

The function of this force which is now in being is to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities, as I pointed out this morning, and carry out its task in accordance with directions received from the United Nations, not from any one member of the United Nations. The force--and it is interesting to recall that the resolution authorizing this force was passed not much more than three weeks ago--is now in being in Egypt where it will be stationed, or any place else where the United Nations considers it necessary to be stationed, in order to carry out the functions which I have just mentioned. The most important function is, of course, the policing of the zone between opposing forces in Egypt in order to prevent the recurrence, if possible, of the fighting. At the present time the headquarters of the force is along the Suez, but it may of course be moved.

It is not a fighting force in the sense that it is a force operating under, say, chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter, which deals with enforcement procedures. It is not a United Nations fighting force in the sense that the force in Korea was; it is operating under a different chapter of the Charter dealing with conciliation procedures. Therefore the alarmist interpretation, the alarmist possibility, mentioned last night by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra that Canadian elements in this force might find themselves in conflict with British soldiers is, I suggest merely a figment of his imagination. It is not the purpose of this force to be used in fighting operations against anybody. It is not that kind of force. If the hon. member had read the United Nations document concerning the function and organization of this force, which have already been agreed on, he would, I think, have understood that.

This force will stay in Egypt until the United Nations decides that its functions are discharged, or, of course, until the governments participating in the force withdraw their contingents. It must, of course, not infringe on the sovereignty of the government of the territory in which it is operating. That is obvious. But the exercise of that sovereignty in the case of the government of Egypt where the force is operating now must be qualified by the acceptance by Egypt of the resolution of the United Nations concerning the force. Egypt has already agreed to the admission of this United Nations force to its territory; and it seems to me to be obvious, because it is not an enforcement action of the United Nations under Chapter 7 of the charter that every effort should be made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and by the United Nations itself, to secure and maintain the co-operation of the Egyptian government in the functioning of this force, and the co-operation of the other governments concerned, including the government of Israel.

But that does not mean, as I understand it--and I assure you, Mr. Speaker, this has been made very clear in meetings of the Advisory Committee--that Egypt or any other government can determine by its own decision where the force is to operate, how it is to operate or when it must leave. Furthermore, the right of Egypt to consent to the admission of