

Some of it may appear to you repetitious, but I am doing this in order to get the picture as clearly as possible before the committee.

Canadian policy towards the Middle East was outlined, as you know, in considerable detail by the Prime Minister and by myself in our statements to the house last Friday.

With regard to Lebanon, our hope is that in the short term—and I would emphasize that word and that concept—in the short term, the United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL), the extent of which was intimated by the Secretary General after the voting on the Security Council's resolutions—will be effective in establishing stability and in creating conditions which will permit the withdrawal of United States forces from that country.

As I informed the house, the Secretary General has not, as yet, finalized the plan for the expansion of UNOGIL.

There was a telegram which came in just before I left the office this morning which indicated that that work on the part of the Secretary General is nearly finalized. So we expect—or the government expects—that there will be a further invitation from the Secretary General to contribute.

We now have ten or eleven officers, and we anticipate that we will be invited to contribute additional men to that group, UNOGIL.

I stated in the house on Friday that it was not unlikely that the Secretary General would set up an advisory committee with respect to the operations of UNOGIL in its work in Lebanon.

I can now inform the committee that the Secretary General has established that committee and that Canada is a member of it. It is an advisory committee with respect to the operations and objectives of UNOGIL and Canada will be on the committee along with representatives from Brazil, Ceylon, Colombia, India, Norway, and Pakistan.

I would like to make this very clear indeed. This is the same personnel that is to be found on the UNEF advisory committee, but of course they will meet as a UNOGIL advisory committee. I express the hope again that the work of UNOGIL might be a forerunner and a manifestation of long-term United Nations authority on the ground in Lebanon.

This will also assist in reaching the objectives that I announced in my speech in the house on Friday. UNOGIL might contribute to a long term solution for Lebanon—namely, an internationally recognized status of neutrality on the Austrian model, a status which conceivably might have further application in that area.

You will recall that Mr. Martin in his address on the debate on external affairs shared the view that this might be considered as a pilot project which might be used in other countries in the Middle East. I have heard it suggested since I made my statement in the House of Commons on Friday that that might be unacceptable to the Lebanese. There was nothing in the statement—and I checked *Hansard* with respect to this, Mr. Chairman—there was nothing in my statement that carried with it any implication that such a status of neutrality would be imposed on the Lebanese. It must be acceptable to the Lebanese.

I endeavoured in my speech in the house to indicate my—not my expectation but my grounds for hope, having regard to the history of Lebanon—that it might be acceptable to the Lebanese. On Friday I also mentioned that it was important to find some means to ensure economic stability for Lebanon and for the Middle East as a whole, and that the United Nations and other organizations might have a role to play in this connection.

I was gratified to hear Mr. Pearson mention the same idea in his statement in the house when he spoke of a Marshall Plan for the Middle East administered by the United Nations. He mentioned that the Soviet Union would be less able to exploit its aid-giving, if the scheme were under United Nations auspices.