

shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise, the Secretary-General shall, on the request of any member of the League, forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

When we come to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals on the other hand, honourable senators, the powers of the Assembly, which embraces all the nations which will come in, are very definitely in contrast with the Security Council. I ask you to consider that, because to my mind it is of importance. Chapter V, Section B-1 states:

The General Assembly should have the right to consider—

That is a well chosen word.

—the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; to discuss—

Another very carefully chosen word!

—any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace.

and so on. And here is what the General Assembly under the new scheme shall not do. It shall not,

—on its own initiative make recommendations on any matter relating to the maintenance of international peace and security which is being dealt with by the Security Council.

In my opinion that is a very radical departure from what was contained in the old League covenant, and in my view the new scheme is a much better one. These powers are vested in the Council, as you will find in Article VIII, Section B, sub-sections 2, 3, 4 and 5. Let me read from Section 4 what the Security Council may do:

Should the Security Council consider such measures to be inadequate, it should be empowered to take such action by air, naval or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade and other operations by air, sea or land forces of members of the Organization.

Drastic power is vested in the Security Council of eleven members, five permanent members of which include what I have termed the "three great-powers" and China and France; and six other nations elected for two-year terms, and not entitled to immediate re-election.

Hon. Mr. CADLER: May I ask a question there? You have been speaking about two councils; one the Council of the League of Nations and the other the proposed Council. How was the Council of the League of Nations constituted?

Hon. Mr. FARRIS: It was not dissimilar to the present Council in its set-up. A little later

Hon. Mr. FARRIS.

I will clear that up completely, if the honourable senator will permit me. The make-up is not dissimilar. I think that is sufficient for the moment. But the powers of the new Council compared to those of the General Assembly are far greater under the new scheme than they were under the old one. Further than that—and this to my mind is of great importance—the powers of the Security Council are confined to peace matters. I will mention some of the other committees later. The Security Council is a council for peace and is not mixed up with anything else. That is why I like it. Matters that tie in with our committees, other schemes, should be developed collaterally or in sequence after peace has been achieved. The Social and Economic Council is an entirely different committee. Some honourable senators have said that the Social and Economic Council may prove to be of the most importance. I hope this will turn out to be correct. The important consideration for the moment is that they operate separately.

There are two things which should be considered. In the Assembly itself each nation has one vote. I do not know what is going to happen at San Francisco. I think we are all somewhat perplexed. I saw in the papers that Russia was asking for three votes, and that the United States did too, but later abandoned its request.

What should our position be? In the League of Nations Assembly each nation had one vote. This gave 6 votes to the British Empire. The same provision is contained in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Russia is now claiming three votes on the ground that she is made up of separate and independent republics. I am not now advocating any particular plan; I am simply pointing out some of the problems which will have to be faced. The same question came up in the United States Senate when the Treaty of Versailles was before that body for ratification. I quote from Duncan Hall's book "The British Commonwealth of Nations", page 346, which records the reservation passed in its final form by the United States Senate in March of 1920. It reads as follows:

Until Part I, being the Covenant of the League of Nations, shall be so amended as to provide that the United States shall be entitled to cast a number of votes equal to that which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of Empire in the aggregate shall be entitled to cast, the United States assumes no obligation to be bound, except in cases where Congress has previously given its consent, by any election, decision, report, or finding of the Council or Assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of Empire in the aggregate have cast more than one vote.