

Then the first instrument of power is that the security council be assisted by military staff committees whose compositions and functions are detailed in the proposals. We then go along a little farther and we come to chapter VIII, which reads as follows:

Members of the organization would be bound to give assistance in the form of quotas of national forces, or the provision of facilities, in a manner and to the extent previously promised by special agreement or agreements . . .

I shall not quote the whole paragraph because it is rather lengthy, but there is your clause binding all the members of the organization. We now come to the powers of the military staff committees, which read as follows:

It is the military staff committee that is to advise the security council on all military questions. This body, composed of the chiefs of staff of the members with permanent seats. . . .

That is very very important. The military staff committees are composed of the members with permanent seats.

Mr. KINLEY: Read farther on.

Mr. ADAMSON: Or their representatives.

Mr. KINLEY: Go on.

Mr. ADAMSON: Who work out the quotas to be supplied by the members of the organization and prepare schemes for the disposal of such forces for the purpose of preventing a breach of the peace.

Mr. KINLEY: Is the hon. member talking about military staffs?

Mr. ADAMSON: Yes, it is chapter VIII, B. 9. The hon. member can read it for himself.

Mr. KINLEY: Paragraph 9 is the paragraph.

Mr. ADAMSON: I am reading chapter VIII, paragraph 39.

We now come to the right of members to amend the council.

The right of the members with permanent seats to veto any amendment was thought to be necessary, since they have the major responsibility in the question of maintaining international peace and security and could hardly be expected to undertake to carry out this duty under conditions not agreed to by themselves.

Your permanent council have the power to complete and absolute power of veto.

The next clause is very significant:

Amendments so adopted would be binding on all members, even on those voting against them. They are not allowed to withdraw from the organization on this ground as was provided by the covenant of the league of nations. This is undoubtedly a great innovation in inter-

[Mr. Adamson.]

national procedure, but it was thought to be necessary if the organization was to be able to adapt itself to the rapidly changing world of to-day.

I believe you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a charter of power if ever there was one. I am not objecting to that. We have seen that these nebulous, indecisive charters, such as the first Hague court and the league of nations, failed because it did not have the power at its disposal. Because the Dumbarton Oaks proposals do have power it is necessary that we should consider where we stand in Canada as one of the nations going into this agreement under the present proposals without a permanent seat on the council and exactly how far this will affect us.

The three permanent members with power at the present time are Russia, the United States and Great Britain. You will find in Russia a bi-continental country of some 270 millions of people, stretching from the Atlantic in Europe to the Pacific in Asia, probably the greatest military power in the world to-day. The second of the great powers is the United States, a country of 130 millions of people, certainly the greatest industrial power in the world to-day. Under our proposals at the present time and at Dumbarton Oaks the third permanent power outside of China and possibly France is the government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom is a country devastated by war and crippled financially, whose industries have been wrecked by bombings, whose cities have been largely destroyed by fire, and whose population numbers scarcely forty-three million people. So under these proposals we have two great world powers with upward of four hundred million people, the greatest industrial and military powers in the world to-day, and we have a country with but one-tenth the combined population of the other two.

It is for this reason that I disagree with this proposal. The two major powers are fundamentally land or continental powers. If we can judge by history we see that if we are to limit war—and I only say "limit"—we must have the freedom of the seas and the power of the seas. The government of England has said in unmistakable terms, through Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden, that Great Britain can no longer undertake the job of securing the freedom of the seas. Now we are putting ourselves in the hands of one great land country, Russia, which has no need for international trade, and another great land country, the United States, as nearly sufficient unto itself as any country could be in this day and age, a country which is now a great naval power, I admit, but only of comparatively