

Mr. GRAYDON: May I point this out to you? That might be all right, but the difficulty is if the military and staff committee decision and recommendation is what we think it is going to be then there would not be an international police force worth speaking of to enforce anything the Security Council has in mind. That is the point that bothers me. If you build a giant police force to which all nations, including the big powers, contribute then I should think what you say would be perfectly true, but if you only have a little truancy force for the little fellows in the world why the big boy will just laugh at that even if he is only contributing 6 per cent of the world's contribution to the body.

Mr. JAUQUES: Suppose you have this overwhelming police force. Who is going to control that? The Almighty? That is the only authority that I can recognize.

Mr. GRAYDON: It certainly is not going to be Canada.

Mr. COLDWELL: There is a good deal of force in the suggestion made lately that the big fellows should be disarmed and the little fellows should set up the police force.

Mr. GRAYDON: That is about as pious a hope as some of the things in the United Nations charter.

Mr. BOUCHER: My thought was running another way. I make this suggestion to you. What is the use of allocating contributions to an international police force where the economic contributions and the personnel contributions are various?

Mr. MACINNIS: I think this discussion seems to be the essence of futility. It would seem that we are discussing here whether the United Nations is an organization which we should continue to support. I do not think that is the question at issue here at the moment. As it is not the question at issue let us try to deal with matters on which we can exert some influence. I do not think we are prepared now to make a recommendation to the House of Commons on hardly any of these points that have been raised so why waste time discussing them? With the other nations of the world we are trying to build up an instrument that will create world peace. The question is not whether we can stop an aggressor with armed forces when aggression takes place, but that we prevent aggression from taking place through other means. We either have to say we have no faith in the United Nations at all, that it is useless, that Canada should withdraw from it, or we have to make the best of the situation which we and the world are in and use all our influence to create cooperation among nations.

Mr. GRAYDON: I have not heard anybody suggest such drastic changes in our position as are suggested by Mr. MacInnis. I do not see any reason why this committee cannot discuss the shortcomings of the United Nations organization. That is what we are trying to do in the hope that perhaps something may be done to improve the situation.

Mr. JAENICKE: Is that not the attitude you have taken at San Francisco and that has been taken by the Canadian delegation in other conferences of the United Nations? After all I would say from what the report indicates and what Mr. Reid has told us that we as Canadians are not satisfied with the situation. I think our delegations at the assemblies are following the trend of feeling that has been expressed here. I think our representation at the United Nations assemblies has been satisfactory.

*By Mr. Graydon:*

Q. May I ask Mr. Reid one other question? How many cases have been decided by the International Court of Justice up to the present time, and how many cases have come before it?—A. The answer to the first question is none.