

Inquiries of the Ministry

largest force of all on the island, for any increase or expansion of these powers.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I do not agree with the right hon. gentleman that the force has been hobbled, or whatever the word was, because I am sure the evidence reveals that but for the United Nations force, in which Canada has played so distinguished a part, there would have been a deterioration that might well, both at the beginning before the force was established and afterward, have led to war.

As the secretary general said in the report which he circulated 10 days ago, the presence of the force was, in his judgment, vital for the maintenance of conditions that could lead to the avoidance of war and produce a situation that might encourage satisfactory results from mediation. I may say that last Friday I met with Colonel Amy, the officer in charge of the Canadian contingent, and from what he told me, as I am sure from what he has told my colleague the Minister of National Defence, there is no doubt that the United Nations force has, notwithstanding the great difficulties it faced, made an indispensable and necessary contribution in that troubled island.

My right hon. friend says he saw no reference in the newspapers to the added powers of the force.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No; the request from Canada.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): To the request from Canada. As my right hon. friend knows, the secretary general did make a statement in the security council in which he referred to the consultations he had had with participating governments, including Canada—which I may say has been very active in this regard—on the conditions which he laid down and which are embodied in the notation of the resolution passed by the security council on Friday last. The security council noted the secretary general's request for full freedom of movement for the force, authority to remove military installations, and authority to separate opposing forces and create buffer zones.

It is significant in this context that the security council resolution containing such a clause received for the first time the unanimous approval of the members of the council, including the Soviet union and Czechoslovakia. It should also be noted that in the course of the debate the secretary general received explicit support for his proposals regarding these conditions from a majority

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

of council members and particularly that, in a statement he made after the resolution was passed, he reasserted his intention to continue to seek full freedom of movement for the force.

In these circumstances the secretary general will, in Canada's view—and we have been so advised by him—be justified in proceeding on the basis that the mandate of the force has been reinforced by the security council's deliberations on his proposals. He will now attempt to create more effective operating conditions for the force.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, after the removal of the words of lullaby I want to ask the minister this question. I have before me the resolution and the notation. Has there been any increase or expansion of the powers? That is the simple question that I ask.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be unduly severe with my right hon. friend, and I think I had better take his strictures in the spirit in which they have been offered. As my right hon. friend knows, there was a discussion among the participating countries for a period of four days regarding a resolution that would set out explicitly the powers which were sought and referred to by the secretary general in the report that he circulated some 10 days ago. It was not possible to get consent to this resolution without running the risk of a veto. Rather than run the risk of a veto, which would have meant there would have been no renewal of the mandate, the secretary general agreed to a resolution in terms similar in their generality to the resolution of March 4.

In this resolution of Friday last, notation was made of the report of the secretary general, particularly in regard to the enlarged powers sought by him. He likely takes the position, as he publicly indicated afterwards, that, as there was no opposition to this procedure, he is acting on the assumption that his mandate included these enlarged powers. This is a technique which has often been resorted to at the United Nations. It is the only technique that is available in the face of the potential use of the veto. I think it was a constructive course of action and I am sure the secretary general, backed up by all who support him, has done everything he can to deal with this difficult situation. I am satisfied that the right course has been followed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: So the answer is no.