EDEN OFFERS U.N. ROLE IN SUEZ ZONE
By DREW MIDDLETON Special to The New York Times.
New York Times (1857-Current file); Nov 2, 1956; ProQuest Historical Newspapers The New York Times (1851 - 2002)
pg. 1

EDEN OFFERS U. N. ROLE IN SUEZ ZONE

Invites Area Control Later On—House After Stormy Debate Upholds Policy

By DREW MIDDLETON
Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Nov. 1—Prime Minister Eden said today that Britain and France would welcome eventual assumption of control of the Suez Canal area by the United Nations.

He qualified his declaration by saying he would endorse such action only after Israeli and Egyptian forces had been separated and the situation in the Suez area stabilized.

The Prime Minister's statement in the House of Commons was one of the keys to decisive victory for the Government's intervention policy in Egypt after one of the most turbulent debates in modern parliamentary history.

The allies, Sir Anthony emphasized, do not seek to impose by force a solution of the dispute between Israel and Egypt or of the quarrel with Egypt over nationalization of the Universal Suez Canal Company.

Disrespect for U. N. Denied

Both the Prime Minister and R. A. Butler, Lord Privy Seal, indicated that Britain and France had acted not out of disrespect to the Security Council and the United Nations but because the Governments feared United Nations action would come too late to halt the Israeli-Egyptian war.

There has been "danger and strain" in the Middle East for a decade and the United Nations has not been able to end it despite repeated efforts.

A Laborite motion of censure against the Government was defeated by 324 votes to 255. A Government amendment to the censure motion was approved by 323 to 255. Finally, the original motion, as amended by the Government, won by 320 to 253. The Government majorities of 69, 68 and 67 were about normal.

The Government's grip on Conservative members was tightened by Sir Anthony's moderate, patient speech. But although they were foredoomed to failure, Labor members fought the Government every minute of the debate.

Before the debate began, the noise from the Laborite benches was so great that William S. Morrison, Speaker of the House, was forced to suspend the sitting. The last suspension of a

Continued on Page 8, Column 3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

EDEN OFFERS U. N. ROLE IN SUEZ ZONE

Continued From Page 1

sitting on the ground of disorder occurred July 23, 1936.

When Sir Anthony refused to answer a question put by Hugh Gaitskell, the Labor party leader, the Labor benches were swept by an angry cacophony. Shouts of "answer" and "shame" and "resign" mingled with boos.

The Conservative benches began to cheer in reply and Sir Anthony and his lieutenants lounged nonchalantly on the front bench.

Mr. Morrison, his Scots voice sharp with anger, warned the House once and then suspended it when the noise continued. When it returned it was somewhat chastened but the mood did not last long. There were frequent interruptions of Government speakers.

The longest and loudest cheer of the day was accorded Sir Anthony when he finished his speech.

Aneurin Bevan, who wound up the debate for the Opposition, savagely attacked the Government policy, which, he said, had dismayed Britain's allies and shocked the world. The policy, he said, "stains the name of Britain."

The nation had the whole world against it before, Mr. Bevan declared, referring to the war with Hitler and 1940. But, he added softly, 'we had honor on our side."

"Does the Government intend to bleed Britain to death in Egypt as France is bleeding to death in Algeria?" he asked.

Appealing for the Government to have the courage to retrace its steps and end the intervention, Mr. Bevan declaimed that unless Prime Minister Eden was able to do this "in the name of mankind for God's sake get out."

The Welsh radical's forensic fireworks were touched by grave concern for Britain's good name and a philosophic assessment of the general problems of mankind. Those listening to the soft voice and watching the graying head sensed that Mr. Bevan is aging and at last admits it.

But neither Mr. Bevan's thrusts nor the more pedestrian arraignment of the Government by James Griffiths sufficed to break the palisade of facts with which the Government fortified its position.

Ill prepared in its earlier defense of intervention yesterday and on Tuesday, the Government recouped today in speeches by Sir Anthony and Mr. Butler. Under the prodding of the Opposition, but more often on their own volition, they clarified the allied position.

This clarification included:

¶The Government does not consider itself at war with Egypt but in what Sir Anthony called a state of armed conflict. Britain complied fully with the provisions of the Hague Convention of 1907 by sending an ultimatum to Egypt before attacking.

¶Diplomatic relations between Britain and Egypt were broken early today, the Foreign Office disclosed.

¶The Prime Minister also revealed that the Geneva Convention applied to the forces of Egypt, Israel and Britain in the present operations in Egypt.

The Geneva Convention provides for the treatment of wounded and prisoners in war or armed conflict between nations.

The Opposition persistently criticized the Government for failing to achieve a peaceful solution under the Charter of the United Nations. But Mr. Butler and Sir Anthony both emphasized that this had been attempted in the past.

The present police action, Mr. Butler declared, is a possible preliminary to the restoration of law and order under the aegis of the United Nations. But had Britain and France "waited and hoped" for the United Nations to act "we should not have been able to achieve peace or a lasting settlement."

Mr. Butler also voiced the growing conviction in the Government that once the people and the Government of the United States fully understood the motives that led to the French-British intervention they would take a more lenient view of the action.

The identity of interest between Britain and the United States is one of imperatives of world politics, Mr. Butler explained. "I am convinced that the relations of our two countries will come through this difficult period and that the Americans will understand, as this country will shortly, our motives," he declared.

One of the most telling points made by Mr. Gaitskell in his speech on Tuesday was that the Commonwealth had turned against Britain over the intervention in Egypt. Australia and New Zealand are two Commonwealth countries whose good opinion counts here.

Sir Anthony Eden regained the ground lost to Mr. Gaitskell by citing the speeches by Prime Ministers Robert Gordon Menzies of Australia and Sidney G. Holland of New Zealand in which they supported the Government's policy.

But it was the Prime Minister's assertion that Britain would be pleased to turn over physical control of the Suez Canal area to the United Nations and that the Government sought no solutions by force that had the greatest impact on the House.

After two days of the sharpest wrangling the House has known since World War II, Sir Anthony finally had brought the Commons back to his original explanation for intervention.

"The first and urgent task," he said, "is to separate these combatants [Israel and Egypt] and to stabilize the position."

The Government, he added, is convinced that if it had not acted now "a state of war would inevitably have spread over an infinitely wider area."

Sir Anthony explained to the Opposition that the Government had not invoked the Tripartite Declaration of 1950 under which France, Britain and the United States are pledged to halt aggression in the Middle East, because Egypt had denounced the declaration.

As a result of the efforts of its leaders in speech and its whips in action in the cloakrooms, the Government enjoyed a solid triumph. The majority of 69 by which the censure motion, Labor's main objective, was defeated, was regarded as "very good" by the party leaders.



Associated Press

BERATES EDEN: Hugh Gaitskell, leader of Britain's Labor party. He made sharp criticism of Suez intervention in the House of Commons debate yesterday.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.