

*Supply—National Defence*

bring about a better state of affairs in the world than we have been experiencing in these last months.

**Mr. Hansell:** I want to ask only a question or two, and perhaps I can ask the minister of external affairs my first question. On page 64 of *Hansard* of November 27 he is reported as having said:

Twenty-three nations have offered contributions to that force and eight of them including Canada, have seen their contributions embodied in the formations on the spot which are now working together under the United Nations blue flag of peace.

Could the minister enumerate the 23 nations and also indicate who the 8 are so that we can be brought up to date? I am interested in knowing how many of what are usually called the Russian satellite states are interested in this force.

**Mr. Pearson:** The following eight countries have offered contributions which are now embodied in the United Nations emergency force in one form or another: Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Finland, India, Norway, Sweden and Yugoslavia.

There are 15 countries which have offered contributions which have not yet been taken up, though they have not been rejected. If hon. members will follow this list carefully they will realize that the secretary general has a delicate and difficult task in bringing about what he called a balanced composition in the force. This may help to understand the delicacy of his relationship to the government of Egypt. In connection with the composition of this force, he is the man who with the advice of the advisory council and in the last analysis the full assembly determines the composition. He is trying to bring that about in a way which will secure the maximum co-operation from the government of the country in which the force is operating. The following are the countries which have not yet been asked by him to send forward contingents to this force. Afghanistan, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Chile, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, the Philippines and Rumania.

**Mrs. Fairclough:** As considerable latitude has been granted in the consideration of this item probably I could now put a question to the Minister of National Defence which I had intended to put earlier on the orders of the day, but was unable to do so. In view of the serious nature of the international situation at the present time will the minister say whether any further consideration has been given to the functioning of No. 424 Hamilton squadron stationed at Mount Hope? It may be said that there is very little relationship

[Mr. Pearson.]

between this matter and the item we are considering, but I think in the broad general sense there is.

Here are a group of people who are anxious to continue active flying. This matter has been in abeyance for some months now, but it is still a live issue in Hamilton. These people are still anxious to continue flying, and I should like to know whether any further consideration has been given by the minister to changing their present status. With the seriousness of the situation these men may well be needed.

**Mr. Campney:** I have been giving further consideration to the matter in view of the representations which have been made, and I hope to indicate my decision within the next week or ten days.

**Mr. Harkness:** Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question about the wording of the general assembly resolution in regard to the police force and the order in council passed by this government. It is stated that the purpose of the force is to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. What exactly does "secure" mean under those circumstances? If hostilities broke out again, say between the Israelis and the Egyptians, the securing of the cessation of those hostilities might well involve fighting. Does "secure" mean that our troops will fight to stop any further outbreak of hostilities?

**Mr. Pearson:** The words "secure and supervise", which appear in this resolution and which appear also in the report of the secretary general laying down the functions of the force, were put in deliberately in that form for the purpose of making sure that no impression was given by the wording that this force was a fighting force in the sense that the United Nations force in Korea was a fighting force.

I must confess that in the first draft of the secretary general's report, which was done early in the morning, the words were "enforce and supervise". However, that wording was caught and changed. If the word "enforce" had been left in it would have meant that they would have been under orders to take means to enforce the cease-fire. They are not under any such obligation. For instance, they are not acting under chapter VII of the charter. To secure and supervise merely means that they are to keep the peace.

If hostilities began again, then the matter would be in the hands of the United Nations assembly which would have to decide what action was to be taken. The force will take only such action as would be necessary to