

*Supply—National Defence*

of the United Nations under which this force is acting. There are in the charter provisions by which the United Nations can organize, mobilize and direct a military operation under the security council. But, as I understand it, this force is in no sense under the direction of the security council. In fact I think it is fairly certain that the security council would not authorize this action. It is under the direction of the assembly.

I am also informed that it is under the authority basically of a resolution of 1950, namely a resolution called the uniting for peace resolution. If the minister has not already, in the brief periods when I have been out of the house during the debate, given particulars with regard to that matter, I should be greatly interested, as I think would other hon. members, in knowing just what authority there is in this resolution to set up this force and how it will operate.

Some specific points which come to my mind as to its operation are these. It will be under the general direction of the assembly, as I understand it, and there is that resolution which lays down its terms of reference. It is to secure and to supervise the cessation of hostilities in the Middle East. At least those are the terms in the order in council; and I take it that they have been translated from the resolution of the assembly. That is under the general direction of the assembly. The officer of the assembly is the general secretary, Mr. Hammarskjöld; and he is also the officer of the security council. He is the general officer of the United Nations. I do not suppose one could envisage a difference of opinion between the assembly and the security council and contradictory commands to Mr. Hammarskjöld, but in any event he is the agent through whom the assembly must work. The chain of command, as I see it, will go to the commander of the forces as appointed, namely our Canadian General Burns.

What I want to know from the Minister of National Defence is whether he retains any control over these forces after they have been committed. What is the chain of command after these troops have been committed? The order in council, if I may draw attention to it, is a little equivocal in its expression. It says:

... not exceeding 2,500 in number at any one time, as part of or in immediate support of, an emergency international force . . .

Perhaps the minister can tell us whether the force is committed as part of this international emergency force or whether it is in support of that force and remains under Canadian command to some extent, or whether it comes entirely under the command

of General Burns as the commanding officer of the general assembly? In any event I think the chain of command would be of interest because, if the government of Canada changed its mind about the success of this experiment and wished to withdraw, is it under any obligation or committal not to change its mind? In other words, are these forces committed entirely for the purpose specified in the order?

I appreciate that a small force of this kind can perform only a limited function. Many of us have said in this debate that we are hopeful that this is the beginning of a general settlement of the problem in that area. Certainly this force cannot be expected to do many of the things that have to be done in that area, and they are quite substantial. If the securing of the cessation of hostilities involves, first, the withdrawal of British and French forces from that area, then that is part of this forces' objectives; to see that those forces are withdrawn in accordance with the consent given by their country. It may involve the withdrawal of the Israeli forces, and that may come readily or it may come with a good deal of hesitation. What it involves with respect to the Egyptian forces it is rather difficult to see. I suppose it might involve letting them back into the Sinai peninsula, but that is not something that is at all clear.

If one gets to the point where the agreement on the cessation of hostilities is signed and carried out and this force is there, will it occupy the works and banks of the Suez canal and stand there in occupation pending political action by the assembly to deal with two very serious problems? One of these problems would be the settlement of the boundaries in the almost age-long dispute between Israel and Egypt, and the other would be some settlement of the problem of the Suez canal.

We are hopeful that this is a beginning in the direction of a settlement of these general questions. I appreciate that the house is only being asked to authorize funds to provide forces for the limited purpose of securing the cessation of hostilities. If more is required parliament will soon be in session again. In any event the government has authority, I assume, particularly under the National Defence Act, to do what we all hope can be done, if it can be done effectively; that is, to secure a much more general objective than the limited one for which this force is now being authorized.

I have asked rather a lot of questions and I have put a number of propositions. I do feel that in voting these funds we ought to