

was first instituted was not the idea of an international police force discussed on the basis that there would be perhaps fifty or so nations agreeing among themselves to stop aggression of one other nation of a smaller character which would be amenable to police force supervision? Is it not difficult now, with the world pretty nearly split in two, to have an international police force, if you are going to have an international police force that has, mingled in its composition, reds and communists from all over the world—what kind of a police force are you going to have that is going to be of any good to keep the peace, because it seems to me that when you have the world split in twain, you have a problem that is vastly different from the problem that was envisaged when the security council was first set up and its enforcement provisions made.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is quite true. As you know, at San Francisco we based a lot of our policy and our assumptions on the unanimity of the great powers; if the unanimity of the great powers could not be preserved it could be assumed that the United Nations could not effectively operate as a policing agency. That situation, as you stated, Mr. Graydon, was changed. Indeed it can be argued that if the U.S.S.R. had not been accidentally absent from the Security Council last June, effective action of the kind that was taken could not have been taken. So far as an international force at the present time is concerned—mixing reds and communists as you put it with the others—that is not likely to happen because the Soviet bloc opposed the relative resolutions in the United Nations General Assembly last year.

Mr. GRAYDON: Well, even if they went into an international force they could kill it with a physical veto just in the same way as they are doing it with their veto in the security council because I cannot imagine anything worse than trying to send an international police force abroad with the reds fighting alongside our people when they want to make some other nation keep the peace. It seems to me to be so wholly impracticable. I suppose the only way it can be done is to have the nations who are still on this side of the iron curtain have forces available for use when the general assembly by a majority enters into an arrangement such as was entered into last fall, directs them into action.

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is right. We are trying to operate the United Nations in a now divided world of conflict. We had hoped to be able to operate the United Nations in a world of co-operating great powers.

Mr. DICKEY: Isn't that one of the basic ideas of the North Atlantic Organization? That they were to set up something of that kind under the charter, but that it would be free of that type of objection to which Mr. Graydon has called attention?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: That is true, and, if the United Nations had been able to operate as we had hoped, there would never have been any necessity for us to have the North Atlantic Pact; at least not as a security measure.

Mr. DICKEY: We had some discussion at the last meeting with respect to developments in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and that revolved particularly around the proposed membership of Greece and Turkey. As I understand it, Canada's particular interest has been in the development of the organizational side of the organization and the development within the NATO of effective action machinery to bring about co-operation and look after the security provision. Have there been any developments on that side of the organization that the minister could explain to us?

Hon. Mr. PEARSON: There have been, as a matter of fact, and they have been announced within the last week or two. The North Atlantic organization was becoming rather complicated and cumbersome, there were a good many committees and subcommittees of one kind or another set up, and it looked to us and to other members of the council as though this complexity of the organization that was developing might interfere with its efficiency. As someone put it—