

The body of the resolution consists of five paragraphs. First of all, it endorses the acceptance of that invitation by our Government. Secondly, it recognizes the vital importance to Canada of an organization for the maintenance of peace in the world, and that Canada should be part of that organization. Thirdly, it approves the purposes and principles of these proposals as set out at Dumbarton Oaks, without of course approving every detail of them. Fourthly, it suggests that the representatives of Canada at the conference should use their best endeavours to further the organization of this international body for the maintenance of peace. Fifthly, it says that any organization ultimately set up at the San Francisco Conference must be submitted for the approval of the Parliament of Canada.

The proposals are set out in the pamphlet distributed to honourable members, who, I am sure, have read them with the greatest of care. Let me repeat, these proposals are not final. It is quite clear that they may be modified, and in effect they no doubt will be, in greater or lesser degree, as a result of the San Francisco conference. But these proposals as they now stand represent the measure of agreement which the four great allied powers—the United States, Great Britain, Russia and China—have so far been able to reach between themselves as to the form and substance of the functions of this new international organization.

It is interesting to observe that, generally speaking, the form proposed for this new organization follows rather closely the form of the present League of Nations, though there are some differences in the machinery. The proposals call for a General Assembly, a Security Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat. The General Assembly corresponds to the present Assembly of the League, the Security Council corresponds roughly to the Council of the League, the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat are more or less substantively similar to existing bodies under the League.

But it is important to note that in these proposals there are two new organizations which have no place in the League of Nations. The first is a Military Staff Committee, which is to be responsible for the use of such forces as the Security Council may find necessary to employ in order to put down aggression in any part of the world; and the second is an Economic and Social Council of eighteen members appointed by the General Assembly, whose function will be to "facilitate solutions of international economic, social and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Hon. Mr. HUGESSEN.

So it will be observed that under these proposals the old League set-up has been strengthened in two ways: first, with respect to warlike preparations for the enforcement of security, and, secondly, with respect to peaceful progress along economic and social lines.

I want to deal for a few minutes with the composition of the Security Council as suggested here. As honourable members know, the Council is to consist of eleven members. The five big powers—Great Britain, the United States, China, Russia and France—who are to have permanent seats on the Council, will be represented by one member each. The other six members of the Council are to be representatives of countries chosen by the General Assembly. They are to be elected for a period of two years and will not have the privilege of immediate re-election. The function of the Security Council, its primary object, is to guard the peace of the world, whereas under the League of Nations the responsibility for keeping the peace of the world rests equally upon the Assembly and the Council.

There are people who say that these proposals are very heavily weighted in favour of the five great powers who are to be the permanent members of the Security Council, and I suppose there is a good deal to be said for that contention. I should like for a moment to deal with the discussion which arose here yesterday afternoon out of a question asked by the honourable senator from Waterloo (Hon. Mr. Euler), as to whether a permanent member of the Security Council, one of the five great powers, could prevent the Council from dealing with any dispute to which that great power itself was a party. The answer to that, if I may be permitted to give my interpretation of it, is in two parts. If honourable senators will examine the proposals they will see that the Security Council has two different modes of action. The first is dealt with in Chapter 8, section A, under the heading of "Pacific settlement of disputes." It comprises power to investigate disputes that arise, to make recommendations for their pacific settlement, to refer questions to the international court and to make reports. The second list of functions of the Security Council is under section B. This relates to what happens if a peaceful settlement proves abortive and the economic sanctions or, ultimately, military sanctions, have to be enforced against the offending power.

With that division in mind, it is interesting to refer to the provision for voting by the Security Council, in Chapter 6, section C, paragraph 3:

Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters should be made by an affirmative vote