

out, under article 27, on all essential matters member nations are subject to the decisions made by an affirmative vote by seven members of the eleven-member security council; except the Big Five permanent member nations represented on that council. Any one of these five can veto any such decisions. The special privilege of having permanent seats on the security council, combined with this overriding power of veto, places the five big nations in a special category. While other nations must be subject to their decisions, they themselves are not to be subject to the decisions of other nations at all. Does that represent the sovereign equality of all nations? If so, it would indeed be a peculiar interpretation of that term so far as I am concerned.

Another point. Article 4 declares that membership in the united nations organization is open to all peace-loving nations. What is a peace-loving nation? Is it one that declares a noble intention one day and the next by its actions gives the lie to those professed intentions? Who will decide what is a peace-loving nation? Apparently the Soviet Union is qualified as a peace-loving nation, and yet its neighbours to the west, Finland, the Balkan states and Poland have not had a very happy experience of Russia's peaceful intentions. The best guarantee of the fulfilment of any contract or pact or undertaking is in the establishment of the integrity of the contracting parties—always.

Then, as we come to the actual organization itself, we find that the general assembly is virtually powerless. Under article 5 it may suspend a member nation but only upon recommendation of the security council, which council also has the power to restore the rights and privileges of the suspended member, evidently against the desires even of the assembly itself. Otherwise the general assembly's powers are confined to discussing, considering, calling attention to, or recommending. It should be noted that all power is vested in the security council, and under article 28 that body must be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Therefore permanent representation on this council is not likely to be by any elected representatives of the nations and of the people, but by government officials who will be in the nature of permanent civil servants. That, Mr. Speaker, is the negation of the true democratic principle.

I pass over the possible efficacy of the actual machinery with which the security council will be expected to operate, except to point out that in a world in which the destructive

power of atomic energy has rendered all previous weapons of war obsolete, it would be remarkable indeed if counter-action to a sudden attack by one powerful nation against a weaker nation could be mobilized in time to prove at all effective. It is quite conceivable that the whole of one of the small nations could be completely destroyed before that could be done. But the objection I wish to raise goes far deeper than that.

Suppose that a nation came into conflict with another on an issue which divided the Big Five permanent members of the security council, or to put it in this way, the five permanent members of the security council, a thing which is quite possible, bent as these nations seem to be on continuing the old game of power politics; and hell-bent as they are to vie with each other for world industrial, commercial and influential supremacy. For example, suppose that a communist government in Bulgaria threatened to take armed action against a democratic government in, let us say, Greece. Any proposed action by the security council could and probably would be vetoed by Soviet Russia. Would Great Britain and the United States remain passive in such a case? If they did, or if they did not, either way, that would be the end of the united nations organization for world peace. That, actually, is but one of hundreds of situations likely to arise that could bring the members of the security council into conflict among themselves, and then we would have another global conflict instead of a localized affair.

All we have to do in order to test the possible efficacy of the proposed organization is to consider what would happen if it had existed before the second world war. At that time Germany and Italy probably would have been included as major powers. Suppose the member nations of the security council had been Great Britain, the United States, France, Russia, Germany, Italy, and five smaller countries. Does anybody think for one moment that that war would have been averted?

I now turn to another matter. In chapters 9 and 10 of the charter, provision is made for setting up an international economic and social council, which was dwelt upon at some length by my hon. friend the member for Rosetown-Biggarr. All member nations pledge themselves, under article 56, to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the organization for achieving the purposes set forth in article 55. This naturally means bringing national economies more or less under the control of an international organization.