

greatest power of the security council is set out in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 5 of the proposals, in these words:

In order that all members of the organization—

Not just the greater powers, as the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Roebuck) suggested.—should contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, they should undertake to make available to the security council, on its call—

That, of course, is the reverse of the statement of the Prime Minister the other day with regard to troops serving beyond Canada on call of the security council.

—and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements concluded among themselves, armed forces, facilities and assistance necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

There are to be eleven members, six of them non-permanent, elected for two-year terms and ineligible to serve a second term immediately. Five members are to be permanent; and they are named, in chapter VI of the proposals, as the United States of America, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Republic of China and, in due course, France. Those permanent seats on the council have been allotted on the basis of power; certainly that is so in respect of the first three named; the Prime Minister put it the other day, that those are the three greatest world powers. The nations holding permanent seats are given very wide powers. In the first place, on all vital matters such as the application of force or the imposition of sanctions, they must agree, which of course means that any one of the five may veto action. That is set out in chapter VI, section C, paragraph 3 of the proposals, in these words:

Decisions of the security council on all other matters—

That is, other than procedural matters.

—should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under chapter VIII, section A—

That has to do with the pacific settlement of disputes, as distinguished from threats to the peace or acts of aggression.

—and under the second sentence of paragraph one of chapter VIII, section C—

This refers to regional arrangements.

—a party to a dispute should abstain from voting.

That is the first very important power that is to be given to these nations holding permanent seats. In addition there is to be a military staff committee, which is provided for

[Mr. Green.]

in chapter VIII, section B, paragraph 9. It is really a general staff for this world organization, but in addition to being given the power to make recommendations about the use of troops and to conduct a war it also has control over the regulations of armaments and the possible disarmament of all the nations of the world. That committee is to be composed of the chiefs of staff of the permanent members; it does not include the chiefs of staff of those who happen to be non-permanent members at the time but only the chiefs of staff of the permanent members.

Mr. KINLEY: It is more than that.

Mr. GREEN: You can make your own speech.

Mr. KINLEY: Well, you are wrong; that is all.

Mr. GREEN: The third power is in regard to amendments and is contained in chapter XI. This provides that amendments to the charter must be ratified by the five nations holding permanent seats on the security council, which again means that any one may veto an amendment. Finally they have great power because they are there all the time. They are to be permanent, with each of the five nations having a permanent organization actually at the headquarters of the world organization.

There is great importance attached to a permanent seat on the security council. Under the Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta proposals Canada will never have a permanent seat on that council, though occasionally she may have a non-permanent seat. In other words she will seldom be a member of that council. That is a humiliating position for a nation that has raised nearly a million men during the present conflict and has given so freely of her blood and treasure. In effect, Canada is in the same position as the Irish Free State.

The Prime Minister now bewails our position, yet it is a direct result of the policies of his government. Had the Canadian government so willed, the great world power at Dumbarton Oaks could have been the British commonwealth of nations rather than the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The British commonwealth of nations could have been the power named in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as the power to hold a permanent seat on the security council. There can be no doubt of the attitude of Great Britain; Churchill and Eden have shown it on different occasions as clearly as they dared. I have here the press dispatch of a speech made by Mr. Eden in the British House of Commons over a year ago, in which he said that "if a close and intimate understanding