Juncil, on its call and in accordance with special agreements, armed rees "necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace d security." As you are aware, Article 47 of the Charter calls for e establishment of a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist security Council on this matter. The Military Staff Committee, der the terms of Article 47 (2) consists of the Chiefs of Staff of the five permanent members of the Security Council or of their representatives.

-

The Military Staff Committee has been meeting now for some tree years but as yet it has not been able to formulate general reements for the implementation of Article 43 of the Charter. The sition of my Government on this failure of the Military Staff mittee to make progress was stated by the then Chairman of the inadian Delegation, Mr. St. Laurent, in his opening speech in the ineral Assembly on October 29, 1946, in the following words:

"We are particularly concerned that the Security Council and the Hilitary Staff Committee have so far failed to make substantial ogress towards a conclusion of the special agreements with individual abers required to implement Article 43 and those following of the farter, and thus make armed forces and other facilities available to the Security Council.... Canada therefore urges that the Security funcil and the Military Staff Committee go ahead with all possible teps in the constructive work of negotiating the special agreements d of organizing the military and economic measures of enforcement."

This statement was made almost three years ago and the sition has largely remained unchanged. Canada is not represented the Military Staff Committee (as the latter consists only of the ve permanent members of the Security Council) and so we do not have irst hand information of the disagreements which have led to the resent deadlock. However, it is generally known that these disagreements are mainly concerned with three important points. These are: the size d composition of the forces proposed to be made available by the twe permanent members of the Security Council; the location of the lited Nations forces, and their right of access to the military bases member nations. It should be noted that all members of the Lilitary for committee except the Soviet Union have agreed that the initial reall contributions should be comparable but that in view of "the formation of a composition of national forces of each Permanent the force and in order to further the ability of the Security Council to institute balanced and effective combat forces for operations, these antributions may differ widely as to the strength of the separate

The position of the U.S.S.R. on this point is that these pression of the unitable "on the <u>Principle of Equality</u> regarding the overall strength and the composition of these forces." **EX**

The fallacy of the Soviet position on this question seems ident. The obvious result would be that a naval power, such as the ited Kingdom, would contribute the same number of ships as, let us by, the Soviet Union; the Chinese would contribute aircraft on a parity with the United States, and so forth, or rather that the contributions in any service of any great power would be that of the makest in that service.

^I Report of the Military Staff Committee, Document S/336, 30 April 1947, Chapter IV, Article 11, p.p. 9-10.

Chapter IV, Article 11, page 9.

Ξ