

combined with responsibility is recognized in the permanent membership of the great powers on the council. The application of that principle should, in our view, be carried a step further and among the six states elected to the council there should be several which can make a really substantial contribution to the purposes of the organization. The Canadian delegation, therefore, pressed for the adoption of some qualification for election to the council which should recognize this functional point of view. Our attitude was supported by a number of other delegations, but it was principally due to the cooperation of the United Kingdom delegation that an amendment was introduced by the sponsoring powers which now finds its place in article 23 of the charter.

The relevant paragraph of article 23, while it does not lay down detailed rules for the election of non-permanent members, directs that in the election of such members to the security council due regard should be "specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of members of the united nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution." It was explained by the representatives of the sponsoring powers who introduced this amendment that the phrase "in the first instance" applied to the first criterion for the election of non-permanent members; that is "to the contribution of members of the united nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization", whereas "equitable geographical distribution" was a secondary consideration.

It is the responsibility of the security council to maintain peace, but this does not mean that the council will function only when an emergency has arisen. Any difficult situation which threatens to develop into a disturbance of the peace may be discussed in the council and plans and recommendations may be made. It is, I think, satisfactory that the charter dealing with the peaceful settlement of disputes has been enlarged and improved, because it is before violence has broken out that the organization can do its most useful work in preventing aggression.

The peace enforcement provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals have already been discussed in this house and they were not altered in many essential points at San Francisco. I should, however, mention one change which resulted from the initiative of the Canadian delegation. It was our view that there should be included in the charter

some effective provision under which armed forces pledged in its military agreement by a state not a member of the security council be called out by the council only after that state had effectively taken part in the decision. Accordingly the Canadian delegation put forward an amendment, the substance of which has now been incorporated in article 44 of the charter, with article reads as follows:

When the security council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a member not represented on it to provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under article 43—

That is the article referring to agreements to be entered into between states and the security council to provide stated quotas of armed forces:

—invite that member, if the member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the security council concerning the employment of contingents of that member's armed forces.

Speaking to this amendment at the meeting of the committee on enforcement arrangements on May 10, the Prime Minister of Canada put forward his argument in the following terms:

The purpose of this amendment is clear—to provide that there shall be effective consultation between the security council and a member not represented on the council before that member is called upon to dispatch outside its own territories forces which it has undertaken to make available under the military agreements contemplated in paragraph 5. It seems certain that consultation would, in fact, have to take place, and we feel that a requirement of consultation should be included in the charter itself.

The powers which the proposals would vest in the security council to call upon all members to join in the imposition of sanctions—military, economic and diplomatic—raise especially difficult problems for secondary countries with wide international interests. It is likely that if sanctions have to be imposed against an aggressor, the active collaboration of some states not on the security council will be needed. Let me contrast the position in this respect of the great powers on the one hand and of the secondary countries with world-wide interests on the other. Each great power is assured not only of full participation in the consideration of the dispute from the beginning, but it can itself prevent any decision to impose sanctions, even if it be a minority of one in the security council. All the other members of the organization are asked to obligate themselves in the charter to carry out any decision of the security council, including decisions which might require them to send into action the forces which they are all expected to place at the council's disposal, as well as decisions which might gravely disrupt their economic life. The council could call upon any member to do these things, and there is no assurance that the member would be consulted rather than ordered to take action. I feel sure that whenever a particular member was desired to take serious enforcement action, consultation would be a practical necessity. Therefore, the amendment which the Canadian delegation has