Middle East. The life of France depends on it to an even greater extent. Italy, Belgium and all these small countries depend on the oil that they get from the Middle East. These are the reasons

[Mr. Brooks.]

why it is so important. As a matter of fact, we are told that there are more oil possibilities in the Middle East than in all the rest of the world put together. If this supply were cut off, these nations would be left in serious trouble.

THE LATE OWEN C. TRAINOR

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that under the circumstances the hon. gentleman who has the floor will allow me to make a sad announcement to the house. Another of our colleagues has just passed away in his room in this building as a consequence of a heart attack. Dr. Trainor was a gentleman who had the respect of all his fellow members in this house, and I am sure as to all those who had occasion to have personal contacts with him their real affection as well as their respect. I think we should, as a mark of our deep sense of loss, suspend even this debate notwithstanding the urgency of the matters we are considering until at least the end of the afternoon, and not resume consideration of our business until eight o'clock this evening. If I have the unanimous approval of hon. members I will move:

That this house do now rise and do not meet again until eight o'clock this evening.

I do that as a mark of our sense of deep loss and of our very sincere sympathy with the late doctor's family. I do so move, seconded by my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Howe).

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggart): Mr. Speaker, may I say that we entirely agree with what the Prime Minister has suggested. We join in the feeling of loss and sorrow that he has expressed.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): We would like to support the Prime Minister's motion. I think it is only right that we adjourn until eight o'clock this evening as a mark of respect for our departed colleague. At the same time I should like to express our sense of shock and sorrow at the passing of this good man.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a great shock to the whole house and we in this party feel it very keenly that another of our members has passed on with such tragic suddenness. We certainly agree with the mark of respect the Prime Minister has indicated we should show at this time.

Dr. Trainor has been one of our colleagues and a close friend. Even when his health was not very good he insisted on being here to try to devote his full energies to our common cause in this session. We all join the Prime Minister in extending keen sympathy

The late Owen C. Trainor

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

IMMIGRATION

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FREE PASSAGE FOR HUNGARIAN REFUGEES

Hon. J. W. Pickersgill (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if I could have leave to revert to motions I should like to make a brief statement about Hungarian refugees.

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. member leave to revert to motions at this time in order to make the statement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pickersgill: The other evening when I spoke on the address I reported to the house everything which the government had decided to do up to that time; but this afternoon the government had an opportunity, for tragic reasons, to give further consideration to this question, and it was decided that as almost all these refugees have nothing with them, have nothing they can bring with them except the clothes they are wearing, and as many of them have little or no money, it was not reasonable to expect them to try to establish themselves in this country with a debt over their heads at the very start.

It has therefore been decided by the government not to make the assisted passage a loan but to make it free. This policy, of course, will also apply to those who have already arrived and to those who are en route and who have given an undertaking to make repayment.

I think perhaps I should also tell hon. members the government decided this afternoon, in order to be quite satisfied everything was being done that could and should be done to move as quickly as possible to Canada those Hungarian refugees who wish to come here, that it might be desirable for a member of the government to go to Vienna to see that everything was being done that could be done. I am proposing therefore to leave on Friday afternoon, and I expect to be in Vienna on Saturday.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Legare for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Rowe.

to his family. I am sure everyone feels his loss keenly and I think the Prime Minister's idea of adjourning until eight o'clock out of respect to our departed colleague is a good one.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I do wish to say to the Acting Leader of the Opposition that we extend to him and to all the members of his party who were perhaps more closely associated with the late Dr. Trainor than the other members of the house the deep sympathy which we feel for them as well as for his wife, his son and all his friends both inside and outside this chamber.

Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, as the minister from the province from which Dr. Trainor came, I think I should express the very deep sense of grief which all of the members from our province in this house especially feel at his sudden passing. Dr. Trainor held a prominent medical administrative position in our city of Winnipeg and had not only the respect of all of the members of his profession and all of the members of his own party, but the respect of all citizens as well. He was very efficient in his administrative and medical work and was universally beloved and respected by people in all walks of life and of all political beliefs. I am sure that we who knew him perhaps a little better than those from other provinces have a special reason for feeling very badly at the news that I heard only three or four minutes ago from my colleague the Minister of National Revenue. Those of us who had the privilege of knowing the doctor personally, I think, have a special feeling of sympathy for the members of his family in their sudden loss.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, perhaps as a member from the city of Winnipeg I might add just a word. It will be a shock to the citizens of our city to learn that Dr. Trainor has passed on this morning. He was indeed, as the Minister of Justice has said, highly respected in Winnipeg and we feel very deeply his loss at this time.

I should like on behalf of the people of Winnipeg—I am sure I can do it on this occasion—as well as on behalf of all of the members of the group with which I am associated in this house, to express our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Trainor and to Dr. Trainor, the son of our late colleague.

Motion agreed to and the house rose at 11.58 a.m.

The Address—Mr. Brooks

Mr. A. J. Brooks (Royal): Mr. Speaker, I will now continue my remarks where I left off this morning. My speech, as all hon. members know, was interrupted by the adjournment of the house due to the tragic death of my dear friend and colleague Owen Trainor, and I wish to join with the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent), the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe) and others in their words of sympathy and condolence to Mrs. Trainor and the members of the family.

Before proceeding with the remarks I intended to make I would like to congratulate the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration (Mr. Pickersgill) and the government on the announcement they have made. It seems to me a very obvious attitude for the government to take. As the minister has said, these people have no money; and to expect them to pay their passage to Canada without assistance would be asking of them something which would be impossible. I am glad they are having free passage and I assume, Mr. Speaker, our government is doing the same for them as the United States and every other government that is receiving Hungarian refugees.

We hope the visit of the minister to Vienna will assist in moving them more rapidly to this country. Our ministers have a habit of travelling; they travel all over the world on the slightest provocation, but if this visit will really assist the Hungarian refugees and expedite their passage to this country I am sure we in the opposition have no objection at all to the minister leaving the house. No doubt we will miss him somewhat, nevertheless if he is doing some good in Vienna we will be very pleased indeed.

An hon. Member: Let him stay there.

Mr. Pickersgill: That is what is called praising with faint damns, is it not?

Mr. Rowe: They are in the air most of the time.

Mr. Knowles: Not so faint at that.

Mr. Brooks: At the time of the adjournment this morning, Mr. Speaker, I had spoken of what I considered the muddled thinking and the great misunderstanding and confusion that existed in the world and among certain of the western nations regarding Great Britain and France and the readiness which we regretted on the part of certain quarters to assume that two of the oldest and most honourable nations of the world, France and Great Britain, had committed an act of naked aggression; two nations which I suppose have done more to promote civilization in this

[Mr. Pickersgill.]

world and have done more in past years to assist smaller nations than any other two nations in the world. I think that attitude is to be greatly regretted.

I was also speaking of the importance of the Middle East to the western world and particularly to Europe. I had mentioned the fact that today oil was the very lifeblood of the industry today not only of Great Britain and France but all the nations of Europe. I had spoken of the fact that the Suez canal was, is and has been the lifeline of the European nations. I said we realized the great anxiety that existed on the part of these nations in considering that this lifeline might have been endangered.

As well as the importance of the Middle East to the western world, I think it might be well to speak of the explosive situation that exists in that particular part of the universe in its attitude toward other parts of the world. There is no great unity among the Arab nations and there has been no great stabilizing factor in the Middle East since British troops were withdrawn from the canal zone a few years ago. Someone has said, and I believe it is a fact, that the only unity there is in the Arab world today is their unity in the hatred they have of the Israeli nation, so it is no wonder that nations are very much concerned over the situation we find today.

Now, what has been the policy of Great Britain in the past regarding the Middle East? For many years Great Britain has been the stabilizing factor in the Arab world. Great Britain understood the situation. Great Britain, as Churchill said not so long ago, has had a long and honourable association with the Arab nations. It was Great Britain in the first world war that relieved these nations of practical bondage under the Ottoman empire. The soldiers of Great Britain fought for the freedom of the Arab nations. It was Great Britain which helped to set up these nations, provided protection for them and saw that there was some established form of government in the six or seven nations which were created at that time.

As far as Egypt is concerned, we speak about the proposed Aswan dam. Hon. members know that at her own expense Great Britain built not one dam but five or six dams in that country not only for irrigation but also for the development of industry. She helped to build railways in different parts of the country and bridges across the Nile. She spent her money freely for the assistance of those people. That has been the policy of the British government for many years as far as the Middle East is concerned.

The Address—Mr. Brooks

What happened when Great Britain left? A vacuum was created and there was no nation which could control not only the Arab nations but any other nation which tried to exploit the area. The fact that she moved out created a danger to all the nations in the Arab world. She was asked to move out, and she was guaranteed that when she did there would be some force in the area to take over and control the situation.

What has been United States policy? As we know, today the United States is the leading nation of the western world. We all have great respect and regard for the United States, because they are our neighbours, they are the same people as we are. But we know also that the United States has had little experience as a leading nation; she lacks knowledge and understanding. After the British were moved out of this area the policy of the United States was to arm the Arabs. We were told that by arming the Arabs they would be able to protect not only their own interests but the interests of all other nations in that section.

What has been the result? In 1954 a delegation consisting of 20 men from every walk of life in the United States visited Arabia, Egypt and all the Middle Eastern countries to see what was going on, and when they came back they made a report to President Eisenhower. They said it had been a great mistake for the United States and other nations to ask Great Britain to leave, because when she had left the only stabilizing influence in that area had gone with her. They went on to say that it was a great mistake for the United States to think that by arming the Arab nations they could take the place of the forces which had been there before. I have here a book which I am sure most hon. members have read and which is entitled "Security and the Middle East". This book contains the recommendations made to President Eisenhower, among which were the following:

There are no stable governments in the Arab world. Most important, no Arab population can be counted on to support the west . . . arms are certain to be used either to put down internal rebellion or to attack Israel.

How true that has turned out to be. As I said a few moments ago, the only unity to be found among the Arab nations was their hatred of Israel, the only nation which the western world could count upon as its friend. That has been the policy of the United States up to the present time. I should like to read, if I may, an article which appeared recently in the *New York Times*. Dealing with the policy of the United States it said:

Our policy in the Middle East for some years has been weak, tentative, groping. From the moment Nasser made his arms deal with the Soviet union

in September, 1955, it should have been clear that he was a great danger to the democratic west.

The situation has been especially clear for a few weeks. It is not being cynical to say that moral principles and the laudable desire to "let the United Nations do it" have clouded the issues. The realities of power politics were what everyone should have kept his eyes on. Russia is not being moral. Russia does not give a hoot about the United Nations.

There could have been no truer statement than that.

They saw their opening in the Middle East and they went for it. If they succeed in controlling the Persian gulf oil fields and the Suez canal—even just by denying them to us—the Soviet union is going to be a greater world power than the United States. This is simple geography, economics and, above all, power politics. Nothing succeeds like success in this game. If we cannot protect the Middle East from the Russian communists, the free world will lose much of Africa and Asia. We should have no illusions on this score.

That is taken from the *New York Times*, one of the four great newspapers in the world. The article concludes:

The Russians respect strength. So do the Egyptians. So do the Arabs. At least as far as the Russians and President Nasser are concerned, we can safely say they respect nothing else. We have this strength. Let us be prepared to use it and make the Russians understand that we are so prepared. That will almost surely stop the "volunteers" for Egypt. That is the way to keep the peace if—as we all must suppose—the Russians really want peace.

That has been the policy of the United States. That is the criticism which their own people make of that policy. What has been the Russian policy? The Russians have never contributed anything to the advance of the Arab nations. They have until recently stood on the outside. What have they been doing in recent years? They have been supplying them with arms. Israel captured \$50 million worth Russian arms in the recent fighting. Russia has also sent to Egypt and other Arab nations hundreds of mechanics and technicians to instruct in the use of those arms. With a rate of illiteracy as high as 80 or 90 per cent the Arab people were not able to operate the tanks and other technical weapons which must be used in a war today, and Russia has been supplying these people. Russia for some time has been stirring up trouble among the Arab nations in the Middle East. Russia is backing Syria today as she backed Egypt. That is the condition which France and Great Britain found in those countries a few weeks ago.

I have tried to point out the conditions which existed in the Middle East after Great Britain was forced out some two or three years ago. At that time Great Britain maintained a force of 80,000 men to protect the Suez canal. As I say, the

The Address—Mr. Brooks

recommendations to President Eisenhower by 20 leading men in the United States suggested that it had been a great mistake for the United States and other countries to insist upon Great Britain moving out. It left a vacuum, and as they point out nature abhors a vacuum. We are up against this position today, that there is no stable influence there. The United Nations and some of the western nations are insisting that Great Britain and France move out. Great Britain and France have said that they are prepared to move out, that all they want is some stable influence there to take their place when they leave. They realize, as I am sure all members of this house must realize and as the civilized world today must realize, that if there is no stable influence there Russia will come in and the vacuum will be filled by the communists.

We turn to the United Nations. It has a tremendous job. It is a tremendous problem that is being faced. I listened to the Secretary of State for External Affairs yesterday, and I must say that I enjoyed his speech much more than I did the Prime Minister's. I feel that if the minister did not make so many trips to Ottawa for advice from the government we would probably get better results from the United Nations as far as Canada is concerned.

However, be that as it may, the United Nations has voted to send a police force to the Middle East. How large is this force to be? I listened to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes), and I was very much taken with his arguments. We cannot just send a force there composed of a few foot soldiers. As the hon. member pointed out, it must be a balanced force. Surely the United Nations appreciated the situation. That is a term that all military men will understand. Those responsible must have looked at the situation and tried to determine how large and what type of force would be necessary to police the Middle East. That should have been done and surely it was done. If it was not the failure to do so was a serious shortcoming on the part of the people dealing with this situation.

I would expect that the secretary general, Mr. Hammarskjöld, who went to Egypt, on his return would have gone into this situation very thoroughly with the military advisers connected with the United Nations. I would expect that the secretary general when he came back to the United Nations would have gone into the matter thoroughly with General Burns, a Canadian general of whom we are very proud, a man I know well and with whom I have been associated in connection with veterans affairs and other

[Mr. Brooks.]

matters on numerous occasions. Surely General Burns was asked what forces he considered necessary for the patrolling and police duties required in the Middle East.

If General Burns has been told, surely the Minister of National Defence has been told what is required from Canada. We have not yet heard from one member of the government what the requirements of the United Nations force may be and how large it will be. Surely the House of Commons, sitting in special session at this time, is entitled to this information. We should be told whether a force of 6,000, 10,000 or 20,000 men is required from the contributing nations. Surely we should be told by our own Minister of National Defence whether Canada should supply an armoured force, whether we should supply a regiment or just what it is that Canada is supposed to supply.

We know that nations such as Norway, Sweden, Colombia, Canada, New Zealand and so on have volunteered to supply men. These men speak different languages and come from many countries. Surely General Burns will have some trouble in controlling a force of this kind. These men are going into a desert. Canadian soldiers are going to a country entirely different from any country they have ever gone to before. That is also true of the Norwegians, the Swedes and all these people. We should know whether we are getting the type of men for the police force who are best suited for the particular land to which they are going. We know that Great Britain and France have had a hundred years or more experience in training for fighting or police work, whatever you may call it, in the desert. But the Norwegians, Swedes and Canadians are men who come from a northern climate, and we are wondering whether they are the men best suited for this particular job.

These are things on which the United Nations must have been advised by Mr. Hammarskjöld and General Burns; and if the United Nations were so advised, that information should have been passed on either by the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of National Defence to this parliament which is being asked to vote money to send this force to the Middle East. It is not my intention to say anything more in this regard.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Brooks: Yes, there is someone applauding.

Mr. Rowe: He does not like it.

Mr. Brooks: He does not say anything himself, so perhaps he is a little jealous of anyone else who does try to say something. We hope sincerely that the United Nations

The Address—Mr. McLeod

can handle this situation. As I said a moment ago, it is a most difficult problem. I think we quite realize what the situation would have been in the Middle East if we had depended entirely upon the United Nations. It is about four weeks since the trouble started in the Middle East. We are told by the minister that in that time the United Nations has been able to get together 1,700 men and transport them to the Middle East.

We all want peace. I am sure that every nation in the world today is desirous of peace. We wish the United Nations or any other organization trying to correct such situations the very best in their endeavour to maintain peace throughout the world. I am sure the Arabs would be better off with peace. I am sure Israel would be better off with peace. For five years there has been no peace as far as that country is concerned. I am sure that Great Britain, the United States, yes, even the ordinary man in Russia and the satellite countries today, all peoples in the world; are anxious to have peace in the world. As I said a moment ago, I do wish the United Nations Godspeed in the effort it is making to maintain peace, but I think our government should tell the people of Canada just what is being done in order to assure peace in this section of the world.

Mr. G. W. McLeod (Okanagan-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this chamber we heard some words that have caused me very deep concern, and I am sure others were similarly affected. I refer to the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as recorded on page 51 of *Hansard*: "It is bad to be a chore boy of the United States." I do not think he meant the tense or wording of that phrase to be just as it is, namely "It is bad to be a chore boy of the United States". That is a direct admission that we are a chore boy, an admission that he has found it bad to be such a chore boy. Then he went on to say this:

It is equally bad to be a colonial chore boy running around shouting, "Ready, aye, ready".

As I said, I am concerned because I wonder what prompted such words and such thinking, or what thinking was behind those words. In that last sentence there must be some thought of incidents in which Canada has been a colonial chore boy. I would hate to think so, because I do not believe that in the history of this nation we have ever been forced to accept such a role. As I say, I was sorry to hear those words used, but it is possible that under the provocation and in the heat of the debate the meaning was not such as I have taken from them.

I now wish to get on with the subject that we are down here to discuss. As our leader said the other night, we are not here to play politics. We feel that any effort seriously to embarrass or to defeat the government at this time would have no other effect than to delay a solution to the problem, something which I am sure we are all extremely anxious to see brought about. In seeking that solution I will say right off the bat that we believe the solution offered is the only alternative to the situation that exists at the present time in the Middle East. But that situation, Mr. Speaker, we believe can be attributed in no small measure to bungling on the part of this government and of the government of the United States.

We support the government in the matter of its Hungarian relief policy. We are glad to see that the amount given out earlier to the press as \$200,000 has been increased to \$1 million. But we still realize that that is a meagre amount from a country so wealthy as is this one. In fact I believe it just amounts to about 20 cents on every \$1,000 that our government will collect by way of taxes and so on over the next year. I was also glad to hear, just a few moments ago, the statement by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that these refugees, if you want to call them such, will not be burdened with the expense of their transportation to this country.

As to this police force, as our leader said and as I have said, we support it strongly. We support a police force in this instance that is organized to control the disputed area of the Sinai peninsula and of the Suez canal. However, yesterday our Secretary of State for External Affairs envisioned a police force on a much different scale, namely a police force that would be permanently at the beck and call of the United Nations for service anywhere at any time without our immediate sanction.

With that type of police force, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that we are in complete disagreement. It is not our belief that we should surrender our sovereignty and give up absolute control in such an important matter as this. Therefore before we would commit ourselves to such a widened service for the force, we would want to be further consulted; and I am confident that it should be the parliament of Canada that should make the decision with respect to any future change that might be deemed necessary.

To get on from that matter, Mr. Speaker, may I say that we strongly support the British commonwealth of nations and believe that this country must make every effort to

The Address—Mr. McLeod

heal the breach that has been caused by what I assert was too hasty action on our part in the present crisis. When everything is known of the situation that exists as between Egypt and the powers of Britain and France, I think possibly there will be a different decision and a different thought in the minds of some of the leaders of the world. I have a great deal of confidence in the years of diplomatic tact that Britain has shown over past generations in bringing various parts of her empire to the stage where self-government was possible. At the same time, this same empire was the great stabilizing influence for peace in the world. The leader of the C.C.F. pointed out this fact the other evening and did it very well. I therefore need not elaborate further.

I have a great deal of respect for the close relationship that has existed for generations between Britain and Canada. We owe a great deal to Britain, Mr. Speaker, and we have on every occasion until the present done our best to acknowledge that debt. But I feel that now something has happened. What is behind this rift that has occurred? In common with many other people in the world at the present time I think we are safe in believing that the British commonwealth is on the brink of disaster. I lay the blame in large measure on the policies of this government in the present crisis. We have switched our course in order to tie in with United States policies set up by—and I hate to use the word when it comes to describing diplomatic agents and people learned in international diplomacy—a bunch of amateurs. We have committed ourselves to follow the United States pathway and to follow United States policies that express such confusion and vacillation as I am sure have not been expressed in the approach to any great international problem by any other leading power of the world at any time.

I am not making that statement on the strength of my own observations. I am borne out by many statements by United States students of world affairs. I have here an article by Walter Lippmann. It is headed "U.S. Appeasement Failed. Nasser 'Forced' Conflict". We see used in that heading the words "U.S. Appeasement Failed". Along with every other member of this house I hate that word "appeasement". How the Americans scoffed and sneered a few years ago when an Englishman, with an umbrella on his arm, made the trip to Munich, and has ever since then been branded as the great appeaser of all time. The thinking at that time found great fault with this method of appeasing dictators. Today, according to Mr.

Lippmann, the whole policy which they have followed in this crisis has been branded as one of appeasement.

What has happened in this great nation to the south to cause that change of heart? Today, when Britain is backing away from appeasement we find this nation, possibly the most powerful in the world, willing to go hat in hand to one of the dictators of the world in an effort to try and appease, to find a settlement by accepting dictators from that dictator. I could back up this statement, Mr. Speaker, by editorials which appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post*. This magazine has written very strongly of the blunderings in United States foreign policy. However, I do want to put on the record a few words by Ernest K. Lindley, a writer in *Newsweek*, the issue of November 26, 1956. In an article entitled, "Our Stand in the Crisis", he has this to say. He has reviewed the situation and then he concludes with these words:

As this brief outline suggests, our government's policy in the Middle Eastern crisis is not yet completely clear.

Remember, this is as late as November 26.

In the first shock of the Israeli-French-British actions it was coloured by anger. It overlooked, momentarily, the aggressive ambitions and actions of Nasser. It seemed to lose sight of what should have been one of our primary objectives: To keep the Russians out. Second and third thoughts have moved our policy toward a somewhat better balance.

Hoover—

This is a reference to the under-secretary in the United States, and these are his words:

"We have a chance for a fresh start". This applies also to American policy in the Middle East, which cannot be cleared of responsibility for the dangerous mess. Our wavering course after Nasser's seizure of the canal led directly to the present crisis.

This is an indictment, Mr. Speaker, by a keen student of international affairs published in one of the leading magazines of the United States. The United States policy stands condemned in the United States by many of her own experienced students of international and world affairs, yet she seems to chart the course that this Canadian government chooses to follow and the Canadian people are asking why.

In his speech yesterday our Secretary of State for External Affairs tried to excuse the lack of United States interest by referring to the Panama canal. These words appear at page 52 of *Hansard* for November 27, 1956:

The vital importance of the Suez to western Europe is perhaps not appreciated in Washington, and it might have been better appreciated there if this situation could have been related by them to the Panama canal.

The Address—Mr. Knowles

I am sure we are safe in asking ourselves what the actions of the United States would have been had they been faced in Panama with a situation similar to that with which the British were faced in Suez. I believe that is not an excuse for United States taking the attitude which it has taken. If the United States is going to assume the importance of the No. 1 nation, both militarily and financially, in the world, she has to have an outlook that embraces the world and not just the Panama canal. She has to see the Suez as well.

It is this problem with which we are faced, and the job that faces us now is to try to get a permanent solution of the Arab-Israel problem. This has to be done. I have an editorial here from the Vancouver *Sun* of November 20 and the heading is, "Curb Nasser Now". I think we are all agreed that so long as Nasser is allowed to dictate policies, even telling the members who are contributing to the police force what sort of technicians, what sort of troops and even what shall be the names of their regiments, we will not get very far in settling these questions.

Then, following the settlement of this great question, the one problem which concerns me greatly is the necessity for rebuilding and straightening out the twisted framework of the commonwealth of nations. I should like to read a very few sentences from an editorial in the Vancouver *Sun* of November 14, 1956:

Canadians ought to follow the example of those Britons who appear to be doing some quiet thinking about the future of the commonwealth as a result of the Anglo-French military action in Egypt.

Then a little farther down it says:

But no matter what time tells in this regard we have to worry about whether the commonwealth will ever be the same.

It is that, Mr. Speaker, which is causing a lot of concern to good Canadian citizens. This is advice that the government must heed. I must admit that there is a place in this world for the United Nations. We need the United Nations, and it could be a wonderful instrument for the preservation of peace and sanity in the world. But let us not forget the wonderful power for peace and good will the commonwealth has been, and let us bend every effort to repair the breaches that exist today.

I have drawn attention to the changes that have taken place in the composition of the British Empire. These changes have come about by evolution and not by revolution. We were, within the memory of many in this chamber, a colony of Great Britain, although we were not a colony that had to do the

bidding of Great Britain. At that time one of the greatest Canadians, I believe, used a few well chosen words to express our position in that empire. I believe you all remember them. They were, "Daughter am I in my mother's house but mistress in my own". Those words were true while we were a part of that great British Empire. Today, through evolution, we have become a part of the great British commonwealth of nations. We are no longer a daughter in our mother's house but rather, Mr. Speaker, we could say, "Sister am I in my sister's house, but mistress in my own".

Let us foster such a spirit and such a feeling, so this great commonwealth can continue to be an association of nations working together in harmony and peace and being the great bulwark of freedom they have been in the past. I say to this government that in the achievement of this spirit lies the greatest problem we have to face at the present time.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this group I wish at the outset to express our wholehearted approval of the announcement made at eight o'clock this evening by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration concerning further steps the government of Canada is prepared to take to assist Hungarian refugees. We believe that in taking these further steps the government is simply giving expression to what is in the hearts of the Canadian people. I think this is a time to congratulate the Canadian people on the ways in which they have expressed their desire that everything possible be done to assist these refugees; indeed, I think the press of Canada is to be congratulated on the campaign it has carried on during the past few weeks urging the Canadian government to open its heart so far as the Hungarian refugees are concerned.

In relation to the situation in the Middle East which has brought us to this special session of parliament, Mr. Speaker, it seems to us in this group that there are two purposes to which this House of Commons should address itself. In the first place we feel that we, the representatives of the Canadian people, should be indicating very clearly good, solid and strong Canadian support for the efforts which our Canadian representatives at the United Nations have made to establish the rule of law and achieve peace in the Middle East.

The second purpose to which we feel this House of Commons should address itself is that of making it clear to the government of this country that there is still a great deal more to be done, and if we feel that there is much more to be done, particularly at

The Address—Mr. Knowles

the United Nations, it seems to us that we should get this debate over as soon as we can so the Secretary of State for External Affairs might get back to New York and get on with the job.

We offer no apology for supporting, on occasion, policies brought before parliament by the government, even though we may oppose that government. When, in our view, the government brings before this house something that is wrong, something that is detrimental to the interests of Canada, we say so. Indeed, we do more than say so; we do everything we can to block the government when it proposes something that we believe is wrong. That is our duty on occasions such as that. But by the same token, Mr. Speaker, when the government lays before the House of Commons policies which we believe are right, despite our being in political opposition, we should support those policies. We feel, indeed, that any party that expects to have its integrity respected in the country should follow that course and should put aside party bickering, should set aside partisan interests, and support the government when the government brings down policies which are correct, which are in the interests of Canadian people and which are designed to further peace in the world.

On this occasion, however, there is more at stake than the integrity of the political parties that make up this House of Commons. We feel that at the present time the very strength, the very authority of the United Nations is at stake. We are satisfied that with good Canadian leadership at New York in recent weeks the United Nations has staked out a correct course. The United Nations has shown that it has authority; but, Mr. Speaker, when the person who gave a lead to the United Nations, as did the Secretary of State for External Affairs, comes back to his own parliament and finds here bickering and opposition, carping criticism, such as we have had the last three days, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that tends to weaken the strength and the authority of the United Nations.

There has been talk in this House of Commons during the last few days about appeasing Nasser; there have been suggestions that Canada was putting itself in the position of being humiliated before this dictator of Egypt. Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if Colonel Nasser is today standing up and talking big, one of the reasons is that he is aware of the fact that the person who in the United Nations proposed a policy which the United Nations is now seeking to implement is having difficulty getting full support for that policy

[Mr. Knowles.]

back in the Canadian House of Commons. I suggest that if my friends to the right, the members of the Progressive Conservative party, want to talk strong to Nasser, as they say they do, one of the ways to do it is for Canada to speak with a united voice in support of United Nations action at this time. I believe that in doing so we would be giving expression to the views of the vast majority of the Canadian people.

The Canadian people are satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the best that was possible was done at the United Nations at the beginning of this month. Canada played a good part there; our leaders played an effective role on behalf of the people of Canada. As one who on many occasions, on most occasions, in this house, opposes the government because of the wrong policies it brings forth and because of its many failures, it seems to me on this occasion we should be giving the government all the support we possibly can.

Mr. Fulton: We do not agree.

Mr. Knowles: There is also talk in this session, Mr. Speaker, about the commonwealth of nations, and the suggestion is being made that somehow or other Canada has done something to weaken the position, to weaken the authority, of the commonwealth of nations. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the very opposite is the case.

Mr. Fulton: This government has been doing that for five years.

Mr. Knowles: After all, if in recent weeks, there has been any strain put upon the ties that bind the commonwealth together, that strain was not created by Canada. Indeed, I would say that strain was not created by the British people. It was created by a decision taken by the present government of the United Kingdom. In the view of most of the nations of the world, in the view of many people, a wrong decision was made by the Eden government when a decision was made to disregard the rule of law and to take the law into that government's own hands.

What did Canada do in that situation? Did Canada take steps that weakened the position of the commonwealth? On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it seems to us that what Canada did was to save the moral authority of the commonwealth. What Canada did was to speak out with a clear conscience for the maintenance of the rule of law by taking such steps as could be taken to get back to the rule of law, to mend the breach that had been created; and because of that stand it seems to me that in the end the commonwealth will

The Address—Mr. Knowles

be stronger and not weaker because the truth has been spoken by representatives of this country.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if our friends to the right want to strengthen the commonwealth of nations, as they avow to be their purpose, they should stand behind the attempts made by the representatives of Canada to speak with moral authority on an occasion such as that which we are experiencing at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all agree that the situation in the Middle East is so complex we cannot begin to analyse it or assess blame amongst those to whom blame might be attached. There is no doubt but that some blame is due to all parties to the present situation. Some blame certainly is due to the governments of the United Kingdom and France. Some blame must be attached to the state of Israel. Some real blame must be attached to the United States for its policies in the Middle East over a long period of time. Considerable blame must be attached to Egypt and to what Nasser has done, and blame must be attached also to what the government in Canada has done, and I would even attach some blame to some of the parties in this house.

An hon. Member: What about Russia?

Mr. Knowles: May I remind my friends to the right that on February 1, after we had presented to the house a subamendment which asked that before arms were shipped to the Middle East the government should make sure peace in that area would be guaranteed either by the United Nations or by the three parties signatory to the tripartite agreement, my friends in the Progressive Conservative party, as well as those in all parties but ours, voted against it.

Mr. Fulton: What else did you have attached to it?

Mr. Knowles: I have given you the whole of the subamendment we presented to the house. The only other matter before the house at the time was the amendment moved by my friends of the Progressive Conservative party.

Mr. Fulton: You wanted to strike out our amendment.

An hon. Member: Be quiet.

Mr. Knowles: No; we added ours to yours. Even after one has assessed the present situation in the Middle East, even after one has given his particular interpretation as to who is to blame, let it be crystal clear that the whole of that situation, bad as it is, is not

a patch on the horror and the tyranny that is being perpetrated on the people of Hungary by the U.S.S.R.

Nevertheless, what the United Nations was confronted with when it met in New York at the end of October and early in November was the fact of open hostilities in the Suez area and in the Sinai desert, and what the United Nations had to cope with was that situation; and it was in that context that the Canadian decision was taken that the time had come to establish the rule of law in international affairs.

I confess to some amazement at my friends to the right in the Progressive Conservative party in their inability to follow those of us who feel the rule of law is something that should be maintained at all costs. In this House of Commons earlier in this year 1956 our friends in the Progressive Conservative party and we in this party felt that the rule of law was being abrogated in this house. We felt that a certain gentleman across the way was so anxious to get through a certain policy he believed to be right that nothing else mattered. The Progressive Conservatives who joined with us then in saying that it was not only important what you do but that the way in which you do it also matters, now stand up and defend the policies of another government on the ground that even though they had to by-pass the United Nations at the time the thing they were trying to do was all right in itself. They now argue that the end justifies the means. That is a different tune from the one they sang here in May and June of this year, when in their view and in ours the rule of law was being abrogated in this house.

My same friends to the right have been vocal with those of us in this group and in the group to the left and the group across the way down through the years in taking the position, particularly since the end of world war II, that the only hope of world peace lay in the establishment of the rule of law in international affairs.

I have been interested in reading some of the speeches that have been made by my friends to the right and in particular I have been interested in reading some of the speeches made by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and I find that on two or three occasions he has referred to the dream of Grotius. I confess I had forgotten who Grotius was and I had to look him up. It is a very interesting reference which the hon. member has made. He has expressed in referring to the dream of Grotius the view of all hon. members in the house that the only hope of world peace is in collective

The Address—Mr. Knowles

security, in establishing the rule of law and establishing it so firmly that everybody must be expected to follow it, establishing it so that it will be clearly recognized that the only way to deal with breaches of the peace is by collective action.

That view has been expressed in this house academically when we have been debating external affairs. It was expressed very strongly when we were debating the sending of a delegation to the San Francisco conference in the early part of 1945. It was also expressed when we gave support to the joining of the United Nations by Canada, and it was expressed again in 1950 when we were confronted with the necessity of contributing to the United Nations force in Korea.

As I read the records of this house there has been unity on this question of collective security, the rule of law, and implementing that idea in supporting police action by the United Nations down to the present time. We reach now the most critical case the United Nations has ever had. We reach now a time when the United Nations needs the support back home of the countries represented at the United Nations, and in this short special session we have been confronted with something less than the complete support that we thought and hoped we would have for this policy.

We looked and hoped for this support, as I say, because of the stand all parties in this house have taken across the years. And so, Mr. Speaker, we feel as I said at the start that one of the purposes to which this house should be addressing itself in this special session is making it clear that the Canadian people are behind this policy of the rule of law by collective action in world affairs. I hope that even yet there will be voices of support from the only party in this house that seems to be opposing the government on this occasion, the Progressive Conservative party. My friends to the left, like ourselves, are supporting the government's policy even though we may have suggestions to make and criticisms to offer. The only party that is opposing the government is the Progressive Conservative party, which has moved an amendment which represents a vote of non-confidence in the very policies we are down here to discuss. But I hope that even yet voices in the party to the right will recognize the fact that it would be far better for the peace of the world if they would join in supporting this good Canadian policy at this time.

Mr. Nesbitt: There would have been no rule of law if the Russians had got into Egypt.

[Mr. Knowles.]

An hon. Member: Why not cross to the other side of the house, Stanley?

Mr. Knowles: My hon. friend says there would have been no rule of law if the Russians had gone into Egypt and he is perfectly right; but, Mr. Speaker, if the Russians—

An hon. Member: They are in there now.

Mr. Knowles:—had moved into the dispute between Israel and Egypt and taken the law into their own hands we would have said, "This is in violation of the rule of law; this must not be tolerated." It would have been said in much stronger terms than those in which it was said in this case. I think the government is to be commended for the moderation that was used in describing the action of the British and French, and commended at the same time for taking a strong stand in the setting up of an international police force to go into the Suez area.

Mr. Fulton: About six months too late, that is all.

Mr. Knowles: But, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the start, we feel there is another purpose to which parliament should be addressing itself in this session. We should be reminding the government in the clearest terms we can that the job has only been started, that in terms of securing peace in the Middle East, in terms of securing peace in the world, there is a great deal yet to be done.

I remind the minister and the house of the points that have already been laid before parliament by my leader, the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggarr (Mr. Coldwell) and by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Stewart). We feel, for example, if I may use the words of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, that the momentum generated recently at the United Nations should not be lost but should be used to carry on to the winning of a political settlement of the issues in the Middle East. That political settlement must include a recognition by the Arab states of the existence of Israel. It must include a peace treaty between those states and Israel, with the clear understanding that all have a right to live in that area.

We feel too that the time has come when consideration should be given to extending the United Nations police force to the other borders of Israel on which there is at the moment real concern. Indeed the news today suggests that there is concern as to what is happening in Syria. Even as last January and February, we urged that the United Nations should do something about the trouble between Egypt and Israel, so we now urge that

The Address—Mr. Knowles

the United Nations should move in with a police force before trouble happens, rather than after, between Israel and the bordering countries of Lebanon, Syria and Jordan, so that the peace of the world may be saved even before it is broken further at this time.

I hope that because of the gravity of the present situation our insistence that this be done will be given greater attention by the government than was our urging last January that an international police force be put in between Israel and Egypt.

I would remind the house as well of the points made by those who have spoken already on behalf of this group, that real and serious consideration must be given to the solving of the social and economic problems which obtain in the Middle East, such as the re-settlement of the refugees and other issues. These problems simply must be solved. We know that the problem of the refugees, the problem of a political settlement and the other economic problems, such as the raising of the standards of living in that area, the settlement of the Suez canal issue and others, all hang together. That is why we advocate most strongly something in the nature of an international T.V.A. on the Nile river to develop the Aswan dam and generally bring about an improved use of the waters of the Nile so as to increase the standards of living of the people in that country. That is why we also advocate something in the nature of an international oil authority so that the tremendous resources of oil to be found in that part of the world, oil which the rest of the world needs and wants and is willing to pay for, may bring back to the people in that area something in the way of increased and improved living standards.

We say there should be a political settlement. We say the problem of the refugees should be solved. But we say also you are not going to solve these problems until you improve economic conditions. This is a package deal. These matters all hang together. Because these other things are important in the achieving of a political settlement we urge the Secretary of State for External Affairs when he gets back to New York, back to the United Nations, which I hope will be soon, to put the same vigour into an attack on these problems which he put into his efforts to get an international police force set up and moved into that part of the world at this time.

We feel also that at this time when the world has accepted with some sense of satisfaction the idea of an emergency force being organized, further efforts should be made to get a permanent international police force established. My hon. friends to the left

seem to be concerned lest such a police force be made up of national components which would be beyond the immediate control of the nations concerned. That as a matter of fact was a problem which was thrashed out at the time of the San Francisco conference, and I do not think there is any question that it can be solved.

Even if you do have to have some sort of continuing national control over the various component parts, what we should have in existence is an international police force which would be ready to move whenever there was trouble, rather than have to go through this procedure of setting up an emergency force every time something like that occurs. I am reminded of a speech made by the hon. member for Prince Albert, I think in 1945 just prior to the time of the San Francisco conference, when he referred to the strategic position of Canada's airfields and suggested that we should make our air bases available to the United Nations so that United Nations troops could be stationed at our airfields in Canada and moved quickly to any spot in the world where trouble might break out.

That was an idealistic expression with which I agreed at the time and with which I still agree. In fact we are fast getting to the point—this is the view of this group—where we do need a police force, not one to be got together after trouble has broken out but one available, on the job and ready to move in whenever the United Nations decides that trouble has broken out or may develop. I submit that such a force would not only be able to deal with trouble when it broke out but the very fact that there was such a force ready to move would in many instances prevent trouble breaking out at all.

So we urge upon the government that the Secretary of State for External Affairs be sent back to New York just as soon as possible to go to work on these items of unfinished business which are just as important as the job which has been done already in getting an emergency force set up and sent to the Middle East.

When we get into committee of supply, which we hope will be soon, there are a few questions we would like to ask the government. Since there has been this delay perhaps I might state two or three of them now so the answers can be prepared and given to us when the time comes. We are interested in the fact that although it is obviously going to cost many millions of dollars for Canada to send this force to the Middle East, we are being asked to vote toward that purpose only the sum of one dollar. I know what a dollar item is, it is a matter of legislation.

The Address—Mr. Knowles

By voting that dollar we agree to give the government authority to use some of the money which we voted for defence last session, the \$1,775 million, for this purpose. I think the Minister of National Defence at some point in this week's session will have to explain to us how it was that only a few months ago he insisted that that figure was the result of accurate budgeting. We did not believe it at the time, but now when many millions of dollars are needed to move these Canadian troops to the Middle East the extra money does not have to be provided, it is already there in the \$1,775 million we voted. I think we should have some explanation this session as to how national defence budgeting is done.

We also want to know where the contribution which Canada will be making, as we presume she will be making, to the United Nations for United Nations expenses on behalf of the troops in the Middle East is to come from. We would also like to know where the money will come from that will be paid by Canada toward the expense of clearing the Suez canal. We would also like to know just how the expenses of the Middle East force are to be paid as between the pay and allowances of our soldiers and the other general expenses. Are they to be paid directly by the Department of National Defence or are they to be paid by means of contributions to the United Nations, the United Nations in turn paying those expenses?

We feel also that during this session the Prime Minister should give us the same kind of assurance he gave quite categorically in 1950 regarding the part parliament would play in the dispatch of troops to different areas. In 1950 when parliament gave its approval to the dispatch of troops to Korea the Prime Minister made it very clear that if it became necessary to send troops to any area not mentioned in the then existing order in council the section of the National Defence Act would apply and parliament would be called within a 10-day period.

It seems to us that we should have that same assurance at this time, that if it becomes necessary to send troops to any other area parliament will be called. I think the government should also have our assurance that if it is necessary to do that, parliament will give its support to the sending of Canadian troops wherever they are needed for international action to preserve the peace of the world.

These are questions, Mr. Speaker, that we can put to the government when we get into committee of supply on the two items that are before us. I simply say now that we feel

[Mr. Knowles.]

that basically our job in this session is twofold; on the one hand to make clear our support on behalf of the people of Canada of the steps the government has taken thus far and, on the other hand, to make it clear to the government that the people of Canada expect the government to go on and finish the job. If the government fails to take steps to try to solve these other problems, social, economic and political, the efforts made thus far may well have been in vain. On the other hand, if the Secretary of State for External Affairs on behalf of the people of Canada can play some part in getting a solution to these political, social and economic problems, mankind may perchance even yet look forward to the winning of peace in the Middle East and to the achieving of peace and human accord throughout the world.

(Translation):

Mr. Leon Balcer (Three Rivers): Mr. Speaker, during this debate, we have heard several more or less violent speeches from both sides of the house which shows the importance of this serious matter.

I do not intend to speak at length and I will only make a few brief remarks.

I want to say at the outset that I am in favour of an international police force as long as it is adequate and reasonable. However, I find quite ludicrous the panic shown by our government in asking that the United Nations set up such a force.

During the past three weeks we have heard all sorts of statements, which differed one from the other to the point that they were sometimes contradictory. Our leaders should not panic everytime some incident occurs in the Middle East.

One must be realistic and one must recognize that tension is always existing in that part of the world.

At the present time, one can see that the Arab countries and Israel are spying on each other and getting ready for war, as they are only separated by artificial borders. Moreover, it is from that same part of the world that Nasser, the dictator, not only supports the Algerian rebels, but rouses their feelings and encourages them to slaughter the French settlers in Algeria. As long as this stratagem goes on, one must not be surprised to see the great western nations like Britain and France lose patience and take unfortunate decisions. We must not forget either that Russia will continue to supply arms to Egypt and to take all the possible means to spread its influence in that part of the West so rich in oil, a product which is among the most important in today's world.

The Address—Mr. Balcer

This international force will no doubt have a difficult task but it is nevertheless necessary. That force should have been set up long ago. As a matter of fact I remember that our former leader (Mr. Drew) had more than once urged the government to use its influence in the United Nations to bring about the setting up of such an international police force. We have now come to regret that the government has so long delayed asking the United Nations to set up this force. We have the impression that the present situation could have been avoided in this way.

However, as I was saying a moment ago, even though this international police force is necessary, I still feel that the way the government has been acting is not calculated to make this force popular in this country. There have been fumbblings of all kinds and when action did come from the United Nations we have soon become aware of the activity of those people, either in the government or in the general staff—I really do not know who would like to see this country doing more than anybody else, in a military way, and take part in every conflict, whatever our responsibilities. There is no doubt that they are probably responsible for the great confusion there was about, for instance, the men of the Queen's Own Rifles who were flown from Calgary to Halifax, accompanied by an extraordinary amount of publicity. It could be seen on television, or read about in the papers where every soldier made a statement.

The aircraft carrier, H.M.C.S. *Magnificent*, was called back from Europe in a rush. It had no sooner reached Halifax that a team of workers got aboard to convert it for the transport of troops. In spite of all that panic and hesitation, the aircraft carrier, as well as the Queen's Own Rifles battalion, are still in Halifax and no one knows when they will leave to become part of the international force. The only one who did not lose his head in these circumstances was probably General Burns and, apparently, he was not consulted or was allegedly consulted after all sorts of decisions had been made, on which he threw cold water.

Then one day the people of Canada learn that president Nasser does not accept the presence of Canadian soldiers because they wear on their shoulders a flash likely to lead to confusion and to give to understand that we are a colony of England. The next day we are told that it is not president Nasser but none other than Mr. Hammarskjöld who had said that. Some other day, it might well be General Burns or even the government. This evening, Canadian newspapers report that a Canadian major back from Naples

made the statement that, failing Nasser's permission, the Queen's Own Rifles battalion could not proceed to Suez.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thing which cannot make the United Nations international police force as popular in Canada as might be desired. It is a fact that, out of a complement of 6,000 men immediately Canada promises to send 2,500. It is no longer an international police force if Canada takes over the command and provides contingents far greater than those of any other country. It is a little surprising to note that this international force, whose setting up has been approved by a huge majority of the member states of the United Nations, has troops from only six or seven countries.

I am of the opinion that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) should advise his delegation to insist that this international force be made international in fact and not only in name.

No doubt, we must support the United Nations. It is the sole guarantee the smaller nations have against the larger ones. It is also the best way for us to obtain peace and ensure it for generations to come.

We must give it means of imposing respect; that is why personally I am in favour of an international police force. Nevertheless, Canada's contribution should be well set in advance and should not be offered blindly. All the Canadians who will be members of that international force should be well armed, well equipped and, more particularly, well trained. We must be assured that if they have to stop Russian volunteers or others from crossing the borders, they will not be exposed to irreparable losses.

Therefore, the government has the responsibility of proceeding with due caution, that is, it should not send our troops over there blindly, but only after a thorough inquiry into all the ramifications of the situation. It should also make a thorough study of all the needs of our troops and of the part they will be called upon to play in that international force.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter about which I would like to say a few words and it is this: during this debate the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) spoke quite violently against the great western nations. He levelled severe criticisms at the leaders of some great European countries. He spoke about colonialism in no uncertain terms. I feel however that is the time for his government to pass from word to deed. I submit that the government, which claims that our country is independent, should avail itself of the opportunity offered by our contribution to the United Nations force to give Canada

The Address—Mr. Harkness

its own national flag. I make this request as was done by a member of the other house, who once sat next to me in this house and who pointed out yesterday the humiliating situation in which Canada finds itself. Like him, I feel that it is humiliating for Canada to have throughout the world troops which cannot be identified by their own flag.

Mr. Speaker, in 1948, the convention of the Conservative party adopted a resolution to that effect. That was eight years ago and we are still waiting for the government to implement the convention's recommendation. We hope that it will receive favourably hon. senator Fournier's suggestion and that it will avail itself of Canada's participation in the United Nations police force to accede to our request.

(Text):

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of confused thinking with regard to the Middle East situation and the world situation generally. I think it was very well illustrated by the speech we heard a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). In my opinion, at least, he paid no attention to the basic realities of the world situation, particularly those of the situation which has existed in the Middle East for the past several weeks and, as a matter of fact, for the past several months.

A great deal of the confused thinking which has arisen in regard to the present world crisis I think has sprung from a sense of shock. When the Israelis made their attack, followed by the intervention of Britain and France, I think most people in this country and in the United States and a large number in England experienced a considerable sense of shock. That shock was due to the fact, I think, that they did not know what the situation was, that they had not thought the thing through.

Most of us have had at the back of our minds for a number of years—ever since the last war—the thought that the United Nations was going to protect us from the outbreak of a third world war and was going to maintain peace. The fact that the United Nations apparently had been by-passed or disregarded by these countries consequently shocked people. It also shocked them to think that the United Nations had not been able to preserve peace; and particularly I think it shocked them when they realized that, as Mr. Eden said in effect, the reason the United Nations had been by-passed was that they were not capable of taking effective action in the Middle East under the circumstances which existed.

[Mr. Balcer.]

The feelings aroused as a result were feelings of considerable emotional strain. I do not wonder that feelings of that sort were aroused, and I do not wonder that they have caused a good deal of confused thinking. However, in my opinion they have served to obscure the basic realities of the world situation.

The fact which we must keep in mind in considering the present world crisis and the whole world situation is that which has been with us ever since shortly after the last war, namely that the world is divided into two great power blocs; Russia and her satellites on one side and the free world on the other side. A struggle has been going on between those two power blocs, with Russia and her supporters attempting by every means possible to increase her influence and power throughout the world with the ultimate object, of course, of destroying the western world and its free way of life. That is the basic fact and the one which, in my opinion, we must keep at the back of our minds in considering the present situation in the Middle East and the present world situation; but I am much afraid that it is a fact which has not been kept in mind.

Over the radio some time ago, when this thing was started, someone said that the NATO countries have too much to lose to quarrel seriously amongst themselves. I think that was a true statement. By quarrelling amongst themselves the NATO countries, the free nations of the western world, merely play into the hands of Russia. If the rift which has developed amongst the western nations continues and widens I think we can say goodbye to any hopes we may have of preventing a third world war and of our peoples in the west maintaining the way of life which we have known. In other words, we might as well throw in the sponge if we begin to fight amongst ourselves.

It seems to me that has been the great tragedy of this present situation, and that is the thing I have failed to understand with regard to the attitude of and the policy followed by the United States. It has seemed to me that the United States has completely lost sight of this basic fact. Their policy has been almost incredible in view of what the basic situation is and what they have known it is, and in view of the actions they took in Korea and elsewhere. Their policy certainly filled me with surprise and consternation.

Then when I found Canada tagging along in their wake and following essentially the same policy that the United States was following, I thought so disastrously, it was horrifying. I found it much more difficult to believe than what the United States was

The Address—Mr. Harkness

doing. In my opinion neither country seemed to appreciate the extreme foolishness of weakening the bond which held the NATO countries together and which held the whole western world together. I think what is needed more than anything else at the present time is that the United States government and the Canadian government wake up to that situation and take steps which are likely to correct it, rather than ones which are going to make it worse as I think has been done to a large extent so far.

One of the basic facts we also have to keep in mind is that the strength of NATO depends upon the strength of the individual members of that alliance. The two most important members, from the point of view of size and numbers of people, after the United States, are Great Britain and France. If the western world is to remain sufficiently strong to counter the Russian threat and to maintain the peace, to maintain the western way of life, those two countries have to remain strong economically. They cannot remain strong economically if they are cut off from one of the sinews of their economic strength, the oil supply in the Middle East.

That oil supply has been threatened for months. Britain, France and all western European countries are completely dependent on that oil supply. Now for three weeks it has been not completely cut off but partially cut off. What has been the effect? Already in most of these countries gasoline rationing is in operation, or plans have been made to put it into operation rapidly. A slow-down of the whole economy has started. It is essential, as I say, that the economic strength of Britain, France and all western Europe be maintained if the western world is to maintain its strength. In order to maintain that oil supply there must be a guaranteed free passage through the Suez canal. We find Britain and France in a position where they were threatened, both as to the source of the oil and as to the means of getting it through the Suez canal and into their countries. Under those circumstances, of course, they followed the first law of any nation, the law of self-preservation.

It seems to me that the United States has not, up to this time, realized that. Apparently the Canadian government has not realized it. The fact that that is the situation, and a considerable number of people, newspaper com-

mentators on foreign affairs in the United States, have recognized it, as is apparent by the articles that have appeared in newspapers and magazines in the United States for some time past. The last article I read which demonstrated that fact was in yesterday morning's *Gazette* by the Alsop brothers. I will quote only a few short paragraphs from it. It starts this way:

The central point that has virtually escaped notice in the present crisis is that the several strains already felt by the western alliance are downright trifling, are really nothing, compared to the strains that lie ahead.

That is what I particularly fear in the present situation. There have been considerable strains. The Secretary of State for External Affairs said that the strains were such that the commonwealth was in danger of falling apart at one time not so many days ago. These commentators, the Alsop brothers, go on in this article to document the strains that have been felt so far and say that they are nothing compared to the strains which are in sight as a result of the whole Middle Eastern situation if things are allowed to continue more or less drifting along. A little farther down in the article they say:

But then American diplomacy and Soviet threats combined to transform Nasser's great military defeat into a great political victory.

The effect in Transjordan was instantaneous and electrical.

The writers continue by citing the effect in the rest of the Middle East, and how that reaction will destroy the source of oil and the economic strength of Great Britain in western Europe. Then they go on to point this out:

Then too, if all Britain's Middle Eastern oil sources are lost, it will cost Britain just about \$1 billion a year. The shaky British balance of payment cannot conceivably stand this further drain. If the oil goes, Britain will go bankrupt. After declaring bankruptcy, Britain will have to abandon her NATO and other strategic commitments and will go out of business as a serious world power. But how is American policy going to be adjusted to cover the loss of western strength caused by British bankruptcy?

I would urge this government, the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs to keep these basic facts in mind and to use all the influence they have with the United States government to modify their present policy and work out a settlement which will make it possible to preserve NATO strength and the strength of western Europe. Otherwise I see nothing but disaster ahead.

The Address—Mr. Harkness

It is of no use for people to say, as many have said, that Britain should have taken this whole matter to the United Nations. She took it to the United Nations innumerable times. I saw in a newspaper yesterday, whether or not it is true I do not know, that this Middle Eastern question had been raised 200 times in the last five or six months. In any event, whether or not that is true, it has certainly been raised time after time and nothing was done about it. The situation was deteriorating all the time. Now it is not good enough for the majority of the nations, and particularly it is not good enough for a country which by its strength and size must be the leader of the free western world, the United States, to say that the strict letter of the United Nations charter has been broken and therefore we must condemn this action; we must take punitive measures, because that is what they amount to.

When you are fighting a battle of any kind—and there is no doubt there is a battle going on between the western powers and Russia and her allies—the main thing is to win the battle. You may lose a hill here or a trench there, but you should not focus your attention on one small phase of the matter but should keep the over-all picture in mind and try to arrange things so your basic strength is conserved. So far as I can see this has not been done.

I have some hope that the action which was taken by the British and French in the Middle East will be the means of revivifying and putting some teeth into the United Nations. The provision of a police force is, I think, all to the good. I hope the police force will be successful. God knows, up to the present time the United Nations has had no effective means of enforcing any decision it may have made, except for that period during the Korean war. If a general war in the Middle East is to be prevented, so far as I can see there has to be a police force which is effective, and certainly that is not the kind of police force which is envisaged at the present time.

The headline in tonight's newspaper reads, "Syrian Crisis Mounts". This whole area is in an extremely explosive state, and unless decisive action is taken, or there are threats of action, particularly by the United States, the whole situation is going to blow up. When that happens, of course, anything might happen. A third world war might be upon us before we know it. Therefore I think this is not the time to be splitting hairs over

[Mr. Harkness.]

whether a certain regulation or the general covenant of the United Nations was broken or was not broken. The thing to do is to try and take some action to prevent a third world war developing, and I think such a war is threatening. In other words, what the United Nations must do, I think what the NATO countries as a whole must do—and I would hope that the NATO countries and the countries of the Baghdad pact would all act together in this thing—is to take some steps for a permanent settlement in the Middle East.

So far nothing has been done about a permanent settlement in the Middle East. The festering sore which has existed there for the last seven or eight years has not been touched. As far as the United Nations is concerned there have been no proposals there to try to make a permanent settlement, to get any permanent agreement between the Arab nations on the one side and Israel on the other as to what the borders will be, to get any recognition of those borders or any definite solution to the numerous problems which exist there. The police force will not do it, no matter how strong the police force may be; but the police force, if it is strong enough, might prevent any further war developing, if it is got in there rapidly.

But the only way in which you will get a sufficient police force in there now is to have it supplied by the larger nations which have forces in being and are willing to put them in. I do not think you can get anything like sufficient numbers of troops in there, sufficiently well organized, on short notice by the method which is being followed of getting 50 troops from Colombia, 150 from Norway, and so on. I am not condemning that. It is all very well, but it is not sufficient for the purpose of a police force only as between the Israeli and Egyptian powers alone, let alone to look after the whole situation in the Middle East.

This extremely ominous Russian build-up of arms in Syria and in other parts of the Middle East is such as to make it quite clear that Russia and her satellites—and remember, they are members of the United Nations and therefore you cannot expect the United Nations by anything like any sort of unanimous or semi-unanimous vote to take any real measure to stop this sort of thing—are building up arms to such serious proportions that it is apparent to almost everyone that Russia is going to cause a general blow-up there if she can possibly do so. The whole situation there is extremely unstable, as was stated in this article. The action which has been taken so far by the United Nations has really served to save Nasser from military defeat

The Address—Mr. Harkness

and to re-establish him in a strong position in Egypt and amongst the Arab countries generally, and thus it has served to encourage the Arab countries in their belligerence. I think it has also served to encourage Russia to shoot in more and more arms with good hopes of stirring up more and more trouble in that area.

As far as the United Nations police force which has already been sent into Egypt is concerned, the composition and numbers of that force we have not had. The Minister of National Defence told us that Canada had allocated something like 2,400 soldiers and airmen. As far as the force is concerned, of that number only something like 300 army personnel and about 500 or 600 air force personnel have gone over. In other words the bulk of our commitment has not gone into Egypt at all, and quite a few of the army personnel have not gone to Egypt either. They have remained right in Naples. I see again a headline in tonight's paper—in spite of what the Secretary of State for External Affairs said about not allowing Nasser to dictate who went into Egypt, how long they stayed or when they came out—something along that line. This is one, but there have been two or three others along the same line. The one tonight reads:

Q.O.R. need Nasser O.K. before sailing
Official of UN does not expect action unless he changes mind.

This article is dated Naples, Italy, November 28, and reads in part as follows:

A United Nations official said today that Canada's Queen's Own Rifles are not likely to sail for the Middle East unless President Nasser of Egypt changes his mind.

This is believed to be the first time that a United Nations official has admitted that the Canadian battalion is being kept out of Egypt on Nasser's say-so.

Mr. Pearson: There is no senior United Nations official at Naples.

Mr. Rowe: Is there a junior one there?

Mr. Harkness: All I can do is to read the article which is written by Dave McIntosh,

a Canadian reporter, who is at Naples and who apparently received this information. The article goes on to tell us about various statements by a Canadian officer, as follows:

Meanwhile, the first Canadian officer to return to Naples—

And so forth. I presume he is the man of whom they are speaking. In any event, this is not the only statement of this sort which has appeared in the newspapers in the last two or three days. I have another one from a paper of a few days earlier, which reads along the same line. This is from the *Ottawa Citizen* for Tuesday, November 27. The article is dated from Naples and reads in part as follows:

Canadian army officers in Italy say they doubt that the Queen's Own Rifles will ever be sent to the Middle East.

The officers say there have been suggestions the battalion should remove its shoulder patches to satisfy the Egyptians, but add that the morale of Canadian soldiers has already suffered enough. The only Canadian soldiers here not sent on to Egypt are members of the Queen's Own.

In spite of all these denials we have had from the Prime Minister and from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I do not think there is any doubt that in effect Colonel Nasser has been dictating who is to make up the police force, when they come in, where they go, and so on. A police force of that kind is not going to be effective; it is not going to be able to do the job.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

On motion of Mr. Harkness the debate was adjourned.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Green: What is the business for tomorrow?

Mr. Harris: I suppose I should give the same answer I gave last night, Mr. Speaker, that we always have hopes that tomorrow we will get into supply.

At ten o'clock the house adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 29, 1956

The house met at eleven o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT OF PRESENT SESSION
TO JANUARY 8

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister) moved:

That when this house adjourns after returning from attending on the giving of royal assent to the proposed appropriation bill, it shall stand adjourned until Tuesday, January 8, 1957, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, after consultation with Her Majesty's government, that the public interest requires that the house should meet at an earlier time during the adjournment, Mr. Speaker may give notice that he is so satisfied, and thereupon the house shall meet at the time stated in such notice, and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion?

Mr. M. J. Coldwell (Rosetown-Biggar): Before the motion is put, hon. members will recollect that I suggested, when we entered upon the present debate, we should proceed with the debate as quickly as possible and get that part of the business done. I said also that if hon. members had any further business that they wished to bring before the house an opportunity should be given for them to do so. In my opinion there are pressing matters which hon. members might like to bring before the house. I am not going to deal with them at length, but I am going to say that I have come back from western Canada, after having visited my supporters in my own constituency, and I found a very serious situation on the prairies, both financially, as was mentioned in the house, and in the inability to deliver wheat in order to get the necessary funds.

I also found there was trouble with some farmers who had sent samples of barley, for example, which they hoped to have graded and expected to have graded as malting barley. When they sent a carload in after having been told from samples forwarded that it was malting barley they found it was not, and they lost their wheat quota rights, and that has tended to increase the difficulties in my constituency.

I do not want to interfere with the current debate, but I also wish to say there are certain matters in the mining and other areas

that should receive some consideration in this house before we adjourn. I want to see this business that we are engaged in concluded but I think that I must, on behalf of those associated with me at least, oppose the adjournment of the house when this debate is finished so that any members who have business to bring before the house may do so as quickly as possible, not spending any more time than is necessary; but these matters should receive the consideration of the house before we adjourn and consequently I feel constrained to oppose the motion at this time.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I am sorry that the hon. gentleman feels he should oppose the motion. This session was called for one purpose and one purpose only and the proposal is the kind of proposal that was made during the years when there was hot war going on, but it is made because the situation is one about which there is great anxiety, and one about which no certainty as to what the future events may be is possible at this time.

I think it would be the desire of the majority of the house, when it has dealt with this business, to adjourn and then have the regular session started as early in the new year as possible when there will be ample opportunity for different matters of interest to be brought to the attention of the house. Even if we sat constantly I am sure that there are hon. members who would feel at all times that there were things of interest that they could talk about, but I do not think at this time it would be the desire of the house to make this into anything but an urgent special session for the purpose of dealing with those matters that were indicated in the speech from the throne.

I am sorry that I cannot acquiesce in the suggestion of the hon. member that the motion be not proceeded with. It is our feeling that it would be the desire of a majority of the members of the house to dispose of this business and then wait until the next regular session, which I stated yesterday it was our intention to have open immediately this one was prorogued, if this motion is adopted. There would then be a speech from the throne in the ordinary way dealing with everything that the government felt it was necessary to deal with at an ordinary annual session of the Canadian parliament.

Business of the House

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Acting Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I find myself in agreement with the Prime Minister. This session was called for a specific purpose, and it seems to me it would be unfortunate if it were allowed at this stage to be interrupted. In any event, Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the motion to go into supply would be the more appropriate place for a departure from the plans the Prime Minister has announced. I think even that would be unfortunate. There are problems and there will be problems from time to time such as the serious problem which exists in western Canada, as the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggar (Mr. Coldwell) pointed out. Notwithstanding that, I think we are here for a specific purpose and in all fairness and from a national point of view I think it is still more critical than the somewhat more local problem which, as the Prime Minister (Mr. St. Laurent) said, could be dealt with at a later stage.

Mr. McIvor: Good boy.

Mr. Coldwell: Might I suggest to the hon. gentleman that I did not suggest an interruption of this debate, but when this debate is concluded an opportunity should be presented to deal with these matters.

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): May I ask the Minister of Finance if we are not right in assuming it will require a motion to go into supply before the appropriation can be dealt with? Would that not be the case?

Hon. W. E. Harris (Minister of Finance): No, I do not think so. We have now reached that period in the week when we can go into supply without question put.

Mr. Fulton: But you have not called any department yet and they can only be called subject to unanimous consent.

Mr. Harris: No, this is an estimate supplementary to this year's estimates that have been already tabled.

Mr. Fulton: But this is a new session.

Mr. Harris: Yes, but this is an estimate supplementary to the 1956-57 estimates, and I believe we can go into supply without question put.

The house divided on the motion (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson	Batten
Applewhaite	Bell
Arsenault	Benidickson
Ashbourne	Bennett
Balcom	Blair

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

Blanchette	Langlois (Gaspe)
Boisvert	Lapointe
Boivin	Lavigne
Bonnier	Leduc (Gatineau)
Bourget	Leduc (Jacques Cartier-Lasalle)
Breton	Lefrançois
Brisson	Lennard
Brooks	Lesage
Brown (Brantford)	Lusby
Brown (Essex West)	Macdonnell
Bruneau	MacEachen
Buchanan	MacKenzie
Byrne	MacLean
Cameron (High Park)	McBain
Campney	McCann
Cannon	McCubbin
Cardiff	McDonald
Caron	McGregor
Carter	McIlraith
Casselman	McIvor
Cauchon	McMillan
Cavers	Maltais
Charlton	Mang
Clark	Masse
Cloutier	Matheson
Crestohl	Menard
Dechene	Meunier
Deschatelets	Michaud
Deslieries	Michener
Diefenbaker	Mitchell (Sudbury)
Dinsdale	Monette
Dupuis	Monteith
Enfield	Montgomery
Eudes	Murphy (Lambton West)
Eyre	Murphy (Westmorland)
Ferguson	Nickle
Follwell	Nowlan
Fontaine	Pallett
Forgie	Pearkes
Fraser (Peterborough)	Pearson
Fraser (St. John's East)	Philpott
Fulton	Pommer
Gagnon	Poulin
Gardiner	Power (Quebec South)
Garson	Proudfoot
Gauthier (Lake St. John)	Prudham
Gauthier (Nickel Belt)	Purdy
Gauthier (Portneuf)	Ratelle
Gingras	Reinke
Gingues	Richard (St. Maurice-Lafèche)
Girard	Richardson
Goode	Roberge
Gour (Russell)	Robertson
Green	Robichaud
Gregg	Robinson (Bruce)
Habel	Robinson (Simcoe East)
Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace)	Rouleau
Hanna	Rowe
Hardie	St. Laurent (Quebec East)
Harkness	Schneider
Harris	Shiple, Mrs.
Healy	Simmons
Hees	Sinclair
Hellyer	Small
Henderson	Smith (York North)
Henry	Stanton
Hosking	Starr
Houck	Stick
Howe (Port Arthur)	Stuart (Charlotte)
Huffman	Thibault
James	Tucker
Jutras	Tustin
Kickham	Van Horne
Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough)	Viau
Kirk (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare)	Villeneuve
LaCroix	Weaver
Laffamme	Weir
Lafontaine	Weselak

Inquiries of the Ministry

White (Hastings-Frontenac)
White (Middlesex East)

White (Waterloo South)
Winters—170.

NAYS

Messrs:

Argue
Barnett
Blackmore
Bryce
Bryson
Campbell
Castleden
Coldwell
Ellis
Gillis
Hahn
Hansell
Holowach
Johnson (Kindersley)
Jones
Knight
Knowles
Leboe

Low
McCullough (Moose Mountain)
McLeod
Nicholson
Patterson
Quelch
Regier
Shaw
Smith (Battle River-Camrose)
Stewart (Winnipeg North)
Thomas
Winch
Wylie
Yuill—32.

FRUIT

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REQUEST FOR ROYAL COMMISSION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): I have received a telegram asking me to ascertain if the Minister of Agriculture can give us a report as to the position of this government on the request of the British Columbia fruit industry for a joint dominion-provincial royal commission. I might say the telegram indicates that there is some reluctance on the part of this government to grant such a commission. I hope the minister will be able to correct that understanding and that the request will be granted.

Right Hon. J. G. Gardiner (Minister of Agriculture): I understand that the minister of agriculture for British Columbia is on his way to Ottawa to discuss the question. I would hesitate to make an answer to the question until he has been here. Up to the moment we have suggested that we think, if a royal commission is to be appointed, it should be appointed by the provincial government.

Mr. Fulton: As a supplementary question, may I ask whether that means the minister's present inclination is that there should not be federal participation or merely that the request should come from the provincial government?

Mr. Gardiner: The position we have taken up to the present is that if a royal commission is going to be appointed to examine into this industry in British Columbia it should be appointed by the provincial government, but we have undertaken to place all of our experts and our information at their disposal if they undertake to do so.

Mr. Nowlan: If the federal government should decide to co-operate in a royal commission, would it be made applicable to the apple industry of Canada, as a whole, and not just to British Columbia?

Mr. Gardiner: This is a question which, of course, enters into consideration of the other question, but there would be some difficulty in having one operate that way.

Mr. Jones: Do I understand that the minister has not definitely turned down the request of the B.C. tree fruit growers? I understood you had turned them down, but now I understand you are going to consider the matter when the application is formally made.

Mr. Gardiner: We had definitely turned down the request that a royal commission be appointed by the federal government, and suggested if there was going to be one it should be appointed by the province. Now, the suggestion, which I understand the minister is coming here to discuss, is that we should appoint a commission jointly. We have not given final consideration to that until we hear what the minister has to say.

PACIFIC GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY

REPORT OF APPROVAL OF GRANT BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

On the orders of the day:

Mr. T. H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, based on a Vancouver *Province* dispatch that Premier Bennett had gleefully announced that the federal cabinet had approved a \$10,400,000 grant to the Pacific Great Eastern Railway in British Columbia. My question is, when did the cabinet approve this grant?

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): I have not seen that dispatch. There must be some misunderstanding about it because there has been no approval of any grants. The Minister of Trade and Commerce and I had an interview with Mr. Bennett on the 19th. We discussed the situation in British Columbia and we were delighted to hear the premier say that there was so much development going on there. He mentioned several projects that he thought should have federal assistance or federal consideration, and with respect to the Pacific Great Eastern Railway he was to see the Department of Transport and submit the request he was going to make to that department. I asked him to indicate from point to point where he wanted to ask for a subsidy,

Inquiries of the Ministry

but there was no total figure arrived at. I understand that he did afterwards discuss the matter with the minister and the officials of the Department of Transport, but there is no recommendation as yet before the council.

COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT**SUGAR—INQUIRY AS TO PRICE INCREASES AND ALLEGED MONOPOLY**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice if he is aware that since the outbreak of the situation in the Suez a number of sugar companies in Canada have raised their prices on sugar six or seven times, amounting to around 75 cents per hundred pounds, and that from their price lists, a number of which I have in my hand, there is a strong suspicion that they are acting as a combine? Will the minister have this situation looked into? Would he like to have these price lists put into the hands of Mr. MacDonald?

Hon. Stuart S. Garson (Minister of Justice): As a matter of routine, Mr. Speaker, the officers of the department keep movements of prices of the kind to which my hon. friend refers under observation. While I have not personally checked in that connection, I would be surprised if they had not already taken cognizance of the ones to which he refers. I have no objection to receiving the documents he has and turning them over to Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. Knowles: I shall send them over.

UNITED NATIONS**SYRIA AND JORDAN—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASE IN EMERGENCY POLICE FORCE**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and ask him whether or not, in view of the present situation in Syria and Jordan, consideration has been given by the secretary general to an increase in the numbers of the emergency police force, and what requests, if any, have been received as to the allocation of members for that additional force?

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): In reply to the first part of his question, Mr. Speaker—my hon. friend asked this question the other day—the information received would not indicate that there is any change in the situation on the Syrian-Jordan border, certainly no deterioration, though it remains serious.

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

So far as the second part of this question is concerned, the United Nations force is being steadily built up. It has now reached a figure of something over 4,000 and, as I said the other day, 23 countries have offered contributions to it. The extension of the functions of that force to cover Jordan and Syrian borders will require, not a decision from the secretary general but a decision from the assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. Howard C. Green (Vancouver-Quadra): May I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Prince Albert? Does the Canadian government believe that the United Nations emergency force should be extended because of the situation existing on the borders of Syria, Jordan and Israel, or does it not? Further, does the Canadian government believe that power should be given by the United Nations for such a force to intervene in that area?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Speaker, that is, of course, a very good question. The force was set up to do a specific job, a very important and difficult one. The extension of the functions of the force to cover other areas raises also difficult and complicated questions, and might at this time interfere with the original functions that have been agreed on.

I would also point out there are United Nations truce observers on the border of Syria and Jordan at the present time, and when a statement was made at United Nations, I think it was last week, to the effect that there had been certain incidents on the Syrian border brought about by Israeli troops it was possible for the United Nations observer to report on the inaccuracy of this statement at once. Therefore, the borders have, at least, the advantage of observation by the United Nations. The extension of the function of this police force to cover borders where there has been up to the present time no major incident leading to war is an important matter and is now under consideration, but I cannot say anything more about it than that at the present moment.

[Later:]

REPORTED VETO BY EGYPT OF ENTRY OF FURTHER CANADIAN FORCES

On the orders of the day:

Mr. J. C. Van Horne (Restigouche-Madawaska): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is there anything to the rumour that Colonel Nasser has also objected to the Canadian government sending Royal typewriters to Egypt?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): This is too serious a matter for that kind of frivolous question.

While I am on my feet I might deal with a related and more serious question that was mentioned last night in the debate, that according to United Nations officials at Naples—this is a press dispatch—Colonel Nasser had exercised a veto on the further entry into Egypt of Canadian forces. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) brought this up. I have been in touch with the secretary general's office about it. There are only two United Nations officials at Naples, both junior officials, one in the administrative branch and the other in the public relations branch. Neither official has any authority whatever to make any such statement, if he did make it, and the statement would be inaccurate if it were made.

NATIONAL DEFENCE**SUEZ—INQUIRY AS TO DISABILITY PROTECTION AND SERVICE PENSIONS**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. G. H. Castleden (Yorkton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. What protection is provided for Canadian service personnel involved in the present police action under the United Nations in the Suez area?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of what the hon. gentleman has in mind when he talks of protection.

Mr. Castleden: Disabilities and pensions.

Mr. Campney: These are regular troops on active service, and they will get an overseas allowance, but otherwise they will remain as long as they are merely a police force certainly in the same condition as they would be in NATO countries or at home.

CALGARY—STATEMENT ON FIRE IN MILITARY BUILDINGS

On the orders of the day:

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the question raised yesterday by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Fraser). The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) also spoke to me in the same connection in regard to the fire which took place at Camp Sarcee in Calgary on Tuesday afternoon. A board of inquiry is investigating there at the moment, but I should like to give the house such facts as have been so far ascertained.

The fire was caused by the explosion of an accumulation of gas from a leaking gas main.

I am informed that this natural gas main had only recently been installed by the local gas company and was actually under test by them at the time.

Apparently, the gas escaping from the main accumulated for some time in the main part of the building, which was a tank hangar, but the explosion itself was touched off in the boiler room. There was no access between the two buildings, but one was adjacent to the other. A violent explosion occurred in the boiler room, which is a concrete building, and it demolished that building and allowed the gas to fill the tank hangar, which burst into a mass of flames. The building was destroyed. It was valued at approximately \$155,000. At the time of the fire there were 14 tanks in the hangar and six others outside. A soldier managed to move one tank from inside the building and the six outside were also removed to a safe area. However, the 13 remaining tanks in the hangar, together with other items of tools and equipment, were damaged though the extent of the damage will not be known until it is fully assessed. One civilian fireman stoker suffered burns, but there were no casualties.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): May I ask the Minister of Finance a question? Is the government suing the gas company for damages?

Mr. Campney: The hon. member will have to wait and see when the facts have been established.

LABOUR CONDITIONS**CAMPS SHILO AND RIVERS—INAUGURATION OF FIVE-DAY 40-HOUR WEEK**

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister indicate when the five-day 40-hour week will be extended to civilian cleaners and helpers at camps Shilo and Rivers?

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): I will have to look into the question. I am not aware just what the conditions are at these two camps. I know we are progressively bringing in the five-day week, but I will look into it.

Mr. Dinsdale: May I ask the minister a supplementary question? Is he aware that the present policy operating in connection with cleaners and helpers is contrary to the principle of equal pay for equal work for classified civil servants, as laid down by government policy?

Mr. Campney: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

*Inquiries of the Ministry***CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY**INQUIRY AS TO GRANTING RUNNING RIGHTS
OVER THE HUDSON BAY RAILWAY

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Bryson (Humboldt-Melfort): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the parliamentary assistant to the Minister of Transport in the absence of the minister. Is it the intention of the government to introduce a measure at the next session of parliament that will give the C.P.R. running rights over the Hudson Bay Railway, thereby facilitating the movement of grain from C.P.R. points?

Mr. L. Langlois (Parliamentary Assistant to the Minister of Transport): May I take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker?

REFERENCE TO ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION
AGAINST PENSIONERS

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Has the minister any report to make on the matter having to do with certain retired employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway which was raised in this house on June 15 by the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Philpott) and supported by several other members in various parties? The minister will recall that he pledged on that occasion he would do anything he could to achieve the objectives of those of us who spoke on the matter. Has he any report to make at this time?

Hon. Milton F. Gregg (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I recall the discussion concerning the personnel my hon. friend refers to but I have no further report than that which I made last session.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask if the minister is still working on the matter?

Mr. Gregg: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

TRANSPORT

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF CONTROLLER

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Johnson (Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. In his absence, perhaps the Minister of Trade and Commerce is able to supply the information. In view of the resignation of the transport controller, to be effective at the close of navigation, which will be in a very few days, can the minister announce who his successor will be or, if not, when he will be appointed?

[Mr. Campney.]

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to make that announcement but I will call the attention of the Minister of Transport to the question.

GRAINREQUEST FOR REDUCTION OF INTEREST RATE ON
MONEY BORROWED

On the orders of the day:

Mr. H. A. Bryson (Humboldt-Melfort): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Finance whether he is in a position to answer the question I asked yesterday?

PIPE LINESTRANS-CANADA PIPE LINES—INQUIRY AS TO
DELAY IN CONSTRUCTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. W. M. Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace): Can the Minister of Trade and Commerce inform the house whether the conversion of steel plate into the construction of oil tankers will reduce the supply available for pipe, and thus further delay the construction of the trans-Canada pipe line?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I cannot say what the pipe situation will be over the next two years, which is the time required to complete the trans-Canada pipe line. It is my understanding that the pipe for next year's work is definitely under contract and I look for no early interruption in the supply.

TRANS-MOUNTAIN LINE—REQUEST FOR STATE-
MENT ON EXPLOSION AT JASPER PUMP
STATION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Carl O. Nickle (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. In view of the international importance of the movement of oil from North American fields to tide water at the present time, can he comment on the explosion and fire yesterday at the Jasper pump station of the Trans-Mountain pipe line in Alberta? Specifically, to what extent has this explosion curtailed the flow of oil to the Pacific coast through this line in Alberta? How long will such curtailment apply, and how soon will permanent pumping stations with greater capacity be completed at the location of this explosion?

Right Hon. C. D. Howe (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the government has no information on the subject. Personally, I had not heard that the explosion had taken

The Address—Mr. Harkness

place. Trans-Mountain is a privately-owned pipe line. However, I will try to obtain such information as the government has and answer the question tomorrow.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The house resumed, from Wednesday, November 28, consideration of the motion of Mr. Legare for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Rowe.

Mr. D. S. Harkness (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I had almost completed my remarks last night but was in the midst of pointing out that we in this house during this debate have really had no information in regard to the composition, the total numbers or the functions of this United Nations police force which is a matter on which I think the entire Canadian public would like to have more information. It is a matter concerning which there is a good deal of confusion and I would hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of National Defence might be able to give us the latest information concerning the points and tell us exactly what the situation is.

As far as one is able to make out from various newspaper accounts, the functions of this United Nations force which the minister a moment ago said were important functions are to police the canal zone and to police a strip of border territory between Israel and Egypt, a strip along the Israeli-Egyptian border.

I notice in today's paper a reported statement by Mr. Hammarskjöld which says:

Hammarskjöld said the "provisional" target for size of the force is two combat brigades totalling some 6,000 men.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, if that is the total size of the force envisaged it would appear to be very inadequate to carry out these two functions of policing the canal zone and policing the border strip between Israel and Egypt.

Also, as far as I can see, the composition of this force is almost entirely an infantry force. I think perhaps infantry might be able to do the policing in the Suez canal zone fairly readily but I would submit that as far as maintaining the border strip through that desert country is concerned infantry would be very poorly adapted for that purpose. I would hope that some other sort of force would be provided.

The ideal force, I believe, would be a reconnaissance regiment. Canada, of course, does not have a reconnaissance regiment so

cannot help out from that point of view, but if there is no reconnaissance regiment available then I should think the need might be met by providing a jeep force.

The Queen's Own Rifles is an extremely good regiment. I went to say goodbye to them before they left Calgary. They departed full of high spirits and with extremely good morale. I have seen them on parade on several occasions and they are an excellent unit from every point of view. I think it is extremely unfortunate that they have been sitting in Halifax for the past three weeks kicking their heels and not knowing what is the definite situation—

An hon. Member: They are better off there than in Calgary.

Mr. Harkness:—which is not going to help the morale of the army and the other defence force generally.

In any event a regiment of that sort could be supplied with jeeps somewhat along the lines of those which were used by the jeep forces of the special air service force and the special boat service force during the last war. They were provided with jeeps which were mounted with twin heavy machine guns. They carried four men each and made deep penetrations behind the enemy lines. As a result of this twin machine gun armament they had an extraordinarily heavy fire power and were really in a position to take on anything except armour. They did extremely good work and I believe a force of that sort could be quite readily provided. There are plenty of jeeps and there are plenty of machine guns, and in lieu of a "Recce" regiment, in other words, a light armoured force, I think this government should do everything possible to ensure that the border force between Israel and Egypt is supplied with jeeps of this nature so that they are mobile and can do the job properly.

I do not think anything except a mobile force which is able to travel more or less anywhere—and this is one of the great advantages of jeeps, they can get through almost any type of country—is capable of doing the job properly. Therefore, I put this thought out for the consideration of the government and would hope something along that line might be done.

Mr. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, having regard to the world situation today and the dangerous implications that become more and more apparent in the Middle East and the actions being taken by the U.S.S.R. in various parts of Europe, no debate I have participated in since coming to this house has been, in my opinion, fraught with greater consequences

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

than the one now before this house. While there are various matters, economic and otherwise, in this country that require attention I felt a few moments ago during the vote, and I feel now, that our devotion at this time should be to the spiritual things and to the maintenance of freedom. Economic matters will receive their proper attention when the regular session begins in January.

Having said that, I must point out that I view the world situation as a perilous one: too perilous to be treated in a flamboyant or reckless manner, too dangerous to permit of our placing ourselves in the position of being judges of the action taken by Britain, France and Israel.

An hon. Member: And Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We are all in the position of not being able to judge without being judged ourselves. In less than a month—yes, it is within the month—the world has witnessed days of magnificent nobility in Hungary, and treachery in Egypt. There have been vast opportunities for the forces of freedom to be united rather than disunited. Someone has said that within those days relations in the world have shifted and sagged among the free nations, and have stretched and strained. One of the results of the events of the last four weeks has been a division and disarrangement of the old alliance between Britain and the commonwealth, France and the United States, which holds a fearful prospect unless mutual confidence and infinite compassion once more restore that trust and that common dedication to freedom which in the last four weeks has been so seriously strained.

We have seen nobility in Poland and Hungary. The chromium surface of communism has been punctured. We know now that the protestations of Khrushchev and Bulganin were designed merely to achieve an interim purpose. Once more it appears that Stalinism is in the saddle and that the frightful fear of an international war has been rendered greater than any of us could have anticipated a few months ago.

The U.S.S.R. has engaged in a massive conspiracy with Nasser to take over the Middle East. Judge not that ye be not judged is as necessary today in our thinking as it was when those words were spoken. There was no international force. Last evening the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to a speech which I made in this house in 1945 in which I suggested, as did all those who were in any way interested in the establishment of the rule of law, the setting up of an international

force, designed not for a given purpose in one area of the world but one that would in fact be available to prevent aggression and wrongdoing in any part of the world.

The dreams of 1945 have been dissipated in the light of the experience of eleven years. Blame it on the veto if you will, but mankind with all its experience of the frightful carnage in world war II did not learn its lesson. An international force powerful enough to prevent aggression anywhere in the world became a delusion and hopeless dream. As I listened to my hon. friend the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) speaking the other day I thought of the opening day in San Francisco in 1945 when we met in that hall which had been dedicated to the memory of those who had died in the first great war. Over the doorway of that hall was this superscription: This monument eloquent of hopes realized and dreams come true.

Those dreams have not come true. The dreams of an international force had not come true when the conspiracy took place in the Middle East. Let no one say that the U.S.S.R. was not preparing with Nasser to undermine and to destroy every vestige of British and French power in Africa as well as in the Middle East. Over in the Sinai peninsula were found concrete runways to handle jet planes, pillboxes, vast underground garages for tanks and trucks, and fuel dumps. They were not constructed by the Egyptians.

As I said a moment ago, one of the most serious things that we face is the division between us of the free world. Interestingly enough, the one country which comes out of this with new prestige is the U.S.S.R. When Bulganin threatened to use missiles in massive retaliation it was only a matter of a day or two before the United Nations acted and brought about this temporary force. We will never learn. We did not believe Hitler when he wrote "Mein Kampf". Churchill did, and he stood alone in the British House of Commons. He warned the people that Hitler meant what he said.

How many in this house read "The Philosophy of the Revolution" by Colonel Nasser? He sets forth in line after line and page after page his purpose and philosophy and what he intends to do. It is a small book. It will not take you very long to read it. It starts with the principle in his mind created by his fearful hatred of things British. He tells us that as he watched British planes flying overhead his prayer always was, "O Almighty God, may disaster overtake the English." He starts out that way, and then he sets out in this book his plan. Read it and understand what is happening today in the Middle East. He says

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

that the source of strength of Egypt in the Middle East is her geographical and strategic position which embraces the crossroads of the world, the thoroughfare of traders and the passageway of armies. He says:

There remains the third source—oil—a sinew of material civilization without which all its machines would cease to function. The great factories producing every kind of goods; all the instruments of land, sea and air communications; all the weapons of war, from the mechanical bird above the clouds to the submarine beneath the waves—without oil, all would turn back to naked metal, covered with rust, incapable of motion or use.

He says in effect that his main ambition is to take over the Middle East and then, having done that, to take over Africa, to mobilize the people of the Moslem world. There are 80 million in Indonesia; 50 million in China; millions in Malaya, Siam and Burma; 100 million in Pakistan; more than 100 million in the Middle East and 40 million in the Soviet union. There is the blueprint.

Never has anyone written in so few words so terrible a prospect for mankind. I speak only from my own interpretation of it. When I read of Khrushchev saying "We will bury you," as he speaks of the free nations, when I hear Bulganin threatening missile warfare and the sending of so-called volunteers from Russia and China, I ask myself this. What must we do? What course shall we follow? Whatever action we take, upon that we will be judged. We cannot secure an international force such as was dreamed of at San Francisco. Within this time and generation, as I see it, we will have to be restricted to international forces, temporary in their character, meeting local situations as they arise.

What would the U.S.S.R. have done with the instruments that it made available to Egypt if it had waited until the United Nations would act? As reported in the *New York Times*, here are some of the weapons that have been delivered to Egypt recently: At least 50 Il'yushin bombers, 100 MIG fighters, 300 medium and heavy tanks, a substantial number of T-34's, the largest tanks there are, between 400 and 500 field anti-tank and anti-aircraft guns, several rocket launchers, mines, radar and wireless telegraphic equipment, two destroyers, four minesweepers, 15 to 20 motor torpedo boats.

Where do I stand, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this force? One gives the deepest thought to these things, and I stand where I stood on the 31st of January in this house. At that time there was an interruption on the part of the Minister of National Health and Welfare when objection was being raised to the fatuous policy on the part of the government of supplying Egypt with one type of armament and Israel with another. What I said was as a result of having seen these

tenuous lines that separate the Arab lands from Israel. As far as I could see, the only immediate hope was to set up an international force to protect and assure the boundaries and at that time, as found at page 723, I said:

I suggest to my hon. friend who interrupted that one of the things he can do, with his influence in the United Nations, is to see to it that something in the nature of an international force is established to the end that this dangerous situation shall be obliterated. If it is not, and war breaks out there, we shall have war all over the world . . .

I am glad that that part of my statement was not correct, for in every generation war has seen a march of conquerors. It is almost like a beaten road to war. The Secretary of State for External Affairs answered me the next day, as found at page 777 of *Hansard*, and he indicated that such a force would not be effective because there was no permanent boundary line. I say to my hon. friend today that if what was done on November 2 had been brought before the United Nations earlier the tragic beginnings of this situation as Israel marched might have been averted. It is one of the ifs of history, but I say that I made that suggestion in the attitude I have always tried to assume in parliament. As a member of the opposition I have my own responsibilities to present those things which I believe will be of some benefit. The view was held in Jordan, the view was held in Israel that such a force would be effective.

What has Canada done since then? Well, I read the records of the United Nations where Canada is forever speaking on resolutions but lacking resolution and displaying no definiteness. I say to my hon. friend that last Saturday was an example when the vote took place in the United Nations, a repetitious vote, on the motion to order Britain and France out of the Middle East. I read with pride in the press that my hon. friend had made such a strong and bitter castigation of the U.S.S.R. that Shepilov shook, that the members of the assembly were silent, and finally they applauded. Magnificent! But then Canada abstained. Speaking on resolutions, lacking resolution!

What about the last three weeks? Are we going to place Britain and France in the same position as the U.S.S.R. with its attitudes, its actions, its cruelty, its tyranny in Hungary in the last three weeks? According to information there has been a reshuffling of Soviet forces in western Poland and a concentration of Russian troops in East Germany on the Oder river and along the Austrian border. The strait-jacket of tyranny is to be restored to the puppet states under the control of the U.S.S.R.

I am not here to castigate but I say to the Prime Minister that his words of the

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

other day struck in me the reaction that injudicious annoyance with the questions of the moment—at a time when judicious and judicial calm should have been expected from him—had led him to utter these words, as found at page 20 of *Hansard* on November 26:

I have been scandalized more than once by the attitude of the larger powers, the big powers as we call them, who have all too frequently treated the charter of the United Nations as an instrument with which to regiment smaller nations and as an instrument which did not have to be considered when their own so-called vital interests were at stake.

The only reference in the preceding paragraph is to Britain and to France. I am scandalized, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister saw fit to condemn Britain and France to the same bag in which the U.S.S.R. was placed. I shall say no more about that because I do not wish to use words which later on I would have to repent, as I feel the Prime Minister will have to repent in the days ahead. No matter how one may judge, placing those three in a common position is, to say the least, not in keeping with the fact that two of them represent the motherlands of Canada, that those two have for generations preserved freedom and within our generation have done that very thing. I do not think this government has had any realization of events internationally in their proper perspective; or if it has, it has kept that information from parliament. We in the opposition have not been consulted. That is one of the complaints in Britain. After all, when our future is at stake and freedom stands challenged, surely these eighteen feet that separate us do not demand that we be kept in the dark.

I go back to January 11 of this year when the question arose as to whether aircraft were being shipped to Egypt and the Secretary of State for External Affairs said that he was unable to say whether any had been shipped. While he spoke the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Minister of National Defence, who must have known, sat silent. On January 16 the hon. member for Esquimaux-Saanich asked whether any military equipment for the Middle East was being shipped by a designated transport and the minister said in effect that he was unable to say. On January 17 the Secretary of State for External Affairs admitted that aircraft had been shipped but he said that the reason that he did not give a proper answer the other day was the use of the word "recently". From now on, three months is not recently in an international calendar. Later on, the Prime Minister said that the decision to permit the shipment of arms had been made

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

by the cabinet in June, 1955. On January 20 the Minister of Trade and Commerce said that the export was authorized by an order in council of July 7. The next day he said that there was no such order in council. Mr. Speaker, here was a serious situation. This was parliament, entitled to receive information and receiving selective information. A few days later the Prime Minister completed the picture by saying that the matter was never before the cabinet in June, July or at any other time.

Something is wrong, Mr. Speaker, when on a matter affecting freedom in the world a cabinet furnishes information of that kind: misinformation, no information. I sometimes wonder why it is that things like that should exist. If the proposal for a United Nations emergency force had been advanced before the U.N. not on November 2 but earlier when hon. members in this house who have travelled in the Middle East knew it should be, how different things might have been.

I am not going to quarrel with the Prime Minister over his refusal to produce the telegram with respect to which the press reported that scorching words had been used. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister's words the other day, when he threw Britain, France and the U.S.S.R. into a common bag, represented judicial calm, I should like to see that telegram. In order to be able to answer the question whether that telegram should be produced, the right hon. gentleman did not ask the British government or Sir Anthony Eden whether that telegram could be produced. Oh, no. I want to read this message—which is found at page 23 of *Hansard*—because it is obvious that the wording of the request for consideration of the possible demand by myself and others is couched in the phraseology of one who realizes that the demand could not be accepted. Just listen to this:

A leading member of the official opposition has stated publicly that, when our parliament meets in the near future, he proposes to ask for the tabling of one of the communications I addressed to you recently in reply to one of yours.

It is obvious that this correspondence between us could not be published piecemeal and that, if one of these confidential communications were published, they would all have to be published.

All, Mr. Speaker? Not all; one. The No. 1 communication when danger challenged, is the one asked for; the request was not for the day to day confidential communications but for the one of advice, if you will; the one of challenge, if you will; the one of condemnation, if you will. For, Mr. Speaker, that is the telegram that was sent on behalf of Canada. That is the one that was

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

demanded, not the day to day communications. Certainly no one would ask for the production of all of the correspondence. But only the one was referred to and only the one was asked for.

We now come to the question of an international force. I think that this is a step in the right direction. I think it is something that is *ad hoc* to a particular situation. I think it represents the first time that the United Nations, since the uniting-for-peace resolution, has established the beginning of a principle which, since the days of Grotius to which my friend the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre referred yesterday, has been the dream and the hope of mankind.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs said today that Nasser has nothing to say as to the identity of the force. Well, one of the U.N. officials said so. My hon. friend says he had no authority. It is impossible for anyone to follow the kaleidoscopic changes and alterations that took place in a matter of two weeks over the Queen's Own. What happened? Was this letter from General Burns an escape hatch for the government? Did they suggest to him in any way, after consultation, such a letter? I read from a press dispatch which says that the government is embarrassed. I have not seen any evidence of that in the last couple of days but this was back on November 20.

The federal cabinet, admittedly embarrassed, met today to make its decision on the dispatch of Canadian troops to Egypt . . .

Then, there is a reference to the letter from General Burns, and it says:

The General's letter was written in close consultation with the Canadian government. It is accepted here that it is meant to provide a face-saving out from the embarrassing position of having had the proposed contribution of the Queen's Own Rifles turned down by Egypt's veto.

I need hardly say that this comes from one who enjoys the confidence of the government. I refer to Mr. Robert Taylor of the *Toronto Star*. He seldom does anything to embarrass. Here is what the *New York Times* said in regard to this question. At any time the Egyptian government desires it withdrawn, the force will be withdrawn immediately. Then the article goes on:

. . . Egyptian approval was necessary in the choice of countries that would participate in the force. In addition, Egyptian approval was required as to where the force would be stationed and when it would arrive, . . .

They have accepted the police force to ensure that the British and French and Israeli troops leave the country and that is all.

My hon. friend indicates that he does not agree with that.

Mr. Pearson: It is not true.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I may say that is quoted from a reputable writer in the *New York Times*. I say this, sir, that if it is not true it is surprising how this force has followed the course that Nasser would want it to follow. As a member of the profession of law, Mr. Speaker, I ask what kind of police force would you consider it when a thug would be able to determine the personnel of the force, the beat on which it operates, its tenure of office and the time when it would conclude its operations? I should like further enlightenment from the minister in connection with this force and the role it is to play, because if in fact these statements are correct then this force does not meet the need of the moment. It does not establish the beginnings of that international rule of law which was referred to by Selwyn Lloyd in the British House of Commons when he said:

Law and order cannot be maintained in any country without policemen. A burglar is not deterred because society's property owners pass a resolution condemning housebreaking. Unlawful wounding is not stopped because the victims may all condemn violence. So it is in international society. We have to face the facts, and the fact is that collective security under the United Nations has only once in a real crisis proved effective and that was in Korea in 1950, and then only because of an accident that Russia was absent from the security council.

I say this, sir, I believe that with halting and faltering steps this international force, if the conscience of the free world will give it the power that Nasser does not want it to have, may well prove the beginnings of a new era. History tells but one story, Mr. Speaker, and that is in every few hundred years man has feared the avalanches that would destroy freedom, but always when it is darkest the stars are brightest. I say to the Prime Minister that the references to supermen, regardless of what the situation might be, and the condemnation of those nations which have stood for freedom for generations should not have fallen from the lips of a man who enjoys the respect the Prime Minister does. I say this not in anger; I say it in the deepest feeling of sorrow, that Canada should have permitted the use of words which cannot hurt those against whom they are directed but will raise the hopes of communists everywhere in the world and bring solace to the Khrushchevs and Bulganins. That is the position in which Canada is.

Now, I have said all I am going to say in that direction, except that as one who believes in the responsibility of an opposition I have one suggestion to make, a major one, and one or two others. I am going to say to the Minister of Immigration that I am glad he is taking the course he is and going over to Austria. By his presence he will let them

The Address—Mr. Yuill

know that the free world still has a conscience; that while we cannot help them with military force, we can let them know that those who live in slavery are not forgotten. I am not going to add anything that would detract from what I have said. I think it is something that merits the approval of Canadians as a whole. I have always tried to follow that course in this house.

A step has been taken, in co-operation with the premier of Ontario, Mr. Frost, whereby the federal and provincial governments join together in so far as Ontario is concerned to bring to this country those who did their part in their day and generation to maintain that flickering flame of freedom. I believe that. Now, I come to Canada's responsibility as I see it. The relations between Britain, the United States, Canada and the nations of the free world need to be reconstructed; for, Mr. Speaker, we have started on our first step to international suicide. My suggestion may be worthless, but it is offered for what it may be worth. It is this. In 1943 the free world was in fear, and a conference took place in the citadel in the city of Quebec which brought together the leaders of the free world. Out of the determinations there arrived at, the free world started its march upwards to ultimate victory. We cannot afford to allow our ranks to be divided now.

I see references made to the fact that the United States intends to hold over Britain and France the promise of oil if they obediently do what the United Nations ask. I hope that that is not true. We want no clubs over the sources of freedom. I see in the press—and after all that is where we get our information—that in the United States, where they had an armistice on foreign affairs and responsibility during an election, there are some who believe that a meeting between the prime ministers of Britain and France and the president of the United States should not take place at this time because it would place the United States in an impossible position. Sir, I hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs will let them know that the embarrassing position in which the United States will be placed as a result—and I know of none—will be as nothing compared with the perilous position of Canada and the free world unless something of this nature is done once more to heal the wounds of disagreement.

I mentioned the Quebec conference. Will the Prime Minister of Canada, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs, take the lead at this time and invite the leaders of those nations to a second Quebec conference? Bring together the leading members of the commonwealth here in Canada. Let the pres-

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

ident of the United States come here, as did President Roosevelt in the days of war, and also the prime ministers of France and Britain. Let them meet in that ancient citadel, representative of the contribution made to Canada's freedom by those of the French race and also representing Canada in the home of the two races, now joined together and almost alone. Let them meet without malice, without vituperative statements and without words of grandiloquent content, and in that city lay the foundations for once more re-establishing in the free world a unity which, unless it is achieved and achieved immediately, may result in irreparable harm; indeed, its lack has already caused results that cannot but have been a solace to the hearts of communists everywhere in the world.

Our responsibility at this time, as I see it, is to join together. I quote from an article which appeared yesterday in the *New York Times*. It ends in this way:

We cannot be so insane as not to see how much this would damage our own position.

Mr. Sulzberger was referring to disunity. He goes on:

Traditional friendship and ideological sympathies apart, we must recognize that alliances are based on mutual interest. This mutual interest remains.

I believe it does. I believe that before the ledger of freedom in the unity of the free world becomes too much a debit we should bring together this conference and that Canada, in her enviable position, should bring about that determination which resulted from the first Quebec conference. If that is done, mankind everywhere in the free world will once more look forward to the future not with the fear that so many thinking men and women have today, but with that faith in spiritual things without which we cannot survive.

Mr. Charles Yuill (Jasper-Edson): Mr. Speaker, I have a few words I should like to say in this debate before the vote is taken. I assure you that I am not going to take up very much time, but what I have to say is of very great importance to me and to those whom I represent.

We are here in this special session to consider ways and means of preventing the outbreak of a third world war starting in the Middle East and to earnestly seek for every possible effective means of bringing peace to the world. As the leader of this party has said, we refuse to play politics with this most serious matter in this grave world situation. However I think it is our duty to speak about this situation as we see it and to make whatever proposals we can make that might help to achieve the end we all so earnestly desire.

The Address—Mr. Fulton

So far, little or no criticism has been levelled at the state of Israel for her attack on Egypt, which was the immediate cause of the present grave situation in the Middle East. We realize that Israel has been the victim of a long series of provocations. She has also been guilty over the years of a long series of retaliation. No matter how serious the provocation may have been, the fact remains that Israel did attack Egypt and occupied Egyptian territory, the Sinai peninsula and the Gaza strip. It is true that Israel agreed to a cease-fire and to removal of her troops from Egyptian territory. I think that the fulfilment of that agreement would be the first step toward a settlement of the whole problem in the Middle East.

I strongly suggest that while the emergency police force is being established in the canal zone Canada use her influence in the United Nations to induce Israel to evacuate all the Egyptian territory which her troops occupied in the recent military campaign. Israel should show her good intentions by immediate compliance with that request. She should withdraw to within the armistice lines and stay there until such time as the boundary disputes between Israel and the Arab states have been settled. If in the collective wisdom of the United Nations permanent boundaries are established which award some extra territory to the state of Israel then Israel's position at least would be legalized. However, in view of the great tension in the Middle East and the suspicion and intrigue that abounds there, there is no doubt in my mind that the place to start to find a settlement is to have Israel move back within the territory designated in the armistice agreement.

By that I do not mean to say this would solve all the problems. It would solve only one, namely the bitterness and suspicion engendered by Israel's attack and their occupation of Egyptian territory, but it would be a good starting place and from there I think the United Nations must use every means at its disposal to help bring about a peaceful settlement of all the outstanding problems between the state of Israel and the Arab states.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Fulton: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we could call it one o'clock.

An hon. Member: Go ahead.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Bell: What are you in a hurry for?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member has asked that I call it one o'clock.

Mr. Fulton: It is all right; I am prepared to continue.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask if that is the sense of the house that we should call it one o'clock. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At one o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2.30 p.m.

Mr. E. D. Fulton (Kamloops): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the house at any length with the remarks I have to make because what was required to be said has been said and most magnificently by the various spokesmen for the Conservative party who have preceded me. Before I conclude, I shall be emphasizing only one or two particular aspects of what they said.

My main reason for speaking in this debate just before the vote is taken is to say a word or two with regard to the question of Hungarian refugees. I believe I was the first to make the concrete suggestion that Canada should offer immediate and unrestricted asylum to these Hungarian patriots who have been made homeless as a result of their battle for freedom, which is our battle. I do not want to let this occasion go by without emphasizing my own views and the views of my party, nor do I want to omit to say what I think it is proper for every member of the opposition or every politician who regards himself as having constructive criticism to offer, and that is that now at last we welcome and support the statements which have been made by the government with respect to its present policy on the admission of these Hungarian refugees.

We are glad that the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration is going to Austria and we hope his trip will be successful and will clear the way for the speedier dealing with the plight of those who have been made homeless and their ready and immediate admission to Canada and the reception arrangements that are required to be made here after they have arrived. I think it is proper to say that although we support this action and welcome it nevertheless we do have a residual regret that it was some two or three weeks after the situation first arose before the government officially came around to adopting and announcing a really generous policy of unrestricted asylum to these people.

There is little if anything that we can do in a physical sense to assist in the real struggle for freedom in these countries suffering under the iron yoke of communism,

The Address—Mr. Fulton

nevertheless there is much we can do over and above the passage of resolutions to show that we really mean it when we say that our hearts and minds are with them in their struggles. A magnificent gesture of generosity is required from countries such as Canada and others to do everything which can be done within their power. We can do it because we have the opportunity, we have the resources and we know the benefits that have come to our country from the admission of these people.

Therefore our gesture should be unrestricted and generous so as to show these people that we really mean it when we say to them: You have been made homeless by your struggle for freedom and your participation in that battle which is our battle; you have been made homeless but there is a home for you, and if you are willing to come we will bring you. We support and welcome the statements that have been made by the minister. We wish him a safe and successful voyage with good results in the work that he will be undertaking to clear the way for the admission of these people to Canada and their reception when they arrive.

As to the other matters which have been before the house in connection with external affairs and the policy of the government in connection with the Suez crisis, our position has been clearly and imaginatively stated by the Acting Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Rowe) and magnificently summarized in the speech made today by the chairman of our caucus committee on external affairs, the hon. member for Prince Albert. I do not think there is anything that can be added to what they have said.

For myself I should like to emphasize particularly the view which the hon. member for Prince Albert expanded on in his speech, that is the urgent necessity of Canadian leaders bending every effort toward bringing the commonwealth back together and showing that Canada's interest in it and Canada's readiness to support it is more than a mere passing gesture, but that we realize that in this situation which we find today, where we are engaged in a struggle for the freedom of civilization as we understand it, we cannot be just judges and non-participants; we must participate and therefore we must make our contribution to the commonwealth and our position within the commonwealth clear and meaningful so that no one may mistake it whether they be our friends or our enemies.

We feel that very strongly. While we do not wish to be carping, while we want at this stage to be constructive, we feel nevertheless the deepest sense of regret that some of the policies of the Canadian government, in the

[Mr. Fulton.]

last few months particularly, have been the reverse of what I have just described. Unfortunately they have contributed to the loosening of those ties.

The other thing which the hon. member for Prince Albert and this party emphasized is the urgent necessity of restoring the partnership between the commonwealth and the United States. We are all convinced that there is no more important matter concerning the western world and the free world than the steps to be taken in that regard. We feel that having made our position as a member of the commonwealth clear we must then say to the United States: Let us restore this partnership on the basis that our position is understood, that we have made our position clear, that we know where our friends are. This is not a matter of sentiment, this is a matter of self-interest. We invite you to understand our position and the position of our friends and to return to full partnership and friendship with us.

As has been so often stated previously, Canada's prime role is to act as a bridge between the east and the west, on the one hand, and between the United Kingdom and the United States, on the other. Those two bridges must be restored and the chasm which has been opening up must be bridged once more.

We have in our amendment indicated in what way we think the government must accept a full measure of responsibility for the collapse of those bridges. We shall by our vote on our amendment take our stand on that position. But in so far as the position has been summarized by our spokesman, our acting leader, and concluded and summarized by the chairman of our committee on external affairs, the Conservative party stands by that position and there remains nothing to add.

However, I think it proper to say that I have been authorized by my colleagues to say that when the vote on our amendment is disposed of, and on that we intend to make our position unequivocally clear, we shall support the motion for the address itself. We do think that this is a time for an imaginative and positive gesture such as was suggested by the hon. member for Prince Albert.

We do say, and this is within the confines of the remarks I have just made, that we want to indicate also our support for the principles upon which the United Nations was built, and that is that there should be an effective police force. I think it is useless to talk about those who loosely violate the charter because we must remember that one of the basic principles of the United Nations has not yet been fulfilled, and that was the creation of an effective police force.

The Address—Division

NAYS

Messrs:

Because we believe in that we will support the main motion which calls for provision being made by vote 235 of the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1956, for the purpose of meeting costs incurred for the participation of the Canadian forces in the United Nations emergency force, and to authorize the necessary provisions for the relief of the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary.

We do support those two propositions and we welcomed the statement by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration that the passages of these people would be paid in full. As a result we believe that the appropriation should be increased.

Mr. Pickersgill: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not mind my clarifying that point. It is not intended that any part of this appropriation be used for those passages. The passages will be paid for out of the appropriations of my department.

Mr. Fulton: That is welcome news. However, we are doubtful whether the provisions now being made will in fact go as far as the Canadian people would want to go in providing relief for these people.

It is because of the views I have expressed, Mr. Speaker, and because we believe, both with respect to the support for the Hungarian refugees and other people participating in the fight for freedom and with respect to the necessity to restore commonwealth unity and the western world's unity, that there is a most urgent need for imaginative and positive gestures that we have taken the position we have and rest on the amendment we have moved. But when that is disposed of we will be supporting the main motion.

The house divided on the amendment (Mr. Rowe) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Bell	McBain
Blair	McGregor
Brooks	Michener
Cardiff	Monteith
Casselman	Montgomery
Charlton	Murphy (Lambton West)
Dinsdale	Nesbitt
Fairclough, Mrs.	Nowlan
Ferguson	Pallett
Fraser (Peterborough)	Pearkes
Fulton	Robinson (Bruce)
Green	Rowe
Hamilton (Notre Dame de Grace)	Small
Harkness	Stanton
Hees	Starr
Howe (Wellington-Huron)	Tustin
Macdonnell	White (Hastings-Frontenac)
MacLean	White (Middlesex East)—36.

Anderson	Hunter
Applewhaite	James
Argue	Johnson (Kindersley)
Arsenault	Jones
Ashbourne	Jutras
Balcom	Kickham
Barnett	Kirk (Antigonish-Guysborough)
Batten	Kirk (Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare)
Bennett	Knight
Blackmore	Knowles
Blanchette	LaCroix
Boisvert	Lafamme
Boivin	Lafontaine
Bonnier	Langlois (Berthier-Maskinonge-Delanaudiere)
Boucher	Langlois (Gaspé)
Bourget	Lapointe
Bourque	Lavigne
Breton	Leboe
Brisson	Leduc (Gatineau)
Brown (Brantford)	Leduc (Jacques Cartier-Lasalle)
Brown (Essex West)	Lefrançois
Bruneau	Lesage
Bryce	Low
Bryson	Lusby
Buchanan	MacEachen
Byrne	MacKenzie
Cameron (High Park)	MacNaught
Campbell	McCann
Campney	McCubbin
Cannon	McCullough (Moose Mountain)
Caron	McIlraith
Carter	McIvor
Cauchon	McLeod
Cavers	McMillan
Clark	Maltais
Cloutier	Mang
Coldwell	Masse
Crestohl	Matheson
Dechene	Menard
Decore	Meunier
Deschatelets	Michaud
Deslieres	Mitchell (Sudbury)
Dupuis	Monette
Ellis	Murphy (Westmorland)
Enfield	Nicholson
Eudes	Nixon
Eyre	Patterson
Follwell	Pearson
Fontaine	Philpott
Forge	Pickersgill
Fraser (St. John's East)	Pommer
Gagnon	Foulin
Gardiner	Proudfoot
Garland	Prudham
Garson	Purdy
Gauthier (Lake St. John)	Quelch
Gauthier (Nickel Belt)	Ratelle
Gauthier (Portneuf)	Regier
Gillis	Reinke
Gingras	Richard (St. Maurice-Lafleche)
Gingues	Richardson
Girard	Roberge
Goode	Robertson
Gour (Russell)	Robichaud
Gregg	Robinson (Simcoe East)
Hahn	Rouleau
Hanna	St. Laurent (Quebec East)
Hansell	Schneider
Harris	Shaw
Harrison	Shiple, Mrs.
Hellyer	
Henderson	
Henry	
Holowach	
Hosking	
Houck	
Howe (Port Arthur)	
Huffman	

Supply—National Defence

Simmons	Viau
Sinclair	Villeneuve
Smith (Battle River-Camrose)	Vincent
Smith (York North)	Weaver
Stewart (Winnipeg North)	Weir
Stick	Weselak
Stuart (Charlotte)	White (Waterloo South)
Thatcher	Winch
Thomas	Winters
Tucker	Wylie
Valois	Yuill
	Zaplitny—171.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the main motion?

Motion agreed to.

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister) moved:

That the address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by such members of this house as are of the honourable the privy council.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY

The house in committee of supply, Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

738. To provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board, assistance to the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary, \$1,000,000.

Item agreed to.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

739. To provide expressly that vote 235 of the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1956, be used for the purpose of meeting costs incurred for the participation of the Canadian forces in the United Nations emergency force, and to authorize payment from that vote, subject to approval of the treasury board, of contributions to the United Nations for defraying expenses incurred by it in respect of its operations to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East, \$1.

Hon. R. O. Campney (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Chairman, there is today, at this very moment, as we are all well aware, a very grave crisis existing in the Middle East. It is growing day by day. How can we, in Canada, help to resolve it? There is, for the moment, a cease-fire in effect. The shooting has been stopped. How can we help to keep it that way? There is also building up in that area a United Nations police force which is being formed to halt the killing. How can we best help strengthen that force?

There is a growing determination amongst the nations that we should get at the root causes of this conflict. How, in Canada, can we assist in doing so? These are the important considerations we must keep before us. You may say that the steps taken by the United Nations up to date have been halting, diffident and slow, and that I would

[Mr. Fulton.]

grant you, but they are steps in the right direction and they are quickening. Today the Right Hon. Selwyn Lloyd, in a very conciliatory speech which he made in the House of Commons in London said:

The United Nations force has now been constituted and is growing in numbers, and I pay tribute to the speed with which the secretary general and his advisers have acted. By December 1, there will be about 2,700 men in Egypt, and within 14 days there should be 4,400, among which will be some 700 Canadian troops.

We must, I believe, in Canada continue to do all that we can to persuade other people to walk with us along the highway to an honourable and enduring peace. We must assist afflicted nations wherever we can. Like it or not, we must in all honesty ask ourselves this question; if the United Nations fail, how can we hope to find a way to a world without war?

By now, every Canadian knows what this government in recent weeks and in the name of sanity and humanity has tried very hard to do, and with some success, surely. It has been, as is the policy of this government, to work wholeheartedly and imaginatively with the United Nations in its efforts to stop the fighting in Egypt and to create conditions which will prevent its recurrence. I should like, as one who has worked very closely with him in the last few weeks, to pay my personal tribute to my fellow cabinet minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) because I have had opportunity in that time to realize the patience, the zeal and the effectiveness with which he has represented us at the United Nations.

I suspect that hon. members would like me to outline to them what the Department of National Defence and the armed forces have been doing during recent weeks to support the government's policy, and this I shall endeavour to do. What I shall say, with the information already given to hon. members, will I hope provide sufficient background for the discussion of the defence appropriation now before the committee.

This appropriation, as hon. members will have noted, is purely nominal in amount for the simple reason that it is not yet possible to predict with any accuracy what Canada's contribution to the cost of the United Nations emergency force will be, nor the extent to which these costs will be borne by the United Nations. I shall have occasion to revert to this phase of the matter later.

Approval by hon. members of the nominal defence appropriation will of course be tantamount to approval in broad outline of the actions that the government has thus far taken. The decisions that we in the government have come to after most serious thought

Supply—National Defence

and consideration are now before each member for his consideration. In coming to these decisions which we have taken we have at all times been very conscious, as have our military advisers, of the dangers inherent in sending a relatively small and lightly armed force into an area where so recently there has been much fighting and destruction.

So, from the very first we in the government have been fully conscious as to the sombre and challenging task facing the United Nations and ourselves: the urgent need is to try to secure the peace by establishing quickly—while there is still time—and with the necessary co-operation of the Middle East combatants, the first international police force of its kind ever to be organized in this war-torn world. To pioneer for peace, to try to find new ways to stop war, to be resolute—not to kill but to stop the killing—surely there is no more honourable task for Canadian service men to take on. The proposition to which this government is dedicated, and which I believe all Canadians will endorse, is that it is better to run risks for peace than to be faced with war's certain casualties and chaos.

It has been very evident, I think, to all of us that a general war under conditions obtaining today is in all conscience unthinkable. Surely, then, it is the job of the defence department to assist, by every means in its power, those who would discourage war and assert the claims of peace. That is what we are endeavouring to do under the aegis of the United Nations at this very moment.

May I now briefly review, in three stages, the chronology of military events affecting Canada as they have occurred since the Prime Minister announced on November 4 that the Canadian government was ready to recommend Canadian participation in the United Nations police force proposed the previous day by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, if it was thought that Canada could play a useful role.

Studies were at once instituted by our departmental officials and our service chiefs in anticipation of a call for a Canadian contribution to this force. From these studies and from the second and final report of the Secretary General of the United Nations, made on November 6 and recommending self-contained units of battalion strength for the United Nations emergency force, we concluded at a meeting of senior service officers and government officials who met with me on November 6 that Canada's contribution might be an infantry battalion group.

As a result of the studies and consultations leading to that recommendation, the Prime

Minister, on November 7—the very day on which the United Nations resolution establishing the United Nations emergency force was passed and self-contained battalions were formally called for by the United Nations council—announced the government's offer of a contribution to that force of a battalion group of 1,000 men or more, to be supported by its own mobile base of Her Majesty's Canadian ship *Magnificent*. This offer, the Prime Minister noted, was subject to any re-arrangement made necessary after consultation with the commander of the force, Major-General Burns.

This Canadian contingent, of battalion strength, was to be augmented by technical and administrative units to make it self-supporting. The Prime Minister said that Canada was prepared to airlift the group to the Middle East, and send the *Magnificent* to transport vehicles and stores, and to act as a temporary mobile Canadian base for rations, medical supplies, ammunition, fuel and limited accommodation stores, until more permanent base arrangements could be made ashore. It was indicated that the *Magnificent* would also provide a small base hospital, serve as a force headquarters and provide communications between the force and Canada.

The provision of this mobile base was an important consideration because one does not send troops off to foreign lands—at least I would not want that responsibility—until one knows how they are going to be supplied and cared for, and none of these things had then been decided.

The next day I announced the immediate organization of a battalion group, to be composed of the first battalion Queen's Own Rifles of Canada, located at Calgary, with signals, engineers, army service corps, ordnance and other supporting units, the numbers of which I gave the day before yesterday in answer to a question of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. In the announcement which I made, I said:

It is emphasized that the preparation and movement of this force is being taken now without first having had the benefit of consultation with Major-General Burns, the United Nations commander, and it is possible that the type and organization of the Canadian contribution may have to be changed at a later date. However, it is considered essential to take all possible steps to have the Canadian contribution ready and available for movement overseas within the shortest possible time.

The following day, November 9, General Burns confirmed officially that the initial form of the force should be independent military groups made self-supporting by having their own signals, transport, engineer, medical and other services. Here I might interject, perhaps, that as a result of Canada's policy

Supply—National Defence

of having substantial forces in being, fully trained, well equipped and operationally ready, this plan presented no particular problem.

Incidentally, also, I might say that, of the various battalions available, the first Queen's Own was selected because it was in line for overseas service, and the competence and training state of its personnel made it generally suitable for the job to be done.

While I am dealing with that I would like to answer some of the derogatory remarks, if I may use those words, made about the 1st Queen's Own by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Pearkes) which I must say coming from him surprised me. In those remarks the hon. member pretty clearly intimated that this battalion was not in his opinion qualified for the service which had been allocated to it.

The fact is that the first battalion of the 1st Queen's Own Regiment is a very fine, well trained unit, well organized and well led. There were no untrained men in the battalion even though some of them, as is always the case, have been moved into the battalion within the past few months. No battalion in peace time on short notice can move without certain things being done. The first battalion was on short notice and was ordered to report to Halifax by air.

When that order was received, as would be the case in any battalion moving on short notice, there were certain men in the 1st Queen's Own not available for these reasons: Some were below immediate medical standards, others were under 18 years of age, there were some under 21 years of age and married who would not be able to claim their marriage allowance and there were a few who had less than six months to serve and who had indicated they did not wish to re-engage. There were also a few compassionate cases, there were some on leave who could not be reached in time, there were some on courses. There were four, I think, absent without leave. Generally speaking there were a total of 127 in these categories, as would be the case in any battalion ordered to make a quick move. These probably will ultimately be doing what we might call "the housekeeping" for the 1st Queen's Own at their home station in Calgary during the battalion's absence.

In order to bring the battalion up to strength quickly, and in fact up to almost 100 over peacetime strength, certain personnel—I think about 240 which was the number mentioned by my hon. friend—were drafted from the first battalion to the second battalion. We must remember these are both battalions of the same regiment.

[Mr. Campney.]

Mr. Pearkes: Do you not mean they were drafted from the second battalion to the first battalion?

Mr. Campney: Yes, I am sorry. Men were drafted from the second battalion to the first battalion. These two battalions, of course, belong to the same regiment and being sister battalions the men required could be supplied quickly. Very little time will be taken in bringing the 2nd Queen's Own up to strength again. I think there are approximately between two and three hundred at the regimental depot of the two battalions in Calgary. No other units were asked to supply drafts. The whole battalion is a Queen's Own battalion and it is approximately 100 over peacetime strength. Therefore, if you take the 96 which I think is the exact figure by which it is over strength, all of whom went to Halifax, and if you take off the 127, you pretty well account for the transfer to it of the men from the 2nd Queen's Own.

One other point raised by the hon. member when he spoke was his statement to the effect it has always been the practice in the past that the men who are under 19 should not be sent out of Canada. Well, I think the hon. member is in error in that regard. So far as I know, it has always been the practice, certainly ever since I have been familiar with the department, that men over 18 have gone to the NATO force in Europe. It is true that in active warfare such as Korea where they went out as combatant troops the age was 19. It is left pretty much to the exigencies of the situation into which they are going. In this case the same rule was applied to the police force troops as was applied in the case of our troops going to NATO.

The hon. member wanted to know how many of these men were under 19. As a matter of fact, there were 99 in the first Queen's Own and 65 in the 2nd Queen's Own. Service abroad can take place any time after 18 years of age. I think the set-up of the 1st Queen's Own was a normal set-up and on short notice the force that was required was provided quickly and without any confusion. The hon. gentleman said that these men were hurriedly brought from the 2nd Queen's Own to the 1st Queen's Own. If he means by "hurriedly" in point of time that is quite correct, but I can assure him there was no confusion or difficulty in the matter. It was achieved very quickly and smoothly.

I might say that consideration was given briefly to airlifting to the Middle East a battalion from the brigade group in Germany but this proved entirely unnecessary and for obvious reasons we would have been reluctant under existing circumstances to weaken our NATO forces in Europe.

Supply—National Defence

Now may I deal for a moment with the second stage of the preparation made to accomplish the plan I outlined a few moments ago. It was clearly realized at this time that although we had General Burns' approval of the nature of our contribution before it could be actually dispatched, we must have the approval of the United Nations, the body under whose orders General Burns acts. Nevertheless, in view of the well understood urgency of the requirements, arrangements were immediately made to ready the units and details forming the basis of our promised contribution.

On November 12, to prepare the way for Canada's contribution, 35 army officers and men were sent ahead by air to Naples as an exploratory party to look into the situation there and to take care of all necessary preliminary planning and arrangements for such Canadian troops as might follow.

On November 12, a Royal Canadian Air Force airlift began, concentrating at Longue Pointe, Quebec, the army personnel designated for duty in the service units for the 1st Queen's Own battalion.

The next day, November 13, the main body of the 1st Queen's Own started to move by R.C.A.F. planes to Halifax, in an airlift involving 877 personnel, which was completed in 67 hours.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness) a day or two ago asked me about the cost of this airlift. It is extremely difficult, of course, to dissociate it from other costs of operating these planes in any event, but so far as can be determined for gas, oil and additional expenses of that nature the cost was approximately \$29,000; that is, in addition to their normal duties.

In the meantime, the *Magnificent* had been recalled by the Navy at top speed from Scotland, warned to start refitting en route and be prepared for a quick turn-around. Breasting heavy seas, she arrived in Halifax on the evening of November 13, and by the afternoon of November 18 was extensively refitted, restocked and loaded, with steam up, ready for the order to transport to the Middle East nearly 1,000 service personnel with all their requisite jeeps, trucks, ambulances and other heavy equipment as well as several hundred tons of rations, petrol and other supplies.

The hon. member for Calgary North also asked me what it cost to refit the *Magnificent* for this particular duty. There will be an item in the estimates covering it. It is estimated to have cost about \$50,000 although I cannot give the detailed figures at the moment.

Arrangements were also completed with the Royal Canadian Air Force to airlift the

250 officers and men of the servicing troops so that the whole contingent would arrive at Naples at about the same time, and if this move had gone forward on schedule all these troops would have been there early in the present week. But, just as all the military plans were being completed to carry out the operations to which I have referred, it became apparent that difficulties had developed between the United Nations and Egypt with respect to the composition, the duties to be performed, and other questions having to do with the United Nations Emergency force. While these difficulties were in process of being straightened out General Burns was also reviewing his situation and establishing an altered priority of requirements in order to get his force set up and operating. Fortunately the preparations that we in Canada had been making made it possible for us to meet his altered needs because we had always had in mind that this might occur. We were only trying to be ahead of the gun by getting what we thought was a proper contingent ready.

On Monday, November 19, with the endorsement of the secretary general of the United Nations, General Burns formally asked Canada to meet his priority need for an augmented transport squadron to provide air lift support from the staging base at Naples to points in Egypt. He had only three chartered Swiss airliners and the charter was expiring. There was a further priority need for sufficient service troops to make possible the establishment of his headquarters so that the international police force could start functioning.

Our answer to this request was immediately "yes", and then on November 19 for the first time, as I have said, with the specific approval of both the secretary general of the United Nations and of the United Nations commander we began the third stage of our efforts to support the emergency force.

435 transport squadron of the Royal Canadian Air Force from Namao, Alberta, was released from other duties and positioned at Downsview, Toronto, for immediate dispatch overseas with supporting ground crew, ground handling equipment and aircraft spare parts. 426 transport squadron of Montreal was ordered to prepare to assist 435 squadron in its move overseas and also to airlift to Naples the army service units which had been assembled at Longue Pointe, Quebec, originally to go overseas in support of the 1st Queen's Own.

On Tuesday, November 20, the cabinet met in the morning to formulate the necessary order in council, which was passed, and then the movements overseas were initiated immediately by the departure of a North Star

Supply—National Defence

aircraft carrying an advance party headed by the air officer commanding, air transport command. Since that time successive flights have continued and as of yesterday 309 army personnel and 328 air force personnel, or 637 in all, are now in the Middle East. There may be others en route but I am not sure as to the exact number. However, that is the number actually overseas. The twelve North Stars of 426 transport squadron are now operating an airlift between Canada and Naples in support of the Canadian United Nations emergency force contingent.

The army personnel in the Middle East, when their airlift over is completed, will represent service elements so essential to the functioning of any force. The day before yesterday I indicated that the component elements were made up of the army service corps, signals, army medical corps, ordnance, R.C.E.M.E. and engineers.

The 328 Canadian Air Force personnel now in the Middle East will be increased as required to 599. They are made up of the air crew and ground crew for the twelve C-119 aircraft or flying boxcars of 435 transport squadron which on Sunday last took over the United Nations emergency force airlift responsibility across the Mediterranean for taking men and supplies from Naples via Crete to the United Nations emergency force base at Abu Suweir in Egypt.

The order in council which was passed on November 20 provided for the dispatch of up to 2,500 members of Canada's armed forces as this country's contribution to the United Nations emergency force organized "to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East". In addition to the 637 army and air force personnel now with the United Nations emergency force overseas, and approximately 275 Royal Canadian Air Force personnel who are still available if required, there are 900 officers and men of the 1st Queen's Own at Halifax ready to go, by sea or air as required, and the 600 composing the reduced ship's company of the *Magnificent*. These elements of the three services which I have just mentioned make up roughly the 2,500 Canadians authorized for service with the United Nations emergency force.

I trust that the brief chronology which I have endeavoured to give hon. members and put on *Hansard* of events as they took place during the serious, uncertain, rapidly changing and unprecedented period through which we have just been passing will be sufficient to indicate how capably our armed forces have taken hold of each urgent demand made of them, and how insistent we have been because of the extreme gravity of the situation that there should be nothing dilatory, nothing hesitant, in our efforts to anticipate

[Mr. Campney.]

the needs of the United Nations emergency force.

While proud to be a part of this international force and being fully aware of the risks inherent in such an operation, Canada's concern has been and continues to be simply this: Within the limits that the government has defined to make whatever contribution the United Nations authorities assure us could best serve the interests of the emergency force and to make it available quickly. All else must be secondary to that.

What we have been dealing with is not a mere staff exercise to gather and move troops, but rather a dynamic and so far successful effort to help create an institution unique in the world's history, a United Nations police force designed by its international character specifically to discourage the outbreak of further fighting in the Middle East and thus make possible the hope of an enduring peace.

I should like here to interject a few personal observations arising out of this brief period of rather intensified activity in the Department of National Defence. A great deal of credit rightly accrues to the uniformed and civilian members of our staff for the whole hearted way in which they have pitched into the rush assignments given to them. I think they deserve the warm commendation of this house and this country for their efforts. I have been particularly impressed by the efficient and competent and decisive way in which the services have quickly planned and executed each order and each change necessitated by changing events.

Especially notable has been the team work of the services working together with a fine tri-service co-operation and esprit de corps with only one objective in mind: to do a job of which Canada can be proud. While our activities thus far have not been on a particularly large scale, yet they do represent the largest single operation of recent years to be carried out on a tri-service basis. This has been to me one of the most encouraging aspects of this matter, as I am sure it must be to my predecessor and former colleague, the Honourable Brooke Claxton, who did so much to initiate the tri-service concept in our service regulations.

By good organization and by good planning, by getting the necessary troops and transports prepared and strategically located, it proved possible in a few days to do the following.

First, to airlift from Canada to Italy and Egypt several hundred air force and army personnel and a substantial tonnage of army supplies, aircraft spares and ground handling equipment.

Second, to establish an airlift from Italy to Egypt.

Supply—National Defence

Third, to establish an airlift from Canada to Italy to back up the Canadian contingent now serving in the United Nations emergency force.

Fourth, to establish just a few days ago, last Saturday, in Egypt, the first Canadian element of the emergency force that will serve there. At the moment there are just under 200 personnel at Abu Suweir Egypt.

This sort of achievement has been made possible by the policy, which has been energetically pursued over the past six years, of building sufficient forces in being, trained for immediate employment, and with the necessary equipment, transportation and ancillary services to bring them into effective action with a minimum of delay.

There has, I note, been some, though very little, I am glad to say, criticism of the changes in plans that from time to time have characterized some of our activities during these recent hectic days. Let me say that such changes were actuated only by a desire on our part to be ready at all times to act in accordance with the wishes of the United Nations. Every change that we made was made after prior approval by the United Nations, and every step that we took was similarly approved before it was made.

There was some criticism at one point in the debate with respect to whether we were working closely with General Burns, whether we knew what he had in mind, whether he knew what we could best supply and so on. When the force was bruted we immediately sent to New York three senior officers, specialists in their particular branches, and they are still in New York working with the United Nations staff. But we did more than that. When General Burns finally arrived in New York after considerable delay, we sent the chief of the general staff and the chief of the air staff to New York and they had long conferences with him on all problems confronting us. Therefore I think there is a meeting of minds as to what he has in view and as to what steps we should take, and I think the relationship is excellent and should be very helpful in the future.

There is one other thing. If in the face of unprecedented events, unprecedented confusion and very real danger to peace, the United Nations and the United Nations commander have seen fit from time to time, under these new and strange circumstances, to change their plans and their requests, let us try to realize their difficulties. Let us at least give them credit for the same earnestness of purpose that actuates our own actions and the same urgent desire to make progress in the great and vital work that we have undertaken together. On that phase of the matter I think I might very well quote from

81537—11

a recent editorial in the *Ottawa Journal*. It seems to me to sum up our position in this matter very closely. In an editorial that appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* on November 21 these words are found:

While it would have been satisfying to Canadian pride to have our pioneering suggestion for the peace-policy force followed by immediate Canadian battalion participation in that force, much more than the self esteem of individual nations is at stake. This is United Nations' business, not Canadian business or commonwealth or NATO business. It was not for Ottawa to set planes or ships or men in motion after she had made them available for the instructions of U.N. What Canada has undertaken to do, and must do, is serve in the way U.N. wishes.

May I now say a word about the expenditures which we will be looking at. Because of the defence expenditures and defence programs that it has so consistently supported and endorsed in recent years, this parliament can, I believe, feel gratified that when a testing time such as this has come Canada's armed forces have proved themselves to be decisive, efficient and effective.

With regard to the estimates now before you, as Canadian participation in the United Nations emergency force is to be provided from the regular navy, army and air force in being, the additional costs involved will be limited to those expenditures that may be required by reason of the employment of these forces in this particular role rather than in their normal peace-time role in Canada.

While some data are available from which these additional costs can be estimated, hon. members will realize that in large part they are at this time a matter of conjecture. In an effort, however, to have some appreciation of the possible costs involved in this operation I have had our officials concerned estimate, as best they could, the costs which might likely be incurred for the remainder of the fiscal year. These come all told to just under \$5 million. I have asked them to prepare a breakdown of these expenses for the three services, and with the consent of the committee I should like to table this document. I have prepared copies which can be distributed immediately to all members. It may be useful in considering the estimates.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the hon. member asking leave to table or have printed?

Mr. Campney: I do not think it is necessary to print it unless the house wishes to have that done.

Mr. Knowles: Let us have it in *Hansard*.

The Deputy Chairman: Is it the wish of the committee that this be printed in *Hansard*?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Campney: The breakdown is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE
ESTIMATED EXTRA COSTS OF CANADIAN PARTICIPATION
UNITED NATIONS EMERGENCY FORCE TO MARCH 31, 1957

ROYAL CANADIAN NAVY		\$
Pay and allowances.....	(3)	31,000
Travelling and removal expenses.....	(5)	115,000
Gasoline, fuel oil and lubricants for ships, aircraft and mechanical equipment.....	(12)	98,000
Food supplies.....	(12)	24,000
Naval stores.....	(12)	102,000
Repairs and upkeep of equipment.....	(17)	50,000
All other expenditures.....	(22)	75,000
		495,000
CANADIAN ARMY		
Civil salaries and wages.....	(1)	40,000
Pay and allowances.....	(3)	183,500
Travelling and removal expenses.....	(5)	572,500
Freight, express and cartage.....	(6)	290,000
Postage.....	(7)	4,000
Telephones, telegrams and other communication services.....	(8)	300,000
Printing of departmental reports and other publications.....	(9)	8,500
Office stationery, supplies, equipment and furnishings.....	(11)	18,000
Fuel for heating, cooking and power generating units.....	(12)	5,000
Gasoline, fuel oil and lubricants for mechanical equipment.....	(12)	70,000
Food supplies.....	(12)	299,000
Miscellaneous materials and supplies.....	(12)	51,500
Medical and dental supplies.....	(12)	76,500
Barrack, hospital and camp stores.....	(12)	18,000
Construction of buildings and works.....	(13)	80,000
Repairs and upkeep of buildings and works.....	(14)	35,000
Rentals of land, buildings and works.....	(15)	35,000
Major procurement of equipment—		
Signal and wireless equipment.....	(16)	1,500
Miscellaneous equipment.....	(16)	29,000
Repairs and upkeep of equipment.....	(17)	190,000
All other expenditures.....	(22)	276,000
		2,583,000
ROYAL CANADIAN AIR FORCE		
Civil salaries and wages.....	(1)	40,000
Pay and allowances.....	(3)	50,000
Travelling and removal expenses.....	(5)	250,000
Freight, express and cartage.....	(6)	10,000
Postage.....	(7)	2,000
Telephones, telegrams, cables and other communication services.....	(8)	30,000
Materials and supplies—		
Fuel for heating, cooking and power generating units.....	(12)	20,000
Aviation gasoline, oil and lubricants for aircraft.....	(12)	450,000
Food supplies.....	(12)	96,000
Acquisition of land, buildings and works.....	(13)	50,000
Repair and upkeep of buildings and works.....	(14)	25,000
Aircraft and engines.....	(16)	600,000
Repair and upkeep and equipment.....	(17)	150,000
Municipal and public utility services.....	(19)	10,000
All other expenditures.....	(22)	113,000
		\$1,896,000
Total all services.....		\$4,974,000

Supply—National Defence

Discussions are still taking place in the United Nations with respect to the payment of costs of the emergency force, and it is probable that some of these extra costs will be paid by the United Nations. In this event a supplementary contribution from Canada to the United Nations will undoubtedly be required but in any event the additional cost to Canada to the end of the current fiscal year should not, I feel, go beyond the figure I have mentioned. In the light of all the uncertainties surrounding the expenditures of defence moneys, there are no grounds at this time to seek authority for additional funds and that is why the appropriation now before the house, as I am sure hon. members will all realize, must be regarded as a purely nominal amount.

If, towards the end of the fiscal year, it is evident that as a result of the additional costs incurred in this operation the present defence appropriation will prove inadequate, a further supplementary estimate will be sought. I might add this word in regard to defence expenditures. To date they are running very close to our estimates so there is no significant margin of unused appropriations to be expected, but it is hoped that the margin will be sufficient to cover the additional expenditures incurred in connection with the emergency force.

Mr. Pearkes: Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the house, as has already been shown by our vote, believe it is desirable that Canada share with the other nations composing the United Nations in sending a force to the Middle East designed and prepared to prevent hostilities in that troubled part of the world and to carry out the general police duties to which it may be assigned. We share with the government the knowledge that the people of this country, as well as the peoples of other countries, crave urgently for peace, and it does seem that here is an opportunity for Canada as well as for the United Nations to take positive steps in order to secure and maintain peace. Surely that has been one of the roles of the Canadian defence forces throughout the years, and today our design is not for aggressive war but to preserve peace and to allow the citizens of this land to live in peace.

That may have been the general concept of the defence forces some years ago but it has broadened now since we have become a member of this great international organization, the United Nations, as well as a very active member of a smaller grouping of nations in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I am perfectly convinced that the only way in which peace can be maintained is by some form of collective action.

It is quite impossible in these days for any one country either to defend its own shores against an aggressor or to preserve the peace of the world by its own action. Therefore, realizing that collective action is necessary, we want to ensure that our contribution to that collective force is an effective and efficient one and that our troops will be taking part in an operation which has every reason to be successful.

I am also aware of the fact that the moral effect of a large number of nations sending their contingents for one particular purpose will, to a large extent, outbalance the lack of military cohesion which must exist, to a certain extent, in any international force. It would not be possible for Canada or for any other one country to send a properly balanced police force, with one country supplying the various arms which are required for that work, and to achieve the same moral effect as is to be achieved by a force composed of soldiers, sailors and airmen drawn from, as I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) said, 22 nations. I should like to stress the moral effect of this collective security force.

Bearing that fact in mind, may I say that it is essential that whatever force is sent into this disturbed area must be sufficiently strong to carry out the tasks which are assigned to it, and within the various components it must be a sufficiently balanced force so that it will be capable of carrying out the various roles it may be called upon to carry out. I refer to roles such as the reconnaissance of distant approaches and so forth. During the course of the debate, we have endeavoured to find out what is the composition of this international force. That information has been denied to us. We have not been told what countries are supplying the troops. We have not been told what type of troops these various countries are supplying. In the previous remarks that I made I pointed out that, owing to the nature of the terrain in which our Canadian troops are likely to be stationed, it is essential that those troops be provided with the means of reconnaissance, with great flexibility and mobility. It is not essential that Canada supply all those types of troops but it is essential that some country supply them. It may be Canada's role to provide the base in the form of H.M.C.S. *Magnificent*; it may be Canada's role to provide the transport aircraft and it may be Canada's accepted role to provide an infantry battalion. An infantry battalion will be required in the forces which are being assembled. However, we should like to know that the infantry battalion Canada is supplying will have the support that any infantry

Supply—National Defence

battalion may require in order to carry out the tasks which it may be called upon to perform.

With regard to the Queen's Own Rifles, may I say this. Because of my anxiety that these young Canadian soldiers should have reasonable protection, that they should be safeguarded when going into this dangerous country and serving in a terrain with which they are totally unfamiliar because they have had no training in desert warfare or even in how to live in desert country, I made certain inquiries. I was surprised that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) should have stooped to a low political trick in saying that I had made any derogatory remarks about the first battalion of the Queen's Own. The minister used words to the effect that he was surprised that I had made derogatory remarks.

Mr. Campney: He was.

Mr. Pearkes: These are the remarks that I made, and I am reading from page 80 of *Hansard*:

. . . to my personal knowledge, by something over 240 men and some of those men had been in the unit for only a few short months, less than six months.

Today the Minister of National Defence confirmed the fact that there were 240 men or thereabouts who had been sent from the second battalion in order to make up the first battalion. He also said that some of these men had only a few months of training. I never used the word "untrained". The minister put that word into my mouth. It is not contained anywhere in my speech.

Mr. Campney: I am quite content to let *Hansard* speak for itself.

Mr. Pearkes: I did say that some men had only a few months' training. Then I went on to point out that many of these men had not reached their nineteenth birthday, that they were eighteen years of age. I did not know—and I said I did not know—how many there were. I asked the minister how many there were under nineteen years of age. The minister gave that answer this afternoon and, if I heard him correctly, the number amounted to a total of 165. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that 165 youths under 19 years of age in a battalion totalling 952, according to the figure which the minister gave me the day before yesterday, is a high percentage of young soldiers with only a few months of training. I never said that the regiment was unfit. I have seen these men in training. They are fine, healthy young Canadians. We have not got any better anywhere in this country or in any country. But it is only fair to them that they have

[Mr. Pearkes.]

reasonable protection when they are being sent to a theatre in which conditions are so utterly different from those conditions under which they received their previous training. It was for that reason I spoke the other day and asked for assurances that everything was being done not only to safeguard our young men going into a different and dangerous operation, but also for their health.

I can only repeat that we believe Canada should make a contribution. I repeat that we believe it is essential that the force going to the Middle East should be sufficiently strong and well equipped so it has a reasonable chance to carry out, with a reasonable degree of safety, the very difficult assignment it has to perform. The difficulties which that force may experience cannot be emphasized too greatly. I understand, from what has been said here during this week, that even since we met the situation in the Middle East has deteriorated somewhat. There are indications that Russia has been sending more supplies into Syria, and perhaps also numbers of volunteers. While we devoutly hope that our Canadian contribution will only have to be employed in ordinary police duties, either in the desert or on the Suez canal, we must face up to the fact that if the situation deteriorates a great deal more then that force may have to fulfil its role as a military force and not a police force. I do not know whether it would be possible for the United Nations to withdraw those troops if the situation did deteriorate and active military operations became necessary. I do not think they could. Let us, therefore, take every precaution we possibly can to safeguard the lives of these young men who are sent out.

Another comment that I should like to make is this. This afternoon we were told that there would be a supply base and headquarters on the *Magnificent*. I believe the minister also said there would be a small base hospital. It seems to me rather unwise to place a hospital at headquarters, because if the situation did deteriorate then headquarters would be a very vulnerable point of attack. I would prefer to see the hospital placed elsewhere. Surely it would not be impossible to transport our casualties or injured from the immediate area, and to have a hospital established perhaps in Italy, Cyprus or some other place.

When I come to the question of expense, it is impossible for me to comment on the detailed expenditures. I have not even received the table yet, but my hon. friend on my left has a copy. I had to rise to speak before the page boy was able to deliver it to me. The estimates call for an expenditure of \$1. It is obvious that this is

Supply—National Defence

merely a nominal amount, and authorized funds being spent have already been voted for another purpose. As the minister has just indicated, he will be prepared to bring forward a supplementary estimate if that is necessary. He has given us an indication that the total amount to be spent on this contribution to the United Nations emergency force will be in the nature of some \$5 million. That would appear to be a reasonable amount for the work which is being undertaken.

I should like the minister to tell us something of the accommodation which these troops are likely to have. We have had the experience of finding that providing accommodation in Europe for our Canadian forces has run into very large sums of money. There was a term coined for it, I think "infrastructure". I do not know whether that is to be applied to the type of expenditures which are to be made for the housekeeping of troops in the Suez. No doubt that will be explained in further detail, but we should like to know something about the accommodation that is to be provided.

There is one further question I should like to ask. Would the minister clear up the point? Suppose the United Nations emergency force is ordered to take part in operations other than those to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs referred this morning. Does the government consider it has authority to send those troops to some other theatre in the Middle East, or would it require additional grants of money or official permission from parliament in order to do that? I understand that we are sending these troops as part of the United Nations emergency force, purely and solely for employment in Egypt and the Suez district.

Mr. Jones: I do not intend to take very long, but I think there is one important matter that has cropped up in the last hour or so. Listening to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich pleading for the young men who have joined the forces, probably married young men with families or at least some dependents, I was led to wonder whether or not they were protected. That is the question I wish to bring to the attention of the minister right now. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Winnipeg North this morning, he said that the conditions of service for those going to Egypt are similar to the conditions of service for those who are now in Germany. In other words there is no change in the responsibility of the government for servicemen in Germany or in Egypt.

I have a serious complaint to make, because I find that the Department of National

Defence regards a young man who has not been in the service for 10 years as no responsibility of theirs. If he has only three or four years of service he is not covered for death or accident outside of his duties. The minister knows of the case I have in mind. I have been trying to do something for three years for a widow and two children. This soldier happened to be killed in Germany; and because he was off duty at the time he was killed, up to date they have not received any recognition from either Germany or this government. If we are going to ask young men with responsibilities to go overseas to do our work in Egypt where conditions may be—and I can quite believe it—much tougher than they are in West Germany, we should see that they are adequately protected.

As I pointed out, I believe these men are not adequately protected unless they have been in the service for 10 years, and very few men who have been in the service for 10 years will be going to Egypt. Therefore I suggest that those soldiers with less than 10 years' service who are going overseas should have an insurance policy taken out immediately on their lives covering death, accident, disability or anything else. I am not going to suggest the value of the policy, but it should be at least \$10,000 or \$20,000; otherwise those men who are going overseas to do our work are going over there under false pretenses. They are not covered or protected. The answer given by the minister does not fill the bill, because I can prove that it did not fill the bill in the last three years since to my mind it failed to carry out Canada's obligations to the men who went to Germany.

I hold in my hand a resolution of a Canadian Legion branch in British Columbia, which passed it as the result of bitter and disillusioning experience already with cases in Germany to which I referred. This resolution was passed by the Kelowna branch of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League on November 20 of this year. The resolution reads:

Be it resolved that this branch of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League go on record in asking legislation be immediately implemented to the effect that all service personnel who are sent for duty in the Middle East be insured by the government of Canada, so that in the case of death by accident or the loss of limbs or any injury, whether suffered by the result of enemy action, or civilian carelessness, their families may be supplemented by the awarding of sufficient pension to allow the wife, sons and/or daughters to live comfortably regardless of length of service.

I bring that to the attention of the minister for his consideration. It is the least we can do when we ask these men to go out to Egypt to undertake what is probably a very unpleasant duty, but at our behest and it is in our interest. The least we can do is

Supply—National Defence

see that they and their families are amply protected. I pass it on to the minister for his consideration.

Mr. Macdonnell: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks, but I would prefer to defer them if the minister wishes to answer any of the questions that have been raised.

Mr. Campney: One question was raised by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. He asked as to the composition of the United Nations emergency force. Of course we must all realize that this force is being built up gradually, and I can only give him its status as of now. It is not the complete force, but it may be of interest to him and other hon. members as well.

The elements so far are these: An air transport squadron from Canada, which I have already mentioned; service troops, engineers, signals and other specialized troops from Canada, which I have also already mentioned; a transport squadron from Sweden; ambulance company from Norway; supply platoons for handling rations, etc., from India; half a battalion from Colombia; half a battalion from Denmark; a similar number from Norway, which are combined into one battalion; half a battalion from Finland and half a battalion from Sweden, which are also combined into a battalion; a full battalion from India; and mechanized reconnaissance platoons and supporting elements from Yugoslavia, a total of 4,367. I think a few of the troops I have mentioned from India are in transit but have not yet arrived. That is as near as we can get the figures up to date.

Mr. Knowles: I have a supplementary question. Perhaps either one of the ministers might also at this point answer one of the other questions put by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. I think we all know from what the Prime Minister said in 1950 what the answer is, but I believe it would be well to have it on the record; namely, that if the government finds it necessary to commit troops in that area for any other purpose than that set out in the present order in council, another order in council will have to be issued and, according to section 33 of the National Defence Act, parliament will have to be called again. I think it might be well just to have that assurance made clear in the manner in which the Prime Minister made it in 1950. At the same time I feel that the government should have our assurance—and we of this group feel that way—that if the United Nations does call for further commitments for international police action while parliament would have to meet

[Mr. Jones.]

according to law, it would be prepared to support such further action.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the present force is operating under a United Nations resolution designed to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in Egypt. I had better read the exact words of the order in council:

Authority is hereby given for the maintenance on active service of officers and men of the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force, not exceeding 2,500 in number at any one time, as a part of or in immediate support of an emergency international force organized by the United Nations to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East.

Now, if hostilities in the Middle East break out again or spread within the meaning of that order in council the government, under that order in council, would be authorized to use troops that Canada sent up to that number to supervise and secure the cessation of hostilities in some other part of the Middle East; but hostilities would have to cease first. That would not apply, of course, to the use of this force as a police force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in other areas except the Middle East.

Mr. Winch: That will include Jordan and Syria?

Mr. Pearson: Yes, but there have been no hostilities.

Mr. Winch: But if they do break out?

Mr. Pearson: If there were hostilities, say, between Jordan and Israel, and if the United Nations intervened and managed to bring about a cessation of those hostilities and the police force was required to supervise and secure the cessation of those hostilities, then this force could be used; but this force could not be used, as I understand it, under the order in council or under the United Nations resolution to bring about the cessation of hostilities itself.

Mr. Parkes: Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs give us a more detailed definition of the Middle East? I was under the impression from the remarks he made earlier that this force was confined purely to police work along the boundary of Israel and Egypt and along the Suez. Now he has extended it to cover some rather vague terms, the Middle East.

Mr. Pearson: Well, Mr. Chairman, the functions of the United Nations force—I am not now talking about the order in council—as agreed to in the United Nations resolution, are specifically limited to the cessation of hostilities between Israel, the United Kingdom and France on the one hand and Egypt

Supply—National Defence

on the other, and the United Nations resolution itself does not cover any area other than that which has already been the scene of hostilities.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I think this might be the appropriate time for me to repeat the request I made in speaking in the general debate, as to whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs could give us anything further in regard to the total number which it is envisaged will be employed in this police force.

The Minister of National Defence has told us that to date there are about 4,000 people or some figure in that neighbourhood who have been promised. There have been various figures quoted in newspaper reports. The last one I saw in yesterday's or this morning's newspaper was 6,000. Mr. Hammarskjöld said they were envisaging 6,000 people. Perhaps at this time the minister would have information as to what the total force to be employed there is envisaged to be and how they are going to be used.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, the only information I have from the United Nations is that the secretary general and the commanding officer of the force do envisage an increase of the force up to 6,000 within a short period of time, that already there have been contributions offered to the force which would make possible that increase shortly. Whether it should be later increased to 8,000, 10,000 or even more will depend on the duties and the functions of the force after they have been ascertained in the light of the experience they will acquire while they are there. I am afraid that is all I can say at the present time, but there is no limit in the United Nations resolution as to what the force might be if it were required.

Mr. Harkness: Does that 6,000 include the 2,400 or 2,500 which Canada has committed, or is that only the Canadian contingent which is already there? In other words, is it exclusive of the Queen's Own?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, this morning I asked the United Nations secretary general, or rather his executive assistant because I was not able to get the secretary general, whether this figure I had seen in the telegram did envisage a further contribution from Canada within that period about which he was talking, within the next week or two, to build it up to 6,000, and I was assured that it did.

Mr. Low: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister while he is replying to this particular question, if it were found that

more than 6,000 were required to do the job who would make the decision about increasing the number?

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, that is one of the questions it is difficult to answer categorically, and I know it must be unsatisfactory to hon. members of the house not to get categorical answers to questions of this kind. I also know hon. members appreciate that not only has there not been very much time to work out the answers but there has not been very much time even in which to work out some of the questions.

As it is at present envisaged the secretary general himself would receive from the commanding officer of the force a request for additional formations to do the job which the United Nations has asked him to do. If that which he had was not sufficient then the secretary general in the first instance would take up the request with the assembly advisory committee which was set up for the purpose of advising him. If the request for additional troops was not a very large one it might very well be possible to meet that request without any further steps being taken by applying to one or another of the countries that had indicated a desire to help but whose contributions had not been called for, or it might be possible to ask some other country. If it were a substantial increase it might be necessary to come back to the full assembly and ask for authority to increase the force by a certain number.

Mr. Low: Does the minister know whether the emergency force will occupy the whole of the canal zone, or is there some limitation already placed on the territory into which it will go?

Mr. Pearson: There has been no decision reached, Mr. Chairman. That will have to be decided in the light of the circumstances. As I understand it there has been no actual limitation on the area which the force would occupy to carry out the functions that have been allocated to it.

Mr. Michener: On the same subject of the constitution of the force, I understand there is a limitation in that the major powers are not free to serve on the force; that is, the United States—well, I am not sure about the United States—

An hon. Member: Yes, all four.

Mr. Michener: —but Russia, Great Britain and France. Perhaps the minister could say what specific limitation there is as to who may be associated with our troops in this force, whether there is any power to reject any force that is offered and, if so, who has

Supply—National Defence

the power of rejection. In that case would it have to go to the assembly or could it be handled by the secretary general. I do not want to ask questions which are not capable of being answered, but I would like the minister to tell us how definite the arrangements are at the present time. I think it is important for the house to know just what troops our forces may be serving with and who has the say as to what will be the constitution of the force.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, as the hon. member has pointed out there is, of course, a very important limitation placed on this force by the exclusion of the permanent members of the security council. That is indeed a limitation; but even with that exclusion there is a great deal of the world left from which to draw from the governments of the members of the United Nations who wish to make additional contributions. There is no other limitation in the offer of contributions to the United Nations for this purpose. Twenty-three governments have made offers up to the present time, and I think eight of these have been taken up. The offers are made to the secretary general and he has not refused any. He has accepted certain offers and he will draw on the others as he requires and as he thinks it is desirable to do so. He has, however, been given one general instruction by the assembly in this resolution, that his force should be to the maximum extent possible a balanced force.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Macdonnell: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Harkness: Could I ask a supplementary question. I am not quite clear from the answer the minister gave exactly what Canada's contribution is going to be in the next week or two. The minister said that the 6,000 men who are envisaged as constituting this force within the next week or within a comparatively short period of time—I do not know exactly what length of time he mentioned—would include the 2,400 Canadians who have been committed to this task by the Canadian government. I take that to mean the Queen's Own are included in this 6,000 who will be committed within a week or two weeks or whatever length of time it was the minister mentioned.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, I cannot say exactly whether in the secretary general's calculations for an increase of say 1,500 or 2,000 in the next few weeks he has in mind the whole of the Queen's Own. I have been informed that he has in mind a further drawing on Canadian troops to make up the force to the figure he has in mind now for immediate use; and whether that will include

[Mr. Michener.]

the use of all the Queen's Own I cannot say. I do know, however, and my hon. friend the Minister of National Defence will bear me out in this, that within the last 48 hours we have had another request from the secretary general passed on to him by the commanding officer for additional signal troops from Canada, and we are not quite sure whether we can fit that in within the Queen's Own and within the maximum of 2,500. That is what we are looking into at the moment.

Mr. Harkness: The situation is essentially this, that as far as the Queen's Own are concerned you are still not in a position to know whether or not they are going to be employed?

Mr. Pearson: They are standing by, Mr. Chairman, at the call of the secretary general and the commanding officer.

Mr. Macdonnell: Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Chairman. I began to think if I was too good natured I might not get on all afternoon.

We have voted along with the rest of the house for this emergency force, Mr. Chairman, and speaking for myself I am reminded of the feelings I had when I attended the United Nations some three years ago. When I came back I had two reactions. First of all, I felt I had never seen such frustration in my life. In the second place, I felt that if the United Nations did not exist already it should be invented immediately so as to keep people together, in the hope that while they are talking they will not be taking up arms against each other.

I hope no one will think I am at all facetious in dealing with this terribly serious situation. I would use an argument which I often used away back in the days of the league of nations. The same argument can be used today. When I hear people say that the United Nations is doing nothing at all, that it has never done anything, that it should be got rid of, my mind goes back to a famous cartoon during the first world war and which perhaps is not wholly inapplicable to the case today. This cartoon showed two men sitting in a deep shell hole. It was not a very comfortable shell hole because there was a lot of water in it. Shells were bursting all around and evidently the men were having quite a controversy. Then at last one of them said, "If you knows of a better 'ole, go to it".

As I say, I do not want anyone to think that I am being facetious about a dreadfully serious matter. I do feel and have always felt that we should do our best to keep the United Nations together. We should try never to become cynical about it. We should always hope, even when that hope seems hardest to

Supply—National Defence

have, that it will continue. However, we must face the fact that people are having a great searching of hearts at this moment regarding this emergency force. An illustration was given of the criminal who was allowed to prescribe his own jailer and how long he would stay in jail and what he would do while there. I am not a bit surprised that people have that feeling in the face of the news reports of the last two weeks indicating what Mr. Nasser would have and what he would not have. I do not think the minister has been completely successful in satisfying us on this point. For myself I am still doubtful, and I suggest to the minister that it might be helpful to all concerned if he could give us a little more of the constitutional background, so to speak, of this force and what the assembly has power to do and what it has not power to do.

I understand that there is a difference between the force of 1950 which was set up by the security council and this one. I understand that this is a vastly different type of force. I understand that it has been set up under a resolution which operates only when all the parties, including the policed party, are in agreement. If that is so then I suggest we should know it, so we will not be expecting things of this force which it cannot do. Up to the moment it has perplexed me, and I think it has perplexed a number of other people.

There is just one other thing I wish to say. I want to refer to the imaginative suggestion made by my colleague the hon. member for Prince Albert in his speech today, when he suggested that we needed to do two things. First, we needed to pull the commonwealth together and, second, we needed to heal the breach between the United States and the commonwealth. I think we will all agree that those are two overwhelming problems which face us now. I should like to suggest two things to the minister, and they are not new.

I should like to suggest that although it may sound like a rather large order for one of our colleagues sitting here in the Canadian House of Commons to suggest that he should take the initiative, which would be a tremendous initiative, nevertheless I feel that Canada is in a very special position to do that. We have talked about ourselves, sometimes tiresomely, as being a bridge. I think Churchill used that term and I believe he was technically wrong. At any rate we do occupy a unique position in between these two nations. We talk the language of both Britain and the United States; we talk it both literally and metaphorically. They both know

us; they both like and respect us. Therefore I suggest to the minister that a great deal can be done.

I want to be frank with the minister. I feel that all of us in this house recognize the position he has made for us at the United Nations. He has been there a long time and has got to know everybody. I believe he has a tremendous influence. But like the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, I have always been just a little concerned as to where the minister stands with regard to the commonwealth. We are a little concerned whether he has been able to feature it, so to speak; whether he has been able to bring it into the forefront. I remember looking at a book written by the minister; I believe it was called "Democracy in Action". It consisted of a series of six lectures delivered at Princeton University. I remember a reviewer pointing out that he could hardly find the word "commonwealth" mentioned in the book. I hope I am not exaggerating, but—

Mr. Pearson: There is a chapter on it.

Mr. Macdonnell: That was the impression left on the reviewer, and so far as my reading of the book was concerned it was the impression left on me. I feel the minister is keen about the commonwealth. But I think a lot of people in this country feel that perhaps he has not been able to give it the prominence in his speeches he would have liked. At any rate, without labouring the point further I just wish to go back to what I said at the outset and to add that the imaginative suggestion of the hon. member for Prince Albert is not airy, fairly nonsense. I think it is practical, and I believe there is no better source from which a move to that end could come than Canada and the Canadian minister of external affairs.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, I have not spoken yet in this debate and I shall take only a few minutes. What I have to say will be based on the statement made by the hon. member who has just spoken who said that we needed frankness. They have not been frank during this last week. We are dealing with only two issues. The first is whether we are prepared to support the action of the Canadian government in connection with the establishment of an emergency force, and the second is the matter of providing money for the relief of Hungarian refugees. We have been dealing with these matters from Monday up to the present time, when they could have been settled in two hours. In my estimation the time since Monday has been spent by the official opposition for the purposes of a Conservative convention and an election next June.

Supply—National Defence

If you have an emergency situation and must reach a decision during a critical time like this—I am a C.C.F.'er, not a Liberal—I do not think we should be asking for a breakdown of the money that is to be spent on freight, express, postage, telephones and telegrams. As members of parliament I think we would be stupid if we expected that kind of thing during a special session called to make emergency decisions.

As I said, I have not spoken before and intend to speak for only two or three minutes. All my years in politics have been spent in opposition, both in British Columbia and here. I believe there are times when we should forget completely our party and politics and be concerned only with decisions. This is such a time. There are occasions when responsibility must rest with the government. During my 23 years in opposition I have found myself in opposition to Liberals more than once, but on this occasion I am prepared to say I think Canada through the minister of external affairs has made a contribution which has meant a great deal to the world and to the preservation of the commonwealth.

We are wrong in this House of Commons to hold up the house on questions such as whether it is to be the Queen's Own Rifles, the Seaforth Highlanders or anybody else that is to go over to Egypt, or how they are to be equipped. The government has the responsibility and if it fails it will be charged in this house. But I say that because it has made the decision it is its responsibility. We have been discussing telephone charges and everything else on this sheet, and I say it is ridiculous and stupid. I hope that now we will stick strictly to the principle. Do we believe in the force? Yes. Do we believe in Hungarian aid? Yes. Then let us vote for these things and get on right now.

Mr. Quelch: I wonder whether the Minister of National Defence could clarify the point raised by the hon. member for Okanagan Boundary regarding the degree to which these men are covered by insurance. I understand they are not covered by the general insurance principle of the Pension Act. On the other hand, if these men suffer any form of disability while on duty they will be covered. But what about the man who may be off duty, who may perhaps be sight-seeing and some friendly little Arab, we will say, sticks a knife in his back or drops a bomb on him? What is the situation then? Is he covered?

Mr. Campney: The general principle, and I do not think it has ever been varied, is that when service people are on duty—and

[Mr. Winch.]

there is always a question of fact in each case—they are covered and if they are not on duty they are just like anyone else employed in civilian life who is off duty, meets with an accident, gets into trouble or has an accident with his car. I do not think you should consider the liability in the case of the soldier who is off duty as being any different from that of any other person.

Mr. Quelch: Surely that is a ridiculous suggestion. Surely you are not going to say that when you send a man into a situation like that existing in Egypt at the present time he is in exactly the same position as if he is wandering down a street in Canada. It is an entirely different situation. Just because a man may not actually be on duty surely is no reason to say that if one of the members of the Arab army or even an Israeli happens to stick a knife in his back there is no greater hazard than if he is walking down a street in Montreal. Surely that man should be covered fully the whole time he is there so far as any action by either the Arab army or the Israeli army is concerned. I can quite understand that if the soldier were run over by a civilian car there perhaps might be some responsibility on the part of the soldier because he was not more careful, but surely he should be covered if he suffers any disability as the result of any action of a member of the Arab army or the Jewish army.

Mr. Campney: You are dealing with incidents involving members of other forces. In that case the soldier would be taken care of. Certainly we have never had any difficulties, except in the very occasional case such as mentioned by the hon. member who spoke earlier, which has not been amicably adjusted. You have to consider the facts in all these cases. You just cannot say that everybody is covered or is not covered, but I have never been accused in our department of being unreasonable with regard to these cases, and I would be glad to look into the situation as to the police force. I presume the United Nations will be looking into it too, but I do not want to commit myself to a general principle in the face of conditions that are not yet clarified.

Mr. Low: Would the United Nations not have some responsibility in this case? I should like to hear from the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Mr. Pearson: They are looking into their responsibility as an organization now in respect of this international police force,

Supply—National Defence

concerning which there is no precedent inside the United Nations or outside.

Mr. Blair: I should like to get some information from the Minister of National Defence about the personnel of this police force going from Canada. In his discussion with the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich he said that 165 members of the Queen's Own were in the 18-year old class. I think the number of Queen's Own personnel concerned is 952. Therefore we have 165 out of 952, which is a percentage of 17.3. I am disturbed by this percentage of 17.3. In previous wars in which we have had experience our troops were in a climate somewhat the same as that of Canada. The first two wars were in Europe, but conditions in desert warfare and so on are going to be entirely different.

There is no doubt, and let me be clear on this, that these 18-year olds will be brave, bold, venturesome and enthusiastic, but I think this is a very high percentage of 18-year olds. They compose almost one-fifth of the number of the battalion. I say I find that somewhat disturbing.

I should also like to obtain some information from the minister as to the arrangements to look after these young Canadians. Apparently the *Magnificent* is going to serve as a base. Just what accommodation will there be on the *Magnificent* in their so-called sick bay? These men should have a base hospital. An hon. member mentioned that the establishment of a small base hospital next to headquarters is not a good thing. I fully agree with that. In the first war we saw something of what happened in that regard, and I think the minister has some knowledge of that event.

But let us assume there is a sick bay on the *Magnificent* and a small base hospital. You are going to have to take your convalescents out of there or the hospital will be full. Is there any hospital ship accommodation? Is there any way they can be moved to the mainland for convalescence in Cyprus, Crete or some place like that? We want to be sure that these young Canadians are going to get the very best of accommodation.

I should like to suggest to the minister that this expeditionary force should be hand-picked physically. Let the medical officers go over the men and go over them again. If there are any tests that can show a man's stability or weaknesses, let those tests be used. I think it will pay dividends in the long run. I am anxious that this force be one of the best forces Canada can send because it is representing Canada, and I say again that I am disturbed that 17.3 per cent

of the Queen's Own are 18-year olds. I should like the minister to make a statement on this matter.

Mr. Campney: If I may say so, there is some confusion with regard to the treatment of persons who may become ill. When a contribution to the force from Canada was first envisaged nothing was known with respect to whether there were any medical facilities or base facilities to treat people who might become ill. The *Magnificent* was selected as a base temporarily because there were no such facilities so far as we knew available. In equipping the *Magnificent* we put in a small hospital as a temporary expedient.

I am advised—and this will answer the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich—that the troops are being very well looked after so far at Abu Suweir, and they have good quarters at Capodichino near Naples. The Norwegians are running a base hospital, and I am sure that the medical facilities that will be available on land will be adequate when the time comes when they are needed.

As to the number of younger soldiers, I am really not perturbed about that because we do try to get healthy young men who will make a career in the army. I can assure the hon. member they are very carefully looked after medically and in every other way, and that the medical examinations that have taken place are very thorough. I was in Egypt for six months in the first world war when I was not out of my teens. I certainly was looked after and I thrived on it.

Mr. Blair: You were not doing footwork; you were in the hospital.

Mr. Campney: I was doing a lot of footwork.

Mr. Blair: Yes, in the hospital.

Mr. Campney: In hospital and out of hospital. But seriously speaking, I agree with the hon. member that we must pay particular attention to health in that area. I think that is being very carefully looked after, and I am sure the hospitals will be land-based.

I might answer another question raised yesterday by the hon. member for Winnipeg North, I believe, regarding tropical clothing. We have made investigations into that matter, and I am assured that for the winter months the ordinary dress they are now wearing is the proper dress for troops in the Egyptian area. I might also say that the chief of the general staff advised me this morning that he had a report from the commander of the Canadian forces with regard to the situation in which the troops find themselves in Egypt, and that the amenities such as

Supply—National Defence

movies, sport facilities and other matters are being very well looked after now. He told me there were no complaints and seemed to be no difficulties. We hope to keep it that way. I agree entirely that the welfare of the troops is just as important on police duty as it is on any other type of duty when the men are away from home.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Chairman, I should like to pursue this discussion we had a moment ago with regard to the insurance coverage for the members of this special force. I should like to ask the minister a couple of questions on that subject. The first one is this. Under the present circumstances do the line insurance policies have in them a war clause which would bar the soldier from obtaining benefits if he were on foreign soil on what might be considered to be active service? I know that during the last war a great many of the insurance policies did not apply when the soldiers were overseas or outside of Canada anywhere, whether or not they were actually on active service.

That being the case, if it is true today I do not think the minister's statement applies, namely that a soldier in the special force should be treated in the same way as any other soldier; because the soldiers here in Canada, if they encounter a fatal accident or a disabling accident, can draw on an ordinary line accident or life policy. But if the war clause applies on a civilian insurance policy, these boys who are in Egypt may not be able to qualify for a pension or for an insurance payment in the event of death.

I would ask the minister whether or not that coverage does apply. Second, if it does not—and something was mentioned a few moments ago about the United Nations considering taking over the responsibilities—I would ask if either one of the ministers involved would press very strongly that the United Nations accept responsibility in the event of death or mutilation by accident. Third, I would urge upon the minister very strongly that if action is not taken by the United Nations, he reconsider his stand and make sure that these fellows are fully covered by some sort of accident or death policy.

Mr. Campney: Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad indeed to look into the situation, both from the point of view of our department and from the point of view of the United Nations. On the question of private insurance policies, whether or not they carry a war clause depends on the company policy of the company concerned. I have had both in my time. However, I think the point which has been raised is worthy of consideration, and I shall be glad to look into it.

[Mr. Campney.]

Mr. McIvor: I have listened closely to all the speeches in the debate delivered in English and I have read, as far as I can, all the speeches delivered in French. I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs can go back tonight or tomorrow morning feeling that all sides of this house are backing him up in doing his duty in support of the United Nations. As I read the reports it came to me that Egypt is doing the same old trick the old Pharaoh did when he was forced to allow Israel to walk into freedom. He changed his mind. The ancient enemy of Israel is now bobbing his head up again in order to try to wipe Israel off the earth. They will never be able to do it. It is practically something like that which has happened in Hungary. The devil appeared in another form committing murder. I am proud of those who have spoken in support of the United Nations in stopping this sort of thing. I am convinced that the United Nations is the instrument that is going to do the job. I feel sure that the minister can go back feeling that he has the support of this house and the people of Canada in doing his duty.

Mr. Michener: As the hon. member who last spoke has said, we have unanimously approved the principle of this experiment in idealism, if I may call it that, or this venture which is breaking new ground. It seems to me that, as it has been explained, it depends basically on the consent of the parties involved, namely the consent of Britain, the consent of France, the consent of Israel, and the consent of Egypt. The proportions of the force which is being sent and of which our Canadian troops will form a part are such that they will be largely outnumbered by the military forces now in that area. The army of Israel is large and well equipped, and Egypt has substantial forces and substantial equipment. Hence this force is, as I see it, idealistic in the sense that it is adding some material force to moral opinion as expressed in the United Nations. It does not seem to be constituted to do much more.

I appreciate that it is a novel experiment. It is new. There is a great deal of uncertainty, and we are going into it with the knowledge that there is uncertainty. It may turn out well or it may not turn out well. It may turn out very badly. What we are trying to do in approving the estimates is to get as much information as we can at this time on the legal basis for this action and on the material factors that will exist where the force is constituted there.

As I understand it—and I should like either of the ministers to correct me if I am wrong—there is nothing in the charter

Supply—National Defence

of the United Nations under which this force is acting. There are in the charter provisions by which the United Nations can organize, mobilize and direct a military operation under the security council. But, as I understand it, this force is in no sense under the direction of the security council. In fact I think it is fairly certain that the security council would not authorize this action. It is under the direction of the assembly.

I am also informed that it is under the authority basically of a resolution of 1950, namely a resolution called the uniting for peace resolution. If the minister has not already, in the brief periods when I have been out of the house during the debate, given particulars with regard to that matter, I should be greatly interested, as I think would other hon. members, in knowing just what authority there is in this resolution to set up this force and how it will operate.

Some specific points which come to my mind as to its operation are these. It will be under the general direction of the assembly, as I understand it, and there is that resolution which lays down its terms of reference. It is to secure and to supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East. At least those are the terms in the order in council; and I take it that they have been translated from the resolution of the assembly. That is under the general direction of the assembly. The officer of the assembly is the general secretary, Mr. Hammarskjöld; and he is also the officer of the security council. He is the general officer of the United Nations. I do not suppose one could envisage a difference of opinion between the assembly and the security council and contradictory commands to Mr. Hammarskjöld, but in any event he is the agent through whom the assembly must work. The chain of command, as I see it, will go to the commander of the forces as appointed, namely our Canadian General Burns.

What I want to know from the Minister of National Defence is whether he retains any control over these forces after they have been committed. What is the chain of command after these troops have been committed? The order in council, if I may draw attention to it, is a little equivocal in its expression. It says:

... not exceeding 2,500 in number at any one time, as part of or in immediate support of, an emergency international force . . .

Perhaps the minister can tell us whether the force is committed as part of this international emergency force or whether it is in support of that force and remains under Canadian command to some extent, or whether it comes entirely under the command

of General Burns as the commanding officer of the general assembly? In any event I think the chain of command would be of interest because, if the government of Canada changed its mind about the success of this experiment and wished to withdraw, is it under any obligation or committal not to change its mind? In other words, are these forces committed entirely for the purpose specified in the order?

I appreciate that a small force of this kind can perform only a limited function. Many of us have said in this debate that we are hopeful that this is the beginning of a general settlement of the problem in that area. Certainly this force cannot be expected to do many of the things that have to be done in that area, and they are quite substantial. If the securing of the cessation of hostilities involves, first, the withdrawal of British and French forces from that area, then that is part of this forces' objectives; to see that those forces are withdrawn in accordance with the consent given by their country. It may involve the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, and that may come readily or it may come with a good deal of hesitation. What it involves with respect to the Egyptian forces it is rather difficult to see. I suppose it might involve letting them back into the Sinai peninsula, but that is not something that is at all clear.

If one gets to the point where the agreement on the cessation of hostilities is signed and carried out and this force is there, will it occupy the works and banks of the Suez canal and stand there in occupation pending political action by the assembly to deal with two very serious problems? One of these problems would be the settlement of the boundaries in the almost age-long dispute between Israel and Egypt, and the other would be some settlement of the problem of the Suez canal.

We are hopeful that this is a beginning in the direction of a settlement of these general questions. I appreciate that the house is only being asked to authorize funds to provide forces for the limited purpose of securing the cessation of hostilities. If more is required parliament will soon be in session again. In any event the government has authority, I assume, particularly under the National Defence Act, to do what we all hope can be done, if it can be done effectively; that is, to secure a much more general objective than the limited one for which this force is now being authorized.

I have asked rather a lot of questions and I have put a number of propositions. I do feel that in voting these funds we ought to

Supply—National Defence

have as much information as we can secure concerning the legal basis on which this action rests, the chain of command, how far this operation has been forecast, and how the government considers that it is likely to operate.

Mr. Pearson: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, I am the last man in the committee who would desire to postpone action on this matter. Nevertheless, a good many questions have been asked of me, not only since we have been in committee but also some very important questions by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat. During the earlier discussion of this subject I was asked to enlighten the house in respect to several matters. One matter was the reason we had not previously taken action in regard to a United Nations police force in this particular area. Another was—and this has been brought up again by the hon. member for Greenwood—the relationship of our action to commonwealth unity. There were other important questions that were put to me at that time, and some have been put to me this afternoon, so I think I should crave the indulgence of the committee for a few minutes while I try to deal with these questions.

It was suggested this morning that we have not given parliament enough information in regard to recent United Nations actions or our policy in regard to United Nations actions in the past. So far as the first aspect of this question is concerned we have tried, I think, at this emergency session to deal with all the questions involved. There are matters upon which we have not been able to exchange information on a confidential basis with some of our friends opposite. I agree that in a time of emergency and crisis there should be the greatest possible exchange of information between the government and opposition leaders. It is a precedent that has been followed at times in the past, and it is a good one. If it has not been done on this occasion, the committee will understand that developments have moved very fast and we have been in the house almost constantly since the house was called.

I would point out, however, that there are observers in the Canadian delegation to the United Nations from all parts of this house. They sit in on our delegation meetings, and we hope they feel they are full members of the delegation in regard to the exchange of information. We do not, in our delegation meetings, hold anything back, I assure you, because of the fact that there are members of parliament from all parties. We are glad to have them there. I think the delegates have learned from these meetings practically

everything we were able to learn about developments at the assembly. Then, also, in regard to general information on these matters the committee on external affairs met for many days during last spring and early summer, when we had an opportunity of going over the whole question of the development of policy in regard to the Middle East.

The hon. member for Prince Albert asked particularly for enlightenment, as he put it, in regard to our previous attitude toward a United Nations emergency force for this particular area. I think he is satisfied with what I said earlier about our general attitude toward putting forces under the United Nations for general purposes and the difficulty of doing that under the security council organization as it is at present. I am sorry he is not able to be here this afternoon to decide whether or not what I am going to say about this matter is enlightenment. I would point out, and I have made a pretty careful survey of our record in this regard, that it was as early as 1953 that we discussed, with representatives of the United Kingdom government in the course of our diplomatic exchange of views, the possibility of replacing the truce supervisory organization in the Palestine area with a police force which would have greater powers, and greater authority, and be able to do things which the truce organization could not possibly do, thereby making the situation easier and making war more difficult.

At that time, in 1953, the matter also came up, though not in public discussion at the general assembly of the United Nations. We had previous discussions with the British and took the matter up with the secretary general, who had himself been considering it. We were told at that time that in his opinion it would not be a desirable move to make publicly at the United Nations general assembly.

That was in 1953. Then later, in 1955, when I happened to be in Cairo, I discussed this question with General Burns who came over from Jerusalem to see me, and we went over the question of the advisability of making a proposal at the next assembly—that would have been the assembly we are at now—for a United Nations force to patrol the boundary not only between Egypt and Israel, but between Jordan and Syria and Lebanon and Israel. On my return to Ottawa we brought this question up again when Sir Anthony Eden and Mr. Selwyn Lloyd visited us here, I think in January, 1956. We also took the question up in Paris with the French government. At that time the governments which I have mentioned, the British government and the French government, did not feel that this was a practicable proposition.

Supply—National Defence

One reason they did not feel that way was that they themselves had been discussing it with the United States and the United States was hesitant about the wisdom at that time of trying to introduce a police force on the borders, with a demilitarized zone. Behind all this hesitation and objection, if you like, was the fact that—and this is quite contrary to what the hon. member for Prince Albert said this morning; I think he must have been misinformed on this matter—neither the government of Israel nor the government of any one of the Arab states was in favour of that kind of force. I can assure the committee we have received arguments from the government of Israel, which indicate why they did not favour that kind of force.

What it was thought might be done at that time was to increase the truce observation organization. That was done, and Canada did send additional officers to it. It was with that background that the discussion was introduced in the house here last January or February—I forget the exact date—by the hon. member for Prince Albert, and it was with that background that I expressed some hesitation as to whether it was a wise move to make at that time. But I did mention the matter again in the committee on external affairs when I was making my opening statement which, as any hon. members who are members of that committee know, is designed for the purpose of introducing matters for later and full consideration by the committee. I said at that time, on April 17, 1956:

The idea of an international force for Palestine—which a few weeks ago got a good deal of attention—

I was referring to the debate in the house. —does not appear now to be regarded on either side, the Jewish side or the Arab side, or by the others most concerned—

I meant the United Kingdom, the United States and the French governments, —as practicable.

That was my statement to the committee, and no reference was made by any member of the committee to that matter subsequently. Therefore I assumed that they accepted that statement of the impracticability of this move at that time.

As I think I said on another occasion, what the three countries most concerned, the United Kingdom, the United States and France, apart from Israel and the Arab states, desired to do was to use the tripartite agreement for the purpose of preventing an outbreak in that area. And it is one of the unhappy aspects of this tragedy that this agreement fell by the wayside in the events of last summer.

So much, then, for the origin of the idea of the United Nations force. There was an occasion, however, a few weeks ago, when a resolution of this kind, under the circumstances which then existed, could be taken up and made effective by the United Nations assembly, and that was done. But I would point out to my hon. friends opposite who have all, I think, without exception expressed themselves as being in favour of the idea of a United Nations force and even felt that it should have been in existence long before this crisis, that if the Canadian delegation had taken the action at the first meeting of the United Nations special assembly which some of them have suggested we should have taken, to support the United Kingdom and France in their efforts to prevent the consideration of this question at the United Nations assembly in that action, and if that support and that of other members of the assembly had been effective, there could have been no consideration of any United Nations force at this time, or possibly at any other time in the future.

I think that is a valid point to make, because when the Canadian delegation voted against the United Kingdom and France on that first measure before the assembly I was charged by some hon. members opposite as lining up with Russia and the United States. But if we had not defeated that move we would never have been able to introduce a resolution for a United Nations force, and when that resolution was first introduced it got—

Mr. Brooks: Did not Great Britain and France ask for a United Nations force?

Mr. Pearson: Well, I shall try to explain that. What I am talking about now is the first session of the special assembly of the United Nations after everything had collapsed in the security council. When that assembly met the first item before it was the putting of this Middle Eastern question from the security council on the agenda of the assembly. If it had not been put on the agenda we could not have discussed the question at all, and the special assembly would have dissolved and there would have been no opportunity to bring up the United Nations force proposal at that time. The United Kingdom and France, for reasons which they thought were quite good, did attempt to keep this matter off the agenda. A few days later, when the proposal was made for a United Nations force, it got a very large vote and no member of the assembly voted against it. But the United Kingdom and France again—and I am not criticizing, because they felt this to be the proper course for them to

Supply—National Defence

follow—abstained with regard to the proposal for a United Nations force which they have subsequently found, I think, to be very helpful to them in the solution of the difficulties we are all in now. That abstention on their part, from their point of view, was a perfectly reasonable one, just as abstention on our part under certain circumstances seems to us also to be perfectly reasonable.

The hon. member for St. Paul's and others have asked me a good many questions about the functions of this force, how it is going to operate, what is the chain of command, and what is the relationship of this force to the government of the country in which it is operating. It is not easy to answer all these questions at the present time because the organization, the function and the principles under which the force is to operate, its relationship not only to the government of the country in which it is operating but to the governments which have sent troops to the force—all these things we are now trying to work out. I assure my hon. friend that that work is certainly not completed. The force is operating under the resolution to which I referred earlier, which is now in effect and which authorizes it to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with all the terms of a previous resolution, the resolution which was passed two or three days before, and which in general does lay down the functions of the force.

Those functions under that earlier resolution were to bring about a cease-fire, and that has been done; to bring about the withdrawal of forces behind the armistice line; to desist from raids across the armistice line into neighbouring territory; to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreement, and to take steps to reopen the Suez canal and to restore and secure freedom of navigation.

The assembly has ordered all these things to be done, and the force itself is to police the doing of them. In line with certain principles and functions which have been approved by the assembly and which are put out in detail in a United Nations document which has been tabled, A-3302 of November 6, this is the final report of the secretary general on the plans for this emergency force, and especially paragraphs 6 to 12 which outline his idea of how it should function.

Now, it is of cardinal importance that in this functioning the force should be under United Nations control and not under the control or dictation of any one member of the United Nations, including Egypt. I tried to

make it as clear as I could the other day, and I have tried to make it clear at the United Nations general assembly, that we would not accept any other interpretation of the functions, the tasks and the duties of this force.

I know that in this debate some very hard and harsh words have been used against the dictator of Egypt, and I certainly am not here to defend him. But I think it is also well to remember there is a relationship between this force and the Arab peoples, and we certainly do not want to divide ourselves completely from the Arab peoples in these matters. Therefore we have to recognize, I think, that those peoples, especially the people in Egypt as represented for better or for worse by their government, do have a special relationship with a force which is operating in their territory. I can assure the committee again, however, if assurance is needed, that we would not accept any principle of action at the United Nations, or participate for long in any force, if that force is in danger of being controlled and dominated by the leader of the government of Egypt. That has already come up in the advisory committee of seven and it will come up again. I can give the committee an assurance that that is the stand we will take, and I am quite sure we will have the support of practically all the members of the committee in that stand and the support of the secretary general himself.

I have listened in previous discussions, Mr. Chairman, to a good many statements to the effect that the action of the United Kingdom and France has saved the world from Russian domination and control of the Middle East. Well, I am not going to go into that at this time, but there is another side to this question. We should also ask ourselves in considering all sides of the question whether the action that has been taken has weakened or strengthened the position of the U.S.S.R. in this area by giving the U.S.S.R. a special relationship to Egypt and to the Arab and Asian states, which has been illustrated by some of the alignments in the United Nations at this time. I do not for one minute criticize the motives of the governments of the United Kingdom and France in intervening in Egypt at this time. I may have thought their intervention was not wise, but I do not criticize their purposes.

It has been suggested, and this is one of the questions that was asked me in the previous debate, whether by our own actions in not aligning ourselves on all occasions at the United Nations with the United Kingdom and France we had not contributed to the weakening and division of the commonwealth and the weakening and division of the western coalition.

Supply—National Defence

Mr. Chairman, I have just one thing to say about that. That division within the commonwealth resulting from the British action would have occurred whether or not we had voted on every occasion with the British delegation down there. We did not create the division. It certainly would have existed between the Asian members of the commonwealth and the other members whether or not we had lined up with those other members, and I think we have to be very careful when we talk about the unity of the commonwealth and co-operation within the commonwealth—and it is something we should not only talk about but should do what we can to bring about—never to forget there are three Asian members of that commonwealth. However, our efforts to bring them into closer association with the commonwealth and to keep them there surely should not mean that even within this association we have not got a very special relationship of intimacy and friendship with the old members of the commonwealth including above all our mother country in the commonwealth, the United Kingdom.

All I am trying to point out now is that our actions at the United Nations, criticize them if you like, did not bring about a division in the commonwealth. Indeed I am compelled to say that our actions and the attitude we adopted did help and are still helping to heal the divisions which are within the commonwealth at this time. If we had not taken the position we did take on these matters at the United Nations we would not have been in the position where we could have performed what I think to be a constructive role by bringing not only the members of the commonwealth closer together again, but, and this in some respects under the present circumstances is even more important, by bringing the United States, the British and the French closer together again.

No Canadian at the United Nations who has to get up and declare the policy of his government can feel anything but an agonizing regret when he finds himself on the other side of an issue from the representative of the United Kingdom. Over the years since we have had to take charge of our own foreign affairs we have had ample reason to respect and be grateful for the wisdom and experience of the United Kingdom at international conferences and in international matters, and over the years we have nearly always found ourselves in substantial agreement with the United Kingdom. At times we have been in agreement with the United Kingdom but not in agreement with the United States, but on this occasion in some of these measures before the United Nations

and indeed in respect of the original cause of this meeting of the United Nations we could not support 100 per cent the actions of the United Kingdom and France.

Believe me, Mr. Chairman, that does not mean we are weakening in any respect in our feeling of admiration, respect and affection for the mother country of the commonwealth. It was in that spirit, even when we disagreed at the United Nations, that we tried to be as helpful and constructive as possible, and to bring about a situation where disagreement would not be necessary in the future; I think, Mr. Chairman, that has happened. I am optimistic enough to believe that in so far as co-operation within the commonwealth and co-operation within the western coalition is concerned we have gone through the hardest of our experiences in the last two or three weeks, that the situation is changing and that we will come closer together again. The speech made this afternoon in the House of Commons in London by the foreign secretary of the government of the United Kingdom gives some indication, I believe, that this is true. We must all devoutly hope, and I am sure all hon. members of this house do hope, that it will be true. If there is anything any of us can do to bring about this work of restoration and reinvigoration within the commonwealth and within the western coalition all of us, I know, will be very proud indeed to do it.

The hon. member for Prince Albert said this morning when he made the interesting proposal that there should be a high level conference in Quebec to pursue this objective that Canada was in an enviable position in these matters, and that because of that position we have special privileges and special responsibilities.

I agree that we have in many respects an enviable position, but it is also a position of some responsibility. If it is enviable I venture to suggest that our actions at the United Nations in the last three weeks have not made it less enviable.

Leaving these controversial aspects of the question aside for the moment, I know I am speaking for every hon. member in the house when I say we can now look forward to the time when there will be a closer and more intimate relationship in the commonwealth, which includes three great nations of Asia, and in a western coalition which must have as its core the closest kind of co-operation and intimacy among the United States, the United Kingdom and France. That is the job for us to do from now on, and I hope we will all be able to pursue it so that we will

Supply—National Defence

bring about a better state of affairs in the world than we have been experiencing in these last months.

Mr. Hansell: I want to ask only a question or two, and perhaps I can ask the minister of external affairs my first question. On page 64 of *Hansard* of November 27 he is reported as having said:

Twenty-three nations have offered contributions to that force and eight of them including Canada, have seen their contributions embodied in the formations on the spot which are now working together under the United Nations blue flag of peace.

Could the minister enumerate the 23 nations and also indicate who the 8 are so that we can be brought up to date? I am interested in knowing how many of what are usually called the Russian satellite states are interested in this force.

Mr. Pearson: The following eight countries have offered contributions which are now embodied in the United Nations emergency force in one form or another: Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, India, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

There are 15 countries which have offered contributions which have not yet been taken up, though they have not been rejected. If hon. members will follow this list carefully they will realize that the secretary general has a delicate and difficult task in bringing about what he called a balanced composition in the force. This may help to understand the delicacy of his relationship to the government of Egypt. In connection with the composition of this force, he is the man who with the advice of the advisory council and in the last analysis the full assembly determines the composition. He is trying to bring that about in a way which will secure the maximum co-operation from the government of the country in which the force is operating. The following are the countries which have not yet been asked by him to send forward contingents to this force. Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines and Rumania.

Mrs. Fairclough: As considerable latitude has been granted in the consideration of this item probably I could now put a question to the Minister of National Defence which I had intended to put earlier on the orders of the day, but was unable to do so. In view of the serious nature of the international situation at the present time will the minister say whether any further consideration has been given to the functioning of No. 424 Hamilton squadron stationed at Mount Hope? It may be said that there is very little relationship

[Mr. Pearson.]

between this matter and the item we are considering, but I think in the broad general sense there is.

Here are a group of people who are anxious to continue active flying. This matter has been in abeyance for some months now, but it is still a live issue in Hamilton. These people are still anxious to continue flying, and I should like to know whether any further consideration has been given by the minister to changing their present status. With the seriousness of the situation these men may well be needed.

Mr. Campney: I have been giving further consideration to the matter in view of the representations which have been made, and I hope to indicate my decision within the next week or ten days.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question about the wording of the general assembly resolution in regard to the police force and the order in council passed by this government. It is stated that the purpose of the force is to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. What exactly does "secure" mean under those circumstances? If hostilities broke out again, say between the Israelis and the Egyptians, the securing of the cessation of those hostilities might well involve fighting. Does "secure" mean that our troops will fight to stop any further outbreak of hostilities?

Mr. Pearson: The words "secure and supervise", which appear in this resolution and which appear also in the report of the secretary general laying down the functions of the force, were put in deliberately in that form for the purpose of making sure that no impression was given by the wording that this force was a fighting force in the sense that the United Nations force in Korea was a fighting force.

I must confess that in the first draft of the secretary general's report, which was done early in the morning, the words were "enforce and supervise". However, that wording was caught and changed. If the word "enforce" had been left in it would have meant that they would have been under orders to take means to enforce the cease-fire. They are not under any such obligation. For instance, they are not acting under chapter VII of the charter. To secure and supervise merely means that they are to keep the peace.

If hostilities began again, then the matter would be in the hands of the United Nations assembly which would have to decide what action was to be taken. The force will take only such action as would be necessary to

Supply—National Defence

defend itself against attack. I realize that anything is possible, but I think it is highly unlikely that even if hostilities resumed they would be directed against a force carrying the flag of the United Nations.

Mr. Knowles: There is one question I should like to ask, and I ask it for information only. The minister may feel that he has given this information to the house, but I believe there is still some confusion about it. The Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to a force in Egypt numbering 6,000 persons, and then he referred to Canada's maximum contribution of 2,500. Are those figures related to each other or does the 6,000 include only 1,000 of Canada's men? Perhaps the minister could answer this question by giving us the figures for each of the eight countries which are contributing to the force. I want to make it clear that I am asking this for information only and I have no criticism of any disparity that may exist as to numbers. We are glad that Canada is taking part in this important undertaking.

Mr. Pearson: I find it difficult to be any more precise in this matter than I was a few minutes ago. I wish I had the text of the statement of the secretary general, because I am not sure whether there was a definite time limit in his statement, but as I understand it he announced that within a very short time he expected the force would reach a total of 6,000. That does not mean that two or three weeks after that time 3,000 or 4,000 more may not come, but he expects that 6,000 will be enough to do the job they have immediately in front of them. To show how difficult it is to forecast what that job will be, within the last 48 hours the general in command out there has decided that he needs to send a battalion into Port Said. If the British and French expeditionary forces had left Port Said last week he might have needed only two or three hundred there just for police purposes exclusively, and he might not have needed any a week after that.

The secretary general thinks that to take care of the situation he will need 6,000. That includes 700 Canadians. I understand from a telephone conversation with him this morning that there are 4,400 now. He wants to build that up immediately to 6,000 which will mean 1,600 more, and in those 1,600 additional troops he wants some more Canadians. We have not had details of what he wants. The 4,400 is made up roughly of 700 from Canada, a Swedish transport squadron of 21—I do not know whether these figures have been given any place else—a Norwegian ambulance company of 206, a composite supply platoon from India of 190, 557 infantry from

Colombia, 388 from Denmark, 265 from Norway, 258 from Finland, 346 from Sweden, 714 from India and 765 from Yugoslavia.

Mr. Pearkes: Would the Minister of National Defence advise us concerning the code of discipline under which these troops will be serving? Will the Canadians be governed by the Canadian code of military discipline? When punishment has to be dealt out, will the men involved be tried by their own commanding officers or a Canadian court, or will they have to be tried by an Egyptian court or by some international courtmartial? We would like to have some information as to the exercise of discipline and the protection of any of our men who may through some misfortune fall afoul of some commander from some other unit, or the laws of Egypt or elsewhere.

Mr. Campney: This matter is now under discussion in the United Nations. But it is our contention, and we are acting on this contention for the present and will continue to do so until there is any change, that our forces will be governed by Canadian law and discipline will be administered under our own Canadian system. As I say, the question is being reviewed now in the United Nations.

Mr. Pearkes: Would that apply to any civil offence which might be alleged against a Canadian soldier?

Mr. Campney: Yes. We have taken the view that that should obtain. Whether or not we will maintain that, whether other courts of an international nature will be set up or what the final disposition will be I do not know, but as of now that is our contention.

Mr. Pearkes: I should like to express the opinion that it is very desirable that we remain firm in that stand.

Mr. Campney: We feel quite strongly about it.

Mr. Hansell: Might I ask the Minister of National Defence this question. In his opinion, what relationship will the present situation have to the military aspect of NATO? In other words, does the present situation indicate that the military aspect of NATO will be accelerated, or will there be less emphasis on this aspect of NATO? The particular reason I am asking this question is that I have had a civilian delegation wait upon me with regard to the future of the air training school at Claresholm, which is largely for the NATO forces. Evidently there is some feeling that the future of the air training school may not be too secure in that there may be a possibility of retrenchment

Supply—National Defence

or even closing it down. Can the minister give me any information with respect to that matter?

Mr. Campney: With regard to the general effect on NATO of the present situation in the Middle East and throughout the world, my colleague, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and I are going to the NATO council meeting at Paris the week after next, and that large subject will be discussed at considerable length. As to the question of NATO air training, which I think is what is in the hon. member's mind, I announced in the house during the consideration of my estimates last summer that we will have completed the intake for our NATO air training scheme next year. With the exception of certain limited training which we will be giving to personnel from Holland, Denmark and Norway, which countries have no air training schemes at all, we have now built up the aircrews of the NATO nations and we will only be providing training for these three countries.

This will mean that there will be some shrinking in our training facilities. There will be some changing over of some of them to active service conditions, the closing of some and a general revamping of our air training scheme to take care of our own training and that for the three nations I have mentioned. In that connection the location of our present air training schools will of course have to be considered.

Mr. Brooks: I want to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a further question. Since there seems to be almost unanimous approval of this force in the United Nations, and since only a small number of members of the United Nations are making contributions to the force, has any provision been made for general contributions from the other nations that are not sending any troops in order to help pay for the cost of the troops that are being sent by the countries that are contributing? For instance, the minister said that General Burns is anxious to have more Canadians. I can understand that and I do not think the Canadian people will raise any objection to paying all the bills as far as the Canadians are concerned.

But it does seem to me that where there is such unanimity among the different nations respecting the sending of a United Nations force there should be some general contribution by the other nations of the world to help to pay for the troops that are being sent. Would the minister explain the situation?

[Mr. Hansell.]

Mr. Pearson: That matter is now under consideration at the assembly. A resolution was passed the other day on the financing of the force. It must be remembered that the fact that a country does not appear in the list of 23 I have just mentioned does not mean that other countries will not be making contributions later. I think I am right in saying that the secretary general felt that he had enough countries on the list at the present time to meet the need that he saw immediately before him. We are not sure in the long run how many countries will be contributing. There is also the difficulty of a country offering a small contribution but there might be no particular place for such a contribution of 100 or 150 in the force at a given time. Nevertheless you would not wish to penalize that particular country.

Then there are countries which have refused to accept the force at all, and it is going to be hard to make them pay for it. The other day the secretary general got an authorization for \$10 million, and some of the expenses of this force not attributable to any one country will be met out of that amount. Therefore the countries that do not send a contribution to the force will have to pay some proportion of the cost because they will contribute to that \$10 million.

Mr. Brooks: Might I ask the minister this further question. Is this force that is being sent at the present time more in the nature of a token force from the United Nations which they expect will be expanded later on from other nations?

Mr. Pearson: Six thousand is a fairly respectable token for this particular job. I think it is in most people's minds down there that it may have to be expanded and that other countries may have to contribute. I should not like to be too categorical on that matter at the present time. Nevertheless, I think it is more than a token force at the present time.

Mr. Fraser (Peterborough): May I ask the minister whether Russia will contribute toward this \$10 million?

Mr. Pearson: The other day when this resolution was up for decision at the United Nations assembly, Russia and its satellites all voted against it and said they would make no contribution to that \$10 million.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask whether Canada is making a contribution toward this \$10 million in addition to the contribution we are making by sending our troops? If so, out of what vote will such a contribution be made?

Ways and Means

Mr. Pearson: That matter is now being discussed in New York, as to how this expenditure should be allocated to members of the United Nations and whether its members who make contributions in kind should be given credit against their contributions in money.

Mr. Knowles: May I ask whether Canada will be making any contribution toward the cost of clearing the Suez canal?

Mr. Pearson: I cannot answer that question. It is already included in the discussions going on as to how the \$10 million will be used, and there is a great difference of opinion as to who should be responsible for the financing of the clearing of the canal.

Mr. Bell: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence. We all know that Canada now has available no merchant ships, but we have been told that it is possible to recall some in cases of emergency. I should like to ask the minister whether in this case inquiries were made about the possibility of getting troopships or other ships or whether it was just decided to use the *Magnificent* for convenience and in the desire to bring the navy in on the show. I would further appreciate knowing from the minister what he feels should be done in the future with regard to the need for merchant ships in defence circumstances.

Mr. Campney: Dealing with the hon. member's first question, may I say that no consideration was given to requisitioning ships, for two reasons. First, there was some thought that the force might have to move by air. Second, if it did not move by air it was felt, at the time this decision was taken, that the *Magnificent's* value as a mobile base and her availability made it unnecessary to consider merchant shipping.

With regard to the second question, as to the usefulness of merchant shipping and the merchant ship policy of the government and of the country, I think that is a rather large question to introduce into this particular matter. We all know the situation and we all know that in time of war ships are at a premium. Beyond that I do not think I would care to venture an opinion in the situation as it is today.

Mr. Michener: Although I received many answers and am grateful for them, there is one more question which I think the Minister of National Defence might answer if he can. Do these Canadian forces pass exclusively under United Nations command when they join the force? If so, for how long are they committed?

Mr. Campney: To answer the last question first, they are committed as long as we leave them with the United Nations force. We can bring them out any time we like. They are under our control ultimately. Second, with regard to committing them to the United Nations, the situation today is that they are committed to the United Nations for operational purposes. But so far and subject to any procedure which may be developed hereafter, they are administratively still under our own control.

Mr. Winch: Just so as to have this matter clear may I ask this question. Am I correct in thinking that the contribution of Canada to the emergency force is being paid for by Canada, and is subject perhaps to an arrangement afterwards with the United Nations; but now it is being paid for by Canada?

Mr. Campney: That is correct.

Mr. Harkness: I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence how the gap is to be filled which will be left by the dispatch of this transport squadron to Naples for employment there to ferry troops and equipment to Egypt. As I understand it, that transport squadron was part of the air portability section of our airborne brigade. The airborne brigade was deficient in the number of aircraft available to transport it, in any event, and I have been somewhat worried as to what its situation would be now.

Mr. Campney: The situation is somewhat restricted by this immediate allocation to the United Nations force. It has led to some rearrangement, but we still have a substantial number of transport planes and for the time being—and I may say that we have on order new and additional transport planes now—we shall be able to get along without too much difficulty.

The Chairman: Shall the resolution carry?
Item agreed to.

Resolutions reported and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS

Hon. L. B. Pearson (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that the house go into committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to and the house went into committee, Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

Mr. Pearson moved:

That towards making good the supply granted to Her Majesty on account of certain expenses of the

Ways and Means

public service for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1957, the sum of \$1,000,001 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Mr. Harris thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1957.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first and second times and the house went into committee thereon, Mr. Robinson (Simcoe East) in the chair.

On clause 1:

Mr. Winch: Is the bill printed?

Mr. Knowles: I wonder if I may ask the Prime Minister to make a brief statement at this point. While he had to be out this afternoon we had some discussion with the other two ministers concerning the order in council under which the troops have been sent abroad and the relationship of that order in council to section 33 of the National Defence Act. I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs will realize I am not reflecting on the answers he gave in asking for a statement from the Prime Minister, for it seemed to me there was a little bit of uncertainty as to what the exact situation would be. I wonder if the Prime Minister, either now or whenever we meet again later this day, would make a considered statement as to what could happen during this adjournment. In other words, can he tell us the circumstances under which other orders might be given to the troops without parliament having to be called, and the circumstances under which parliament would have to be called again?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): I think, Mr. Chairman, the situation is just as it was in 1950 and 1951. The order in council makes this emergency force available for service, under United Nations command, in the Middle East. If there were a requirement to have the area in which service would be required extended beyond that, we would still feel that we had to make a decision and that we had, within ten days from the time it was made, to call parliament. Parliament would be in being but the Speaker would have to give notice that it was necessary to have parliament meet within that period to determine whether or not there would be funds provided by parliament to implement that decision, because I think that is the test. We would not wish to have the funds that are being provided by this bill used for anything that would go beyond the scope of the order in council. Although there might be sufficient

[Mr. Pearson.]

money available to cover the additional expense, we would feel that the Canadian people would expect parliament to pass on the responsibilities taken by the government to make a decision that was beyond the one that was made in this order in council of November 20.

Mr. Knowles: In other words, if another order in council has to be issued regarding the troops or if further money is required, under either of those circumstances, parliament would have to be summoned?

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): Parliament would have to be summoned.

Mr. Knowles: Unless we are here.

Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East): It might very well be that January 8 would be within the period provided by the statute, but if it were not within the 10-day period the Speaker would send notice that parliament was to meet on such and such a date at such an hour, as if it had adjourned regularly to that day.

While I am on my feet there was something I did wish to say, which I think was expressed in some of the remarks of the hon. member for Kamloops and other hon. members and is summarized in a paragraph of an editorial in the *Ottawa Journal* of today. It reads:

Canada should have but one major goal for its foreign policy these days, more important even than the doings of its troops in Egypt: that is the immediate improvement of commonwealth relations, of Anglo-American-French relations—but the greatest need of all is the reuniting of the principles and policies of the British and American governments.

I had intended to take the opportunity of saying that had been the goal we have been pursuing ever since the very first of these resolutions came before the United Nations, to work toward what we regard as almost essential for the peace and security of the free world; that is to say, the reliance on commonwealth relations and the reuniting of this alliance in an effective way between the United Kingdom, France and the United States; something that has, I think, been of immense value and without which there would be a void that would cause all of us deep anxiety. I think it is and should be the purpose of the Canadian government to put forth its very best efforts to the ends expressed in this last paragraph of this editorial in today's *Ottawa Journal*. Of course, that is what we have been trying to do.

We have felt that to do that we had to speak our considered views frankly to all our friends, in no "blistering" terms, I can assure the house, but in frank terms; and

that our dependence upon the combined actions of the members of the commonwealth, the members of the NATO organization, the members of that unwritten alliance that has been so useful to the world between Britain, France and the United States, could not necessarily require us to feel, in every instance, that everything done by every one of our allies was the wisest course and decision that could be taken. Under those circumstances, after the most careful consideration we could give the problem, we had to express frankly our views, not in a carping way at all but merely in an effort to have these views considered and serve as usefully as they could in harmonizing the joint action of all those whose goal is the same as our own.

Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Title agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, we might have the usual recess and expect that when we meet at eight o'clock Your Honour will have received some information from His Excellency the Governor General or his deputy as to the hour at which it would suit his convenience to convoke us in the other chamber to have royal assent given to the appropriation bill.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at eight o'clock.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

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 House of Commons,
Ottawa.

The Royal Assent

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SITTING SUSPENDED

Right Hon. L. S. St. Laurent (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might suggest that we should suspend this sitting until 8.30 p.m., and have the bell rung at that time so we would be here when the Black Rod raps on the door.

Mr. Speaker: With the consent of the house, I shall leave the chair until 8.30.

At 8.05 p.m. the sitting was suspended until 8.30 p.m. this day.

SITTING RESUMED

The house resumed at 8.30 p.m.

THE ROYAL ASSENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

And being returned:

Mr. Speaker informed the house that he had addressed the Deputy Governor General as follows:

May it please Your Honour:

The Commons of Canada have voted supplies required to enable the government to defray certain expenses of the public service.

In the name of the Commons, I present to Your Honour 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.

To which bill I humbly request Your Honour's assent.

Whereupon, the Clerk of the Senate, by command of the Deputy Governor General, did say:

In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General thanks her loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to this bill.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker: This house stands adjourned until Tuesday, January 8, 1957, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, subject to call at an earlier time after due notice given by Mr. Speaker. May I assure you that notwithstanding how much I love you all I will not call you earlier than January 8 unless I have to. May I wish you a good trip back home and express the hope that you will not have to be called earlier, so you may enjoy a well-deserved rest, a merry Christmas and a happy New Year.

Supply—Items Passed

On motion of Mr. McCann the house adjourned at 9.16 o'clock p.m. until Tuesday, January 8, 1957, at eleven o'clock a.m.

[The following items were passed in committee of supply]:

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

B—General—

Terminable services—

738. To provide, subject to the approval of the treasury board, assistance to the victims of the recent tragic events in Hungary, \$1,000,000.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Defence services—

739. To provide expressly that vote 235 of the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1956, be used for the purpose of meeting costs incurred for the participation of the Canadian forces in the United Nations emergency force, and to authorize payment from that vote, subject to approval of the treasury board, of contributions to the United Nations for defraying expenses incurred by it in respect of its operations to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East, \$1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, January 8, 1957

The house met at eleven o'clock.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF ADDRESS IN REPLY

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received a message from His Excellency the Governor General, signed by his own hand, reading as follows:

Government House, Ottawa
7th January, 1957

Members of the House of Commons:

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 OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, January 8, 1957

Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that the Honourable 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).

VACANCY

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the house that I have received a communication notifying me of a vacancy which has occurred in the representation, as follows:

Of Hon. George A. Drew, member for the electoral district of Carleton, by resignation.

Accordingly, I addressed my warrant to the chief electoral officer for the issue of a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT

A message was delivered by Major C. R. Lamoureux, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Deputy Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable house in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the house went up to the Senate chamber.

The Deputy Governor General was pleased to close 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:

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 Providence continue to bless and protect this nation.

—

This concluded the fourth (special) session of the twenty-second parliament.

END OF SESSION

INDEX

FOURTH SESSION (SPECIAL), TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT

November 26th 1956 to January 8th 1957

- Address in reply** to Governor General's speech, 7-42, 48-104, 111-4, 115-31, 139-48
 Acknowledgment of by Governor General, 177
 Adjourning debate until United Nations Emergency Force and Hungarian relief are dealt with, 27
 Consideration later this day, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), agreed to, 4
 Motion for consideration
 Moved by Mr. Gérard Légaré (Rimouski), 7-9; seconded by Mr. A. B. Weselak (Springfield), 9-11, agreed to, 148
 Amendment (Mr. Rowe), 18, negatived on division, 147-8
 Speakers, Messieurs:
 Balcer, 126-8; Brooks, 113-4, 116-9
 Churchill, 97-102; Coldwell, 26-31
 Diefenbaker, 139-44; Dinsdale, 93-7; Dufresne, 102-4, 111-3
 Fleming, 66-73; Fulton, 145-7
 Girard, 92-3; Green, 40-2, 49-51
 Hamilton (York West), 81-3; Harkness, 128-31, 139
 Knowles, 121-6
 Légaré (mover), 7-9; Low, 32-6
 McLeod, 119-21; Michener, 83-7
 Nesbitt, 87-90
 Pearkes, 77-81; Pearson, 51-66; Pickersgill, 36-40, 147; Poulin, 90-2
 Rowe, 11-8, amdt., 18
 St. Laurent (Quebec East), 19-26; Stewart (Winnipeg North), 73-7
 Weselak (seconded), 9-11
 Yuill, 144-5
 Motion (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East) for engrossing and presentation, agreed to, 148
- Adjournments**, *see under* House of Commons
- Applewhaite, Mr. E. T. (Skeena)**
 Appointment as deputy chairman, 5-6
- Appropriation Bill** *see* Supply Bill
- Argue, Mr. H. R. (Assiniboia)**
 Grain, delivery quotas, 46
 Grain, interim payment on 1955 crop, 45
 Prairies, cash shortage on, 107
- Armament exports**
 Middle East, to, 14, 16, 88-9, 91, 98, 141-2
 C.C.F. amendment at last session, 123
- Army**, *see* Canadian forces
- Austria**, assistance to Hungarian refugees, 11
- Balcer, Mr. Léon (Trois Rivières)**
 Address in reply, 126-8
 National flag, 128
 United Nations Emergency Force, 126-8
- Bandaranaike, Hon. S.W.R.D.**, Prime Minister of Ceylon, 43
- Bank Act**, amending *re* consumer interest rates, 111
- Bank of Canada**, *see* Interest rates
- Beaudoin, Hon. L. René**, *see* Speaker
- Bell, Mr. Thomas M. (Saint John-Albert)**
 United Nations Emergency Force, need of merchant ships, 173
- Bennett**, the late Miss Sybil, member for Halton, tributes to, 1-3
- Bills**, suspension of standing orders respecting, 6-7, 43-4
- Bills, Public**
 1. Oaths of office. Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East)
 2. Supply (further supplementary). Mr. Harris
See also those titles

Blair, Mr. W. G. (Lanark)

United Nations Emergency Force, medical facilities, 163

Box cars (grain)

Supply to low-quota points, appointment of Transport Controller, 46

British Columbia, request for royal commission to investigate fruit industry, 135

Brooks, Mr. A. J. (Royal)

Address in reply, 113-4, 116-9

Hungarian situation, 116

United Nations Emergency Force, 118-9, 172

Middle East situation, 113-4, 116-8

Bryson, Mr. H. A. (Humboldt-Melfort)

Grain handling, interest rate on money borrowed for, 107, 138

Hudson Bay Railway, C.P.R. running rights over, 138

Calgary, Alta., fire at Camp Sarcee, *see* Canadian forces

Campbell, Mr. A. M. (The Battlefords)

Peyote buttons, 46

Campney, Hon. R. O. (Minister of National Defence)

Camps Shilo and Rivers, working hours of civilians, 137

Fire damage at Camp Sarcee in Calgary, 108, 137

Middle East situation, effect on NATO, 171-2

United Nations Emergency Force, 158

Canadian participation, background, 149-53

Code of discipline, 171

Composition of Canadian units, type of uniform, 44, 163-4

Control of, 173

Defence appropriation, estimated cost tabled, 148-9, 153-5

Disability protection, overseas allowance, 137

Insurance coverage, 162, 164

Medical facilities, 163

Transport squadron, 173

Canadian Broadcasting Corporation

Coverage of UN special sessions, 7, 74

Hungarian uprising, references to, 73

Middle East situation, references to, 92

Canadian forces

Air force, NATO training facilities, closing down Claresholm school, 171-2

Air force, No. 424 City of Hamilton squadron, disbanding, 170

Air transport squadron on Middle East duty, effect on airborne brigade portability, 173

Death or disability compensation, 157, 162

Fire at Camp Sarcee in Calgary, 108, 137

Overseas, repatriating, 91-2

Placing on active service, parliamentary approval for, 15, 19-20, 32

Preparedness, air transport, return of dependents abroad, 83

See also United Nations Emergency Force—Canadian units

Canadian Pacific Railway

Pensioners on less than \$60, 138

Running rights over Hudson Bay Railway, 138

Cardiff, Mr. L. E. (Huron)

Small Loans Act, 111

Castleden, Mr. G. H. (Yorkton)

United Nations Emergency Force, pensions, disabilities, 137

Ceylon, visit of prime minister to Canada, *see* Visitors to Canada

Churchill, Mr. Gordon (Winnipeg South Centre)

Address in reply, 97-102

Commonwealth of Nations, 101-2

Middle East situation, 97-9

United Nations, 99-100

Churchill, Mr. Gordon—Cont.

United Nations Emergency Force, 102

Coldwell, Mr. M. J. (Rosetown-Biggar)

Address in reply, 26-31

Adjournment until Jan. 8th 1957, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), 133-4

Bennett, the late Miss Sybil and the late Thomas H. Ross, tribute to, 2-3

Drew, Hon. George, absence from House, 4

Hungary, situation in, relief, refugees, 27-31

Middle East situation, 28-31

Prairie farmers, economic situation, 133

Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 114

United Nations Emergency Force, 27, 30-1

Collective security, *see under* United Nations

Committees, standing, suspension of S.O. 65 respecting, 43-4

Commonwealth of Nations

Attitude of Prime Minister to, 70, 81, 101, 174-5

Middle East situation affecting, 12, 28-9, 55, 60, 95-6, 108-9, 120-3, 146, 168-9

Pearson, Mr., on, 101-2, 161, 168-9

Crestohl, Mr. L. D. (Cartier)

Egypt, threat to Jewish community, 108

Defence contracts, aircraft repairs for McLennan's Foundry, Campbellton, N.B., 109

Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House appointed, 5-6

Diefenbaker, Mr. J. G. (Prince Albert)

Address in reply, 139-44

Hungary, relief, refugees, 143-4

Middle East situation, 140-3

Krishna Menon's statement on Commonwealth, 108

Quebec conference to promote western unity, calling, 144

United Nations Emergency Force, 143

Increasing to meet Jordan-Syria situation, 65, 136

Dinsdale, Mr. W. G. (Brandon-Souris)

Address in reply, 93-7

Camps Shilo and Rivers, working hours of civilian cleaners, 137

Middle East situation, 93-7

Divisions

Address in reply, amendment (Mr. Rowe), negatived: yeas, 36; nays, 171, 147-8

Adjournment until Jan. 8th 1957, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), agreed to: yeas, 170; nays, 32, 134

Drew, Hon. George A. (Carleton)

Absence from House, 3-4

Resignation from House, 177

Drugs and medicaments

Peyote buttons, spreading use by Indians, taking steps, 46, 109-10

Dufresne, Mr. Wilfrid (Quebec West)

Address in reply, 102-4, 111-3

Egypt, Anglo-French and Israeli invasion of, 111-2

Hungarian situation, 102-3, 112-3

Egypt

British assistance to, 116

Foreign policy, 16, 52, 140

Invasion of, *see under* Middle East

Jewish community, threat to, Canadian representations on, 108

Suez Canal, *see that heading*

Ellis, Mr. Claude (Regina City)

Housing construction and interest rates, 109

Estimates

Further supplementary, 1956-57, presented and referred to committee of supply, 6

External Affairs Department

Estimates, further supplementary, 148

Fairclough, Mrs. Ellen L. (Hamilton West)

No. 424 Hamilton squadron, status of, 170

Farmers, cash shortage on prairies, 107, 133**Ferguson, Mr. J. H. (Simcoe North)**

Interest rate increases, effect on housing, 48

Financial policy, see Interest rates**Fish**

Salmon destruction by sprayers, court case, 109

Flag, National, 128**Fleming, Mr. Donald M. (Eglinton)**

Address in reply, 66-73

House adjournment plans, 107

Hungarian relief, refugees, 72-3

Middle East situation, UN action, U.S. responsibility, 69-71

Trade relations with U.K., 45

United Nations Emergency Force, 72

Fraser, Mr. G. K. (Peterborough)

Fire at Camp Sarcee in Calgary, 108, 137

United Nations Emergency Force, 172

Fruit industry, royal commission to investigate B.C. industry, 135**Fulton, Mr. E. D. (Kamloops)**

Address in reply, 145-7

Commonwealth of Nations, 146

Fruit industry of B.C., royal commission for, 135

Hungarian situation, relief, refugees, 145-6

Supply procedure, 134

United Nations Emergency Force, 146-7

Gardiner, Right Hon. J. G. (Minister of Agriculture)

Fruit industry of B.C., request for royal commission, 135

Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, extending application of, 48

Garson, Hon. Stuart S. (Minister of Justice)

Sugar, alleged combine, 136

Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 115

Girard, Mr. Fernand (Lapointe)

Address in reply, 92-3

Egypt, Anglo-French and Israeli invasion of, 92-3

United Nations Emergency Force, 92

Goode, Mr. T. H. (Burnaby-Richmond)

Pacific Great Eastern Railway, federal grant, 135

Government contracts, see Defence contracts**Grain**

Interest rate on moneys borrowed for handling and movement, 107, 138

Pool of 1955-56, early interim payment on, 45-6

See also Box cars (grain)

Green, Mr. Howard C. (Vancouver-Quadra)

Address in reply, 40-2, 49-51

Hungarian refugees, 40

Middle East situation, 40-2, 49-51

United Nations Emergency Force, 51, 136

- Hamilton, Mr. John B.** (York West)
Address in reply, 81-3
United Nations Emergency Force, 82-3
- Hamilton, Mr. W. M.** (Notre Dame de Grâce)
Trans-Canada pipe line, pipe supply and tanker construction, 138
- Hansell, Mr. E. G.** (MacLeod)
Middle East situation, effect on NATO, 171
United Nations Emergency Force, countries contributing, 170
- Harkness, Mr. D. S.** (Calgary North)
Address in reply, 128-31, 139
Middle East situation, 128-31
United Nations Emergency Force, 45, 131, 139, 159, 170, 173
- Harris, Hon. W. E.** (Minister of Finance)
Bank Act, consumer credit, 111
Bank of Canada, discount rate, 47-8
Estimates, further supplementary, 1956-57, presented and referred to committee of supply, 6
Grain handling, interest rate on money borrowed for, 107
Japan, visit of trade minister to, 108
Small Loans Act, 111
Supply bill, further supplementary, 174
Supply committee without question put, 134
- House of Commons**
Adjournment
In tribute to the late Owen C. Trainor, 114-5
M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East) that House do stand adjourned until Jan. 8th 1957, 133-5, agreed to on division, 134-5
Standing orders suspended with respect to sittings, unanimous consent, bills, committees, etc., 6-7, 43-4
See also Members of Parliament; Parliamentary procedure
- Housing**, interest rates, legislative action, 109
- Howe, Right Hon. C. D.** (Minister of Trade and Commerce and Minister of Defence Production)
McLennan's Foundry, aircraft repairs by, 109
Trade balance, 111
Trade relations with U. K., 45
Trans-Canada pipe line, pipe supply, 138
Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line, reported explosion, 138-9
- Hudson Bay Railway**, running rights for C.P.R. over, 138
- Hungarian refugees**
Immigration to Canada, 18, 72-3
Chest X-rays, 45
Conference, Ontario representation, 110
Free passage, 115-6, 121, 147
Open-door policy, 31, 35
Pickersgill, Mr., on, 36-40
Visit to Austria, 115, 143-6
Plight of, 8, 10-1
- Hungarian relief**, 8, 17, 27, 35, 92, 112, 119, 162
British Columbia Indians, contribution, 39
Distribution of, 25
- Hungary**
Deportations to Siberia, 10-1, 17, 103
Fight for freedom, Russian military action against, 7, 10, 16-8, 27, 32, 51-2, 70, 91-3, 103, 123
NATO condemnation of Russia, 112-3
Obscured by invasion of Egypt, 22, 29, 33, 92
Parliament condemning Russia, 112-3
Representations by Prime Minister to Premier Bulganin, and reply, 24-5, 96, 101
Promises to liberate by force, inadvisability, 52

Hungary—Cont.

UN observers refused entry, 11

Interest rates, Bank of Canada rates, result of increase, 46-8

International relations

Canada's position between Britain and United States, 16, 96, 161

"Chore-boy", 51, 119

Western alliance and Middle East situation, 83-4, 86-7, 95-7, 140, 146

Pearson, Mr., on, 64-5, 168-9

St. Laurent, Mr. (Quebec East), on, 174-5

Second Quebec conference suggested, 144, 169

See also Middle East; North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Israel-Arab relations, see Middle East

Japan, visit of trade minister to, 107-8

Johnson, Mr. W. M. (Kindersley)

Grain, box car allocation, transport controller, 46, 138

South Saskatchewan River project, 48, 110

Jones, Mr. O. L. (Okanagan Boundary)

Fruit industry of B.C., royal commission for, 135

United Nations Emergency Force, insurance coverage, 157-8

Veteran fruit farmers, frost damage in B.C., 108

Knowles, Mr. Stanley (Winnipeg North Centre)

Address in reply, 121-6

Canadian Pacific Railway, pensioners, 138

House of Commons, suspension of certain standing orders, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), 43

Hungarian refugees, 121

Middle East situation, need of collective security, 121-5

Old age pensions, increasing, 46

Sugar, alleged combine, 136

Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 115

United Nations Emergency Force, 124-6, 158, 171, 172-3

Order in council, 48, 174

Lapointe, Hon. Hugues (Minister of Veterans Affairs and Postmaster General)

Veteran fruit farmers in B.C., frost damage, 108

Légaré, Mr. Gérard (Rimouski)

Address in reply (mover), 7-9

Hungary, refugees, relief, 8

United Nations Emergency Force, 7

Loans, hardship on borrowers of small amounts, 111

Low, Mr. Solon E. (Peace River)

Address in reply, 32-6

Bennett, the late Miss Sybil, and the late Thomas H. Ross, tribute to, 3

Drew, Hon. George, absence from House, 4

Hungary, refugees, relief, 35-6

Middle East, action of Britain, France, Israel, 32-5

Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 114

United Nations Emergency Force, 32-5

Area limitations, 159

Macdonnell, Mr. J. M. (Greenwood)

Bank of Canada, influence on interest rates, 47

Commonwealth of Nations, 161

United Nations Emergency Force, constitutional background, 160-1

Manpower, need for survey of, 83

Marler, Hon. George C. (Minister of Transport)

Transport Controller, 46

McCann, Hon. J. J. (Minister of National Revenue)
Peyote buttons, 109-10

McIvor, Mr. Daniel (Fort William)
Japan, visit of trade minister to, 107
United Nations, support of, 164

McLennan's Foundry, Campbellton, N.B., aircraft repair contracts for, 109

McLeod, Mr. G. W. (Okanagan-Revelstoke)
Address in reply, 119-21
Hungarian relief, 119
Middle East situation, 119-21
United Nations Emergency Force, 119

Members of Parliament

Deceased, Bennett, Miss Sybil (Halton), 1-3; Ross, Thomas, H. (Hamilton East), 1-3;
Trainer, O. C. (Winnipeg South), 114-5
Resigned, Drew, Hon. George A. (Carleton), 177

Michener, Mr. Roland (St. Paul's)

Address in reply, 83-7
NATO, importance of, 83-4
United Nations Emergency Force, 84-7, 159, 164-6, 173

Middle East

Anglo-French and Israeli invasion of Egypt, 7, 9-18, 20, 22-4, 28-30, 33-6, 40, 49-53,
75-6, 84-6, 91-4, 113-4, 116, 120, 122-4, 126, 128
Advantages from, 36, 69, 82
Canada's attitude to, 12-8, 22, 24, 33, 49-56, 67-71, 88, 114
Fleming, Mr., on, 54, 68
Influenced by United States, 18, 50-1, 71, 120, 129
Churchill, Sir Winston, on, 14
Commonwealth nations not consulted, 53
Correspondence between Prime Minister and Sir Anthony Eden, 16, 23-4, 101, 142
Opinion in Britain on, 28, 40
Prevented communist coup, 12-4, 17, 35, 50, 69, 90-1, 94-5, 112, 140, 168
United States attitude to, 11-2, 18, 33, 89, 121, 128-9
See also International relations—Western alliance
Withdrawal of invading troops, 10-3, 17-8, 34, 59-60, 70, 79, 145
Arab-Israel relations, 29, 34-5, 42, 53, 75, 88-9, 94, 116-7, 126
United Nations and, 97-9, 130
Britain's policies in, 116-8
Information, adequacy, 98-9, 166
Nile and Jordan irrigation projects, UN assistance suggested, 31, 76-7, 125
Oil profits, using to raise standards of living, 31, 77, 125
Palestine refugees, 76-7, 125
Pearson, Mr., statement of, 52-66
Suez Canal and Arab-Israeli boundary questions, settling, 13, 22-3, 29-31, 35, 54, 64,
76-7, 82, 87, 124-5, 130, 165
Syria-Jordan situation, 65, 124-5, 130, 136, 156
United Nations social and economic rehabilitation of suggested, 76
White paper should have been prepared on, 97
See also Egypt; Suez Canal

National Defence Department

Civilian cleaners at camps Shilo and Rivers, working conditions, 137
Estimates, further supplementary, 148-73

Nesbitt, Mr. W. B. (Oxford)

Address in reply, 87-90
Egypt, Canadian arms shipments to, 88-9
Middle East situation, 87-90
Western colonialism, 89-90

Nickle, Mr. Carl O. (Calgary South)

Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line, explosion at Jasper pump station, 138

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

Discussions at latest conference, 83-4
Maintaining, 98, 103

North Atlantic Treaty Organization—Cont.

- Middle East situation threat to, 16, 98, 128-9
- See also International relations—Western alliance
- Military force, use by UN suggested, 84-7
- Remarks of retiring General Gruenther, 91

Nowlan, Mr. G. C. (Digby-Annapolis-Kings)

- Apple industry, royal commission for, 135

Oaths of Office Bill—No. 1 Mr. St. Laurent (Quebec East)

- 1r., 1

Old age pensions, increasing, 46**Pacific Great Eastern Railway, federal grant considered, 135-6****Palestine refugees, see under Middle East****Pallett, Mr. John (Peel)**

- Bank Act, 111

Parliament

- Calling before committing troops to Middle East, 15, 19-20, 32, 66
- Reconvening if required by changes in regard to United Nations Emergency Force, 87, 126, 157-8, 174

Parliament Buildings, Commons chamber clocks showing different times, 26**Parliamentary procedure**

- Address in reply, consideration later this day, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), agreed to, 4
- Suspension of certain standing orders with respect to sittings, notices of motions, bills, unanimous consent, etc., 6-7, 43-4

Pearkes, Mr. G. R. (Esquimalt-Saanich)

- Address in reply, 77-81
- United Nations Emergency Force, 44, 77-81, 155-7
- Code of discipline, 171

Pearson, Hon. L. B. (Secretary of State for External Affairs)

- Address in reply, 51-66
- Commonwealth of Nations, 168-9
- Egypt's Jews, inquiry re treatment of, 108
- Hungary, situation in, 51-2
- Middle East situation, 52-3
 - Canadian policy, 53-5, 166, 168-9
 - Strain on Commonwealth, 60, 108-9
- Quebec conference, 169
- United Nations Emergency Force, 61-5, 159, 160, 168, 170-3
 - Additional commitments, 158-9
 - Area limitations, 159-60
 - Background of, 57-8, 166-7
 - Increasing to meet Jordan-Syria situation, 65, 136
 - Insurance coverage, 162-3
 - Objections of Egypt, 137
 - Order in council covering, 170-1
 - Under UN control, 168
- United Nations sessions concerning Middle East, 56
- Ways and means, M. for committee, 173

Peyote buttons, see under Drugs and medicaments**Pickersgill, Hon. J. W. (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration)**

- Address in reply, 36-40, 147
- Hungarian refugees, immigration policy, 36-40, 110, 147
 - Chest X-rays, 45
- Peyote buttons, 46

Poulin, Mr. Raoul (Beauce)

- Address in reply, 90-2
- Hungarian relief, 91-2
- United Nations Emergency Force, 90-1

- Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act**, extending, 48
- Prairie farmers**, cash shortage, *see* Farmers
- Procedure**, Parliamentary, *see* Parliamentary procedure
- "Quebec conference"**, calling to strengthen western unity, 144, 169
- Quelch, Mr. Victor** (Acadia)
United Nations Emergency Force, insurance coverage, 162
- Radar stations**, DEW Line, obtaining clearance from United States for visits to, 50
- Regier, Mr. Erhart** (Burnaby-Coquitlam)
Interest rate increases, effect on municipalities, federal policy, 46-7
- Ross**, the late Thomas H., member for Hamilton East, tributes to, 1-3
- Rowe, Hon. W. Earl** (Dufferin-Simcoe)
Address in reply, amdt., 11-8
Adjournment until Jan. 8th 1957, M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East), 134
Bennett, the late Miss Sybil, and the late Thomas H. Ross, tribute to, 2
Drew, Hon. George, absence from House, 4
House of Commons, suspension of certain standing orders, 6, 43
Hungarian refugees, relief, 17-8
Interest rates, lowering by next June, 48
Middle East situation, United Nations action, 12-7
Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 114-5
- Royal Assent**, 175
- Russia**
Arms exports to Egypt and Middle East, 12, 14, 49, 65-6, 88, 90, 117, 130-1, 141
Middle East, intervention in, 12-4, 17, 35, 52, 65, 76, 117-8, 126-7, 156
Offer to send volunteers to Egypt, 7, 12, 60
"Peaceful coexistence", idea of, 11, 52
Policy of conquest through fear, 102
Satellites
Effect of free nations' broadcasts on, 27-8, 36
Moving towards freedom, 52
Refugees from, assistance for, 18, 24
See also Hungarian refugees
Stalinism, return to, 12, 52, 140-1
Treaties and agreements, breaking, 100
- St. Laurent, Right Hon. L. S.** (Prime Minister)
Address in reply, 19-26
Consideration later this day, M., 4
Motion for engrossing and presentation, 148
Adjournment until Jan. 8th 1957, M., 133
Bennett, the late Miss Sybil, and the late Thomas H. Ross, tribute to, 1-2
Deputy chairman of committees of the whole, M. for appointment of Mr. Applewhaite, 5-6
Drew, Hon. George, absence from House, 3-4
Hungary, Soviet action, refugees, relief, 24-5
Middle East situation, correspondence with Sir Anthony Eden, 23-4
Oaths of office bill, 1
Old age pension, increasing, 46
Pacific Great Eastern Railway, subsidy, 135-6
Parliament, calling, constitutional practice, 19-20, 174
Prairie farmers alleged cash shortage, 107
Supply and Ways and Means, M. for committees, 5-6
Suspension of standing orders with respect to sittings, notices of motions, bills, etc., M., 6-7, 43
Trainor, the late Owen C., tribute to, 114-5
United Nations Charter, attitude of large powers to, 20
United Nations Emergency Force, 20-6
Order in council, 5, 48, 174
Western unity, Commonwealth relations, 174-5
- Sinclair, Hon. James** (Minister of Fisheries)
Fish destruction by sprayers, court case, 109

Small Loans Act, amending, 111

South Saskatchewan River project, constructing dam, 48, 110

Speaker (Hon L. René Beaudoin)

Address in Reply, acknowledgment by Governor General, 177

Greetings to Hon. S.W.R.D. Bandaranaike, 43

Vacancy through resignation of Hon. George A. Drew (Carleton), 177

Special orders, *see* Parliamentary procedure

Stewart, Mr. Alistair (Winnipeg North)

Address in reply, 73-7

Middle East situation, 74-7

United Nations Emergency Force, uniforms, 44

Suez Canal

Association of users, 82

Blockage, 29, 49, 85

Clearing, 10, 49, 60, 126, 173

Egypt's nationalization of, 98

Canada's attitude on, 13, 42, 49, 52, 68

Dealing with in UN security council, 53

Operation, United Nations assistance, 76

See also under Middle East

Sugar, alleged combine, 136

Supply

External affairs, 148

Going into without question put, 134

M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East) for House to resolve itself into committee of, agreed to, 5-6

National defence, 148-73

Supply Bill

Bill No. 2 (further supplementary estimates) for granting.....for fiscal year ending

March 31st 1957, sum of \$1,000,001—Mr. Harris

res., 173-4; 1r., 2r., 174; com., 174-5; 3r., 175; R.A., 175

Thomas, Mr. Ray (Wetaskiwin)

United Nations Emergency Force, insurance coverage, 164

Throne speech, debate on, *see* Address in reply

Trade

Balance of trade, 111

United Kingdom, with, effect of closer U.K.-European relations, 45

Trainor, Mr. O.C. (Winnipeg South)

Death of, tributes from members, 114-5

Trans-Canada pipe line

Pipe supply, effect of tanker construction, 138

Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line Company, explosion at Jasper pump station, 138

Transport Controller, 46, 138

Unemployment insurance, claims in northern New Brunswick, 110

United Kingdom, trade with, *see* Trade

United Nations

Aggressors not deterred by, 33, 70, 72, 75, 99-100

Canada's position in, 8, 10

Charter, treating as "instrument to regiment smaller nations", 20, 41, 70, 142-3

Collective security under, 74-5, 94-7, 99-100, 102, 123-4, 127, 143, 155

General assembly, closure in, 22

Hungary, resolutions on, 11, 17, 52, 101

United Nations—Cont.

- Middle East, resolutions on, 9, 11, 17-8, 20, 58-60, 89-90, 121-3
- Canada's vote, 17, 22, 24, 40-1, 49-50, 52, 54-6, 59-60, 96, 100-1, 141, 167-9
- Police force
 - Establishment, 57-8, 69-70, 86, 90, 95, 125, 140-3, 146, 166-7
 - Using NATO for, suggested, 84-7
 - See also United Nations Emergency Force

United Nations Emergency Force

- Appointment of Major General Burns as commander, 9, 21-2
- Canadian participation, 8-10, 12-5, 22, 25-6, 33-4, 62-4, 91-2, 155-6, 162, 171
 - Order in council P.C. 1956-1712, tabled, 5, text, 105, 174
- Canadian units
 - Accommodations for, 157
 - Airlift of Queen's Own Rifles and refitting *Magnificent*, cost, 44-5, 151
 - Armoured jeeps, 139
 - Brigade group from NATO considered, 150
 - Campney, Mr., on, 148-55
 - Composition of, 44, 79-80, 150-3
 - Expenditures on, payment procedure, etc., 126, 153-7, 173
 - Insurance for troops, 157-8, 162-4
 - Mobility, training, supplies and equipment, 77-81, 83, 156
 - Pensions and allowances, 137
 - Queen's Own Rifles, 80, 113, 149-50, 156, 160, 163
 - Delay in sending, 15, 20-1, 63-4, 127, 139
 - Uniforms, 44, 163
 - Welfare and recreation, 163-4
- Chain of command, 165, 168
- Code of discipline, 171
- Complement of 18,000 or 20,000 men suggested, 34
- Composition, functions and operation, 20-2, 61-5, 77-87, 90, 102, 118-9, 127, 130, 139, 153, 155-6, 158-61, 164-5, 168, 170
 - Advisory committee on, 59
 - Effect of Syria-Jordan situation on, 65, 124-5, 136, 157
 - Egypt's attitude, 8, 15-20, 24, 34, 51, 62, 71-2, 93, 121-2, 127, 131, 136-7, 143, 168
 - "Secure and supervise", significance of terms, 170-1
- Costs, sharing, 172-3
- Magnificent*, using as troopship, 16, 21, 127, 149, 151-2, 155-6, 163
 - Hospital accommodation, 149, 156, 163
 - In lieu of merchant ships, 173
 - Stripping of armament, 80
- National sovereignty over units of, maintaining, 34, 119, 125, 173
- Nations contributing to, 170-1
- Proposals of Mr. Pearson, 8-9, 56-9
 - Remarks of Mr. Krishna Menon, 108-9
- Stationing in Middle East until disputes are settled, 34-5

United States

- Middle East policies, 16-8, 29, 50, 71, 89, 94-5, 98, 117, 119-20

Vacancies in House, see Members of Parliament**Van Home, Mr. J. C. (Restigouche-Madawaska)**

- Fish destruction by air spraying, 109
- Interest rate increases, effect on maritimes, 47
- McLennan's Foundry, aircraft repairs by, 109
- Unemployment insurance claims, 110
- United Nations Emergency Force, Nasser objections to Canadian units, 136

Veterans, frost damage to B.C. fruit farmers, 108**Visitors to Canada**

- Bandaranaike, Hon. S.W.R.D., Prime Minister of Ceylon, 43

Ways and Means Committee

- M. (Mr. St. Laurent, Quebec East) for House to resolve itself into, agreed to, 5-6
- M. (Mr. Pearson) for House to resolve itself into, 173

Weselak, Mr. A. B. (Springfield)

- Address in reply (seconder), 9-11
- Hungary, Soviet actions, refugees, 10-1

Weselak, Mr. A. B.—Cont.

United Nations Emergency Force, Middle East, 9-10

Wheat, *see* Grain

White, Mr. H. O. (Middlesex East)

Trade balance, 111

Winch, Mr. Harold E. (Vancouver East)

United Nations Emergency Force, 161-2, 173

Winters, Hon. Robert H. (Minister of Public Works)

Housing, 109

Yuill, Mr. Charles (Jasper-Edson)

Address in reply, 144-5

Middle East, Israeli invasion of, 145

Zaplitny, Mr. F. S. (Dauphin)

Hungary, conference *re* refugees, 110

Prairie farm rehabilitation, wider application of, 48
