

force will operate and when their mission will be completed.

I would like the honourable leader to indicate when a force such as this will finish its duties and why, if necessary, it cannot be replaced by other troops.

It may be of interest to indicate some of the other forces around the world to which Canada contributes. The first one is most interesting. When the so-called armistice was signed in the Korean War, an armistice commission was set up, but Canada since 1955 has maintained two men in Korea. The total cost of those two men to Canada today is the small, insignificant sum of \$160,000, and that cost is still continuing.

In 1955 there was set up a peace force for Indo-China, which is still continuing. That force has cost Canada to date \$10,219,000, of which the sum of \$2,166,000 may be recovered.

For the force in the Congo, which is listed as a continuing force, the cost to date has been \$12,500,000, of which about half that amount may be recovered.

Hon. Mr. Roebuck: Are there any Canadian forces in the Congo?

Hon. Mr. White: In the Congo, the report shows "270 all ranks." It is listed as a continuing operation. The date of this report is June 1964. There may have been some changes since then.

Hon. Mr. Leonard: May I interrupt for a moment? The United Nations force in the Congo terminated on June 30, 1964.

Hon. Mr. White: This paper I hold in my hand is out of date. The covering letter is dated June 4, 1964.

There is a small group of Canadians in Yemen, and another in New Guinea. There is another force for the India-Pakistan border dispute. This last-mentioned group was set up in 1949, and has been operating for some 15 years. I would like to ask the honourable leader, when he replies at some later date, to give some indication of just what this group has accomplished after 15 years, and what further it hopes to accomplish. The cost of this group to date has been \$951,000—practically \$1 million.

The total cost of all these various groups to Canada comes to more than \$72 million. Of that amount \$25 million may be recovered, and if that occurs the cost to Canada will be around \$47 million.

We have a force in Cyprus, which is not included in the return. We all recall that when this force was set up Canada agreed to pay the cost for the first three months. These costs are given as \$3.5 million.

On page 12 of the return furnished by the honourable leader, there is this comment in connection with the force in Cyprus:

Until the Security Council discusses the possible extension of the resolution establishing this force, and in particular the financial basis for any such extension, we are unable to say what financing measures will be taken to continue the force.

I would like to ask the honourable leader if he is able to advise the house how much longer Canada is committed to keeping this force in Cyprus and what further final arrangements have been made as to how the cost is to be apportioned.

When I spoke in May I asked the Leader of the Government if he would give some information as to who is liable for pensions paid to members of military forces who were injured, or to the dependents of those who were killed, while serving in these forces around the world. There was no mention of this in the return filed. As everyone knows, there have been both injuries and fatalities. Only last week two soldiers were killed in the Gaza Strip when their jeep struck a mine. All I would like to know is whether or not Canada is liable for the full amount of these pensions or whether, since it is a United Nations project, that body plays any part in pensions.

When one examines the long and varied lists of forces and commissions in which Canadians are serving around the world, and when one calculates the total cost to the Canadian taxpayer, one realizes that Canada has done not only her full share but probably more than her share. In fact, at times it appears as if Canada were too eager to contribute forces for these various policing organizations around the world. After all, there are now 115 members of the United Nations. Is it unreasonable to ask that all nations make some sort of fair and equal contribution in both men and money to these forces?

Certain countries which are members of the United Nations have refused, to date, to pay their part of the cost of the Gaza Strip and Congo operations. In fact, the nonpayment of their share of these costs has created a present-day crisis at the United Nations.

In 1958 the then Secretary General of the United Nations made suggestions as to certain permanent international forces to meet future emergencies. The United Nations refused to accept his recommendations. The U.S.S.R. and other communist countries, and certain African and Asian countries which had recently received their independence, opposed the organization of any peace-keeping force by the United Nations. Apparently they did not like the idea of the United