

perhaps, to indicate the power and capacity of Canada to provide armed forces for some of these international police forces. If that is to be the basis on which we are to contribute, it seems to me we have to stop, look and listen with respect to our position on the budget set up by the United Nations.

I did not base my reasons for being called in on the military staff committee on anything more than the bald assertion in article 47 which I interpreted as giving us the right to sit in on that military staff committee when it is considering some question which affects us with respect to the international police force. Now, that may be based upon a misinterpretation, but certainly I think the public of Canada was stunned by the news report which came to us last week that the international police force was just to be a sort of truant officer for the little children of the world. We did not think that at San Francisco, at London or anywhere else. We thought the Security Council and the international police force would be something worth while. It would be able to stop aggression wherever aggression was found. We did not think we would be called upon to hear a report which would be as puerile and as futile as this report would seem to be.

Mr. COLDWELL: Was that not just a newspaper guess; it was not an official report?

Mr. GRAYDON: According to the newspaper this morning, it was more or less confirmed. I think the report, when it comes out, will be along that line.

Mr. COLDWELL: So far as the military staff committee is concerned, I do not want to enter into a discussion, but my conception of the point at San Francisco was rather this, that the contribution Canada might be called upon to make might not be in the field of armed forces. We might have to provide transportation facilities for troops across the country or contribute economically. A nation's ability to assist would be determined by the nature of the country, its economic position and its geographical situation and not necessarily on its ability to contribute troops.

Mr. GRAYDON: Then, if that were the case, it poses a real problem for this country with respect to how far the relationship on the basis of the budget goes. If we are to have to contribute on an economic basis and we are going to have to contribute a little more than half of what Soviet Russia contributes, a so-called great power, then we are leaving ourselves in a rather serious position.

Mr. COLDWELL: I do not think the budget is the basis upon which it should be judged. I think Mr. Reid should answer this question.

The WITNESS: There are two or three questions raised by Mr. Graydon, the first of which is whether it would not be advisable to have a section in the report dealing with the work of the Security Council. This report is a report on the work of the second part of the first session of the Assembly. Therefore, it does not deal with the matters discussed by the Security Council except in so far as it was necessary to deal with them in order to explain the background of discussion in the Assembly. It does, for example, deal with the exercise of the veto in the Security Council; it deals with the discussion in the Security Council on the admission of new members and it deals with the discussion in the Security Council on relations with Spain. However, it does not cover the whole field of the work of the Security Council.

Speaking for myself only, I think there is a good deal to be said for Mr. Graydon's suggestion. This would mean, however, a different type of report. It would be a report on the whole of the work of the United Nations with, I assume, special reference to the problems with which Canadian delegations had to contend. I think we might well take that suggestion into account.