

atmosphere to the point at which fruitful efforts can be made to reach a durable settlement of problems in the area.

Canada would welcome a renewed effort in the direction of more permanent and effective arrangements to meet the requirements of the United Nations. I do not suggest that our summary study in connection with the Secretary-General's report should necessarily constitute the basis for the creation of a permanent United Nations force of the UNEF type. Clearly the employment of a UNEF would not be appropriate in every conceivable emergency situation. However, we think the experience derived from UNEF should serve as a starting point and a useful guide to the drawing up of a blueprint for effective United Nations action to meet various future contingencies. We realize that these contingencies are many and varied and that it is not simple, or even perhaps desirable, to try and specify them.

It is just as important, in our view, to study the precedents set for us by those United Nations emergency agencies, none of which could be described as a force. While in certain circumstances something of the proportions of UNEF may be required, it is often better to make use of the truce-supervision type of body, or something along the line of the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon. We Canadians have also had a good deal of experience in these agencies both under United Nations auspices and in the International Supervisory Commissions in Indochina and we believe firmly in their effectiveness under proper conditions. It is worthy of note that the officers of the Commission in Indochina have now completed four years of collaboration with the authorities of the countries in that area in maintaining an international armistice agreement, and they have done so without carrying arms of any kind. The moral authority of an international commission, carrying with it the sanction of the international community, should not be underestimated.

The need for flexibility in our approach to breaches of the peace is made all the more necessary by the complexity and delicacy of the issues which so often confront us. The despatch of armed forces under a United Nations banner is by no means always the best method of dealing with situations in which internal and external forces are engaged simultaneously.

There can be no question as to the interest of the United Nations in preventing any outbreak of violence which may affect international peace and security. There are very grave questions as to how far it may be appropriate or expedient in particular cases for the United Nations to intervene, even in order to prevent a disturbance of the international peace, by measures of force which are not directed against an aggressor, but against one or other of the parties to an armed conflict which is in the nature of a civil war.