

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any further questions?

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I would like to ask a question supplementary to the views you expressed in the house on the future of United Nations from an organizational standpoint. You will recall the reflection that perhaps outside of disarmament the future of the United Nations as a whole was indeed perhaps a matter of the greatest concern within the assembly.

I am coupling both the evident future of the United Nations, its organizational structure, and the many changes that have been from time to time suggested with respect to a simple procedure which could be left out of this for the moment; but I wonder if there is any way that you could expand your thoughts on how we are going to deal with the growth of the structure; whether you think it has outgrown its usefulness as it is at present constituted in the charter; whether purely by enlarging the economic and social council we will deal adequately with new states which are coming into the assembly; whether there is any concern that, perhaps with the admission of new states, that the advantages of having certain voting alignments requires politically from our own position certain structural changes in the council or whether you think, the status quo being maintained, that the charter principles will still stand as they did 15 years ago. Is any effort being made by the Department of External Affairs to study the purpose of reviewing what, if any, changes—I am not thinking of changes such as indicated by the Soviet of putting a built-in veto in the general assembly—general changes or suggestions might be made?

Mr. GREEN: As you know, the United Nations division of the department keeps very closely in touch with the whole picture. We have advocated that the security council and the economic and social council should be enlarged in order to provide adequate African representation on those two councils, and possibly Asiatic representation, and at the same time preserve the places which are occupied by the older countries. I think also that there should be a broad regrouping of the staff of the United Nations with more representatives from the new countries. That is not always easy because they do not have a large number of trained personnel; but I think it is essential that there should be a more broadly based staff as the membership in the United Nations increases. We are very anxious to see changes of this kind made, but we have been careful about complaints against the organization for fear they might lend support, or be considered as lending support, to the vicious attacks being made on the secretary-general and the secretariat by the communist countries.

This particular session has not been a good one for countries like Canada to be making complaints, and for that reason we have not been as outspoken and have not made suggestions to the extent which might have been the case in another session.

With regard to the question of blocs, we believe that the best plan is to have the nations work in blocs as little as possible: try to have them work as individual nations. Canada herself tries to do that. You will have noticed we have been against the formation of a NATO bloc in the United Nations, and I think that the organization would be stronger if nations acted on an individual basis rather than forming half a dozen blocs and voting on issues as blocs.

Mr. SMITH (*Calgary South*): I am sure we all subscribe to that, sir. The simple answer, as far as the assembly is concerned, is that you would not want to tinker with the function of the assembly as such, but any changes which come about should come about only in enlarging the expansion of the two councils to take care of the increased size of new nations.

Mr. GREEN: That is one urgent need at the present time, but it has been impossible to do it.