

We did not believe the cease-fire resolution went far enough and we abstained from voting on it. But immediately thereafter we proposed by resolution that fighting should cease and that a United Nations police force should go into Egypt to supervise the maintenance of the peace. This is the resolution under which the present force has been set up and made effective. It was provided that the Secretary General should report back in 48 hours with a plan for the setting up of the force. At the same time an Asian-Arab bloc of 19 states brought forward a resolution for a cease-fire and a withdrawal, but fortunately Canada, through the instrumentality of our own great Secretary of State for External Affairs, was able to get through the General Assembly prior passage of his police resolution. It was carried unanimously. That is, 54 nations voted for it; and although 19 nations abstained, not one opposed the Canadian proposition for the setting up of the force. Surely neither the honourable Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Haig) nor anyone else can say that we were not acting in the interests of the United Kingdom. In fact, our Secretary of State for External Affairs had been in touch with the British representatives, and the spokesman of the United Kingdom at the UN made this statement:

The first urgent task is to separate Israel and Egypt and to stabilize the position. That is our purpose. If the United Nations were willing to take over the physical task of maintaining peace in that area no one would be better pleased than us. But police action there must be to separate the belligerents and to stop hostilities.

Clearly then, we were working in accord with the wishes of the United Kingdom. It is true that both Britain and France abstained from voting, but it is also true that both Governments subsequently expressed their appreciation of the initiative which was shown by the Canadian delegation and which resulted in the adoption of the resolution. The Asian-Arab resolution was subsequently carried by 59 votes against 5.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition stated in effect that the United Nations is just an organization for "talk, talk, talk" and "words, words, words". Well, in so far as Canada is concerned that has not been the case to date. Immediately the resolution to set up a UN police force was adopted, Canada, whose representative had done a great deal of talking up to that time, immediately took action and volunteered to provide a regiment to form part of the force. Is not that action? That is not "words, words, words". And the regiment is ready to go. Who stopped it from going?

Hon. Mr. Horner: Nasser.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: President Nasser? No, it was not he who prevented the regiment from going. Who is heading this UN police force? A great Canadian, of whom we are all proud, General Burns. It was he, and no other, who stopped the contingent from going.

Hon. Mr. Horner: Because he was told.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald: My honourable friend seems to know more about what took place between General Burns, the Secretary General of the United Nations and others than the rest of us do. But I can assure him that the Canadian force takes orders from no one except General Burns. It was he who decided what force we should send. When an infantry battalion is needed, and when General Burns says it ought to go, it will go. In the meantime what are we doing? We provided an airlift. Some of us here may consider ourselves to be great military strategists, may think we know more about running General Burns' job than the general himself does, but it was he who told us that what should now be sent was, not a thousand infantrymen, but as many aeroplanes as we could get to carry our people from Italy to the Suez. Should we tell General Burns that he does not know what he is talking about, that we are not going to provide aeroplanes, that we insist on sending soldiers? That is what the honourable Leader of the Opposition suggests. If that were done, what kind of an army would we have; what kind of a job could General Burns do? He would be helpless. I can assure honourable senators that we shall be pleased—and I know they will back us up—to carry out every request that General Burns, and he alone, makes of us.

The Government having decided to send this force, Parliament was called. You may ask, why was Parliament called? When Parliament was in session in 1950 in connection with the sending of forces to Korea, the Prime Minister gave an undertaking that in the future whenever forces were to be sent out of Canada for any reason other than the Korean war, an order in council would be passed and Parliament would be summoned within ten days to approve or disapprove of the necessary expenditure. That undertaking was given because the terms of the act establishing the Korean force were so wide that under them the regular armed forces of Canada could be sent at any time to any part of the world for United Nations' purposes. The Prime Minister gave his word that he would respect the provisions of section 33 of the National Defence Act, which reads:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the Canadian forces or any service, component or unit thereof on active service, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation