

it the other day, "Nothing more comes out of the United Nations than we put into it."

I think it is also wrong to rely on United Nations decisions only for a particular area or a particular situation. It should be remembered that if governments are to use the United Nations when they consider it in their interest to do so, and ignore it on other occasions when they find it a less convenient instrument for their purposes, the organization will be very greatly weakened indeed and will be open to the criticism of being merely an agency for power politics. I am not suggesting that these things have happened at the United Nations but I am suggesting that we should watch carefully to see that they do not happen.

Recently the Assembly took a very important step indeed in extending its functions into the field of security after the Security Council itself became powerless in that field through the exercise of the veto. I refer, of course, to the Emergency Force which was set up to supervise and secure a cessation of hostilities. Now, Mr. Speaker, the immediate value of this force which now numbers, incidentally, about 5,500 of whom over 1,100 are Canadians, in respect of the specific emergency which brought it into being has I think been well established. Its continuing value in helping to bring about and maintain peaceful conditions and security in the area in which it operates remains, of course, to be proven. I myself think it should be of a great value for this purpose also, provided it remains genuinely international in control, composition and function, and providing also that its limitations are recognized, especially that it is a voluntary organization which must act strictly within the terms of resolutions which are only morally binding and which must be passed by two-thirds of the Assembly in each case. But even within these limitations the United Nations force can, I think, play an important part in bringing about an honourable and enduring political settlement in the Palestine and Suez area.

We have been discussing the possibilities of such a settlement with friendly governments in recent weeks and it seems to be the general view among members of the United Nations that the present atmosphere, charged as it is with fears and suspicions which have been exacerbated by recent armed conflicts is not at the moment conducive to the kind of discussion and negotiation which would have to precede such a settlement. I think perhaps we have to accept that position. But if, however, the passions and the bitterness of fighting must be given time to recede, that does not, as I see it, mean we can safely sit back and let nature take its course. There may be some reason for delay; there is none for indifference or for indefinite avoidance by the United Nations of a responsibility which is inescapable: to make peace in the area, without which the ceasefire would not have any permanent value.

While the political climate of the Middle East is maturing toward the time when conditions will be more appropriate for a comprehensive settlement it is essential, I think, for the countries of the region, and indeed for us all, that there should be no return to the former state of strife and tension and conflict on the borders; that security should be maintained and, indeed, guaranteed. I suggest that for this purpose there will be a continuing need during the period until a political settlement is achieved for the stabilizing international influence that the Emergency Force is now exercising. And this essential stabilizing role might well require the continuing presence of a United Nations force along the boundary between Egypt and Israel; perhaps also for a time in the Gaza strip and, with the consent of the states involved, along the borders between Israel and her other Arab neighbours, though that of course would require a further resolution from the United Nations Assembly.

It seems to me that some such United Nations supervision might help to ensure the security of the nations concerned which is so vital if they are to approach with the necessary confidence negotiations toward a comprehensive solution of their conflicts.

Not only, Mr. Speaker, in my view, must the borders be made secure between Israel and her neighbours; so must freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal and in the Gulf of Aqaba. As the Canal will soon be open to traffic again it is, I think, very important indeed to press on with discussions which have already begun at the United Nations so that the control of the operation, maintenance and development of the Canal will be in accordance with the six principles agreed on at the Security Council last September—I think it was last September. Events since that time, far from weakening the validity of these principles, have strengthened that validity and I think it is now more important than ever that the operation of this essential international waterway be—and I quote from one of these principles—"insulated from the politics of any one nation" and that the United Nations recognize and confirm that fact.

This is a problem which is right on top of us at the United Nations Assembly now, and it must be solved satisfactorily or there will be further trouble in that area. It is obvious of course—I think it is obvious, though I wish it were not—that the Soviet Union will do its best to prevent such an agreed solution on terms satisfactory both to the users of the Canal and to Egypt. Moscow has already shown that its policy is to trouble these waters and to fish in them.

Looking further ahead, the experience of the United Nations in respect of the Suez crisis, especially the necessity for hasty improvisation, underlines, I think, the desirability and the need of some international police force on a more permanent basis. We have recognized this need in the past. We