

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.