

This present Emergency Force in the Middle East is a unique experiment in the use of an international policy agency to secure and supervise the cease-fire which has been called for by the General Assembly. Why should we not, therefore, on the basis of this experience—the experience we have gained by the operation and establishment and organization of this force—consider how a more permanent United Nations machinery of this kind might be created for use in similar situations as required?

What the United Nations now would seem to need for these limited and essentially police functions is perhaps not so much a force in being as an assurance that members would be prepared to contribute contingents when asked to do so, to have ready and organized for that purpose; with some appropriate central United Nations machinery along the lines of that which has already been established for this present Emergency Force.

The kind of Force we have in mind would be designed to meet situations calling for action, intermediate if you like, between the passing of resolutions and the fighting of a war, and which might incidentally have the effect of reducing the risks of the latter. It would not, however, as I see it, be expected to operate in an area where fighting was actually in progress; it would be preventive and restoratory rather than punitive or belligerent.

It is not possible to determine in advance what would be required in any emergency, but surely members through the proper legislative processes could take in advance the necessary decisions in principle so that should the occasion arise the executive power could quickly meet United Nations requests for assistance which had been approved by it. In doing so we would be making at least some progress in putting international action behind international work.

The third factor that has a bearing on our independence in foreign policy is NATO, our membership in which gives us, not only the assurance of a strong and collective defence if we are attacked but, even more important, is our strongest deterrent against attack. Since I last had occasion to speak on foreign affairs in the House a NATO Council Meeting of very considerable importance has taken place in Paris.

The meeting, to which I have just referred, took place in Paris from December 11 to December 15. Ministers from each of the NATO countries met in Paris. My colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Campney) and I represented the Canadian Government at this meeting. In addition to the annual stocktaking of NATO's defence plan and the approval of a directive for future military planning, secret of course, which took into account both economic and atomic capabilities, we had what we considered