

*Supply—External Affairs*

of that expense, but there is no fixed arrangement yet and this item has nothing whatever to do with the fund in item 672 which we have considered and to which Canada is contributing \$1 million for civilian assistance.

This item represents Canada's assessment with respect to the military costs for the last six months of 1960 alone. No one can yet see the end of the road in the matter of cost in this United Nations intervention in the Congo nor the extent to which nor how long assistance may be required. One can only hope that good reason will prevail and that order will soon triumph over the chaos that has persisted in areas of that country. In the meantime we are bearing the outlays required in providing Canada's contribution to the United Nations forces there.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Mr. Chairman, in the wording of the item the phrase "ad hoc" is used. While I belong to the legal profession as does the Minister of Finance, I find that many people today use this phrase in a rather broad way. Am I right in thinking that when the words "assessment for the United Nations Congo ad hoc account" are used, what is meant is that this is an account which is special to the extent that it does not include participation by all normal participants in the United Nations activities and that this account is one to which Canada is contributing on a basis different from that normally applied in respect of other contributions? I understand that a number of nations which normally participate in United Nations affairs are remaining apart from this ad hoc account. Is that right?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Yes. The significance of the expression "ad hoc account" is to indicate that it is special. It has a special purpose and thus far the money has been raised, to the extent it has been raised, by special means. The ordinary budgetary arrangements have not applied in this area. Indeed, as I mentioned earlier, special contributions by some countries, the United States, United Kingdom and Canada, have had the effect of reducing the sum to be raised by ordinary assessment by some \$17½ million. In other words, the total amount to be raised by assessment has been reduced by these special contributions from \$66 million to \$48½ million.

**Mr. Pearson:** I have heard it stated, and perhaps the minister will confirm the statement or otherwise, that notwithstanding the contributions of countries like our own and the United States, the United Kingdom and others who customarily discharge their responsibilities to the United Nations in this manner, so completely negative has been the

[Mr. Fleming (Eglinton).]

response of other members of the United Nations that the expenses of the United Nations intervention in the Congo at the present time are being borne by overdrafts, that the secretary general has had to borrow money. I saw in the newspapers this morning that he had had to borrow money from Mr. Hoffman of the international development fund. Is it a fact that the United Nations has been unable to raise enough money to cover the expenses which have been entailed in the Congo as a result of security council resolutions supported by those communist countries in the United Nations which have not only refused to contribute but have done their best to frustrate the efforts of the United Nations in the Congo?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** That is quite true and the secretary general, as the Leader of the Opposition has indicated, has been obliged to draw on credit balances standing in some special accounts under United Nations auspices. It is a deplorable situation.

**Mr. Benidickson:** That is what ad hoc means here, that just some participants in the United Nations are prepared at the present time to do as we are doing in advancing funds for this particular purpose?

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** So far as the ad hoc account is concerned, it is a special account set up to meet the expenses of this particular intervention in the Congo. When it was set up it was not assumed there would be defaulters and the special contributions made by the United States, the United Kingdom and Canada have really been made to relieve the United Nations in the face of the very serious difficulties confronting the secretary general in trying to make ends meet when his budget assessments have not been paid by some of the countries on whom they were levied.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Despite a resolution to that effect.

**Mr. Fleming (Eglinton):** Quite.

Item agreed to.

678. Assessment towards financing the United Nations emergency force in an amount of \$392,680 U.S., notwithstanding that payment may exceed or fall short of the equivalent in Canadian dollars, estimated as of February, 1961, which is, \$385,000.

**Mr. Pearson:** I wonder if the minister could give us some indication of the operations of the United Nations emergency force for which this appropriation is to pay? How many troops have we now in Palestine still working for peace in that area? How many other countries are continuing to participate in the United Nations emergency force? Perhaps the minister could indicate whether we