

reach that plateau of rearmament on which real security is found, we will be able to broaden out our efforts to embrace all of the objectives incorporated in the North Atlantic Treaty.

You will see from all this that the North Atlantic Treaty has become the main base of Canadian foreign policy. This does not mean that we have lost interest in the United Nations. The very fact that the foreign minister of Canada is now President of the General Assembly is indicative of our great interest in that organization. The North Atlantic Treaty is not in conflict with the United Nations Charter. Article 51 of the Charter recognizes the right of a country to take collective measures in self-defence if satisfactory arrangements cannot be secured through the machinery of the United Nations. The North Atlantic Treaty is nothing less than the exercise of this right to collective self-defence in the face of a very real threat of aggression. It was an effort to permit the aims of San Francisco to be realized by demonstrating to a potential aggressor that any attempt to take advantage of the power vacuum in Europe would be resisted by a group of nations acting collectively.

Because we have had to resort to another instrument to obtain real security, we should not fall into the easy habit of thinking of the United Nations as a useless burden and an exercise of sham and propaganda. The organization remains of very great importance. It represents the only forum where East and West can meet. It is also the only forum of universal international co-operation and if we were to try to recreate it today we would not be able to do so. We must therefore resist the temptation to throw away the good because we cannot have the best. We must remember that the problem of the United Nations is not the veto or any other of its complex rules and regulations. It is the lack of a desire for peace on a basis of freedom that divides us from the East and prevents the co-operative accomplishment of our aims. In this situation we had no alternative but to rely on joint efforts with our fellow members of NATO wherein, happily for Canada, those who influence most of our international relations are co-operating with the others to build up a position of security without which our cause is lost.

Three main cleavages have become apparent in the United Nations. There is first of all that fundamental cleavage between East and West to which I have already referred. It has been the lack of co-operation on the part of the Soviet Union that is chiefly responsible for the failure of the United Nations to fulfil the high hopes that were held of it at the time the Charter was signed. The second cleavage is that between developed and under-developed countries, or rather between the "haves" and the "have-nots". The third cleavage is that between the anti-colonial countries and those with dependent territories. In each of these three cleavages the line-up of nations is different, but whereas in the cleavage between East and West the Soviet Union and its satellites are very much in the minority, they are usually able to align themselves with the majority when issues relating to the other two cleavages come before the General Assembly. This is because the principle of the sovereign equality of all members is respected as one of the basic provisions of the Charter. This principle, however, implies a responsibility on all members, particularly so long as the fundamental cleavage between East and West continues. Those states which have not got responsibility for the exercise of power should always bear in mind that some of their aspirations cannot be realized owing to the fact that we lack the peaceful co-operation of a bloc of states led by the Soviet Union. The principal obstacle to the kind of life these countries would like to lead is the threat from Eastern Europe - a threat to them no less than to any one of us. The danger of unconsciously seconding the efforts of the Soviet Union to bring about disunity in the