

It would be shutting ones eyes to the defects of the organization if this matter of disunity were only applied to the relations between the Big Powers. The United Nations is far from being a "union of nations". Collective action for agreed common ends is growing slowly, painfully, and one must admit, rather modestly, and the organization is certainly far from achieving the concept of a world government with power to enforce law. The principal members of the organization, the Big Powers, through their veto, do not recognize the right of the organization to coerce them at all. As for the other member-states, so far the organization lacks the power by which it can enforce its decisions. This is perhaps most clearly seen in the cases of Greece and Palestine. These cases illustrate how the United Nations, through the passing of Assembly recommendations, has had to depend wholly upon voluntary co-operation and not upon coercion.

I have suggested earlier that the United Nations relies ultimately upon measures to prevent war and the removal of its causes, rather than upon coercion and suppression by force. But the organization cannot be really effective in maintaining peace without the use of force at all. The main cause for this situation, in which organization finds itself without any means to use collective force in support of the Security Council's decisions, is the fundamental disagreement between the Soviet Union and the other permanent members of the Council, which has so far prevented the Military Staff Committee from preparing plans for the application of armed forces with which it is charged under the Charter. Thus the military agreements provided for under Article 43 between members of the United Nations have failed to come into effect.

The fact that so far the Security Council has been unable to organize collective armed forces to aid it in the discharge of its responsibilities does not however, in the opinion of some members of the United Nations, prevent those who wish to do so voluntarily from banding themselves together for the purpose of collective self-defence or on a regional basis.

At the last General Assembly the head of the Canadian delegation, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, put this idea forward in the following paragraph, which I quote:- "Nations, in their search for peace and cooperation, will not and cannot accept indefinitely and unaltered a Security Council which was set up to ensure their security, and which, so many feel, has become frozen in futility, and divided by dissension. If forced, they may seek greater safety in an association of democratic and peace-loving states willing to accept more specific international obligations in return for greater national security. Such associations, if consistent with the principles and purposes of the Charter, can be formed within the United Nations."

The Secretary of State for External affairs developed this idea further in the statement in the House of Commons on 29 April last when, in reviewing world affairs, he said and I quote: "Our foreign policy today must, therefore, I suggest be based on a recognition of the fact that totalitarian Communist aggression, endangers the freedom and peace of every democratic country, including Canada. On this basis and pending the strengthening of the United Nations, we should be willing to associate ourselves with other free states in any appropriate collective security arrangements which may be worked out under Article 51 or 52 of the Charter".

The Canadian government is certainly not alone in expressing such views.

In the United Kingdom, Mr. Bevin, addressing the Annual Conference of the Labour Party, is reported as saying yesterday that it is the policy of the government to proceed towards a world-wide system of collective security step-by-step, beginning with those countries that are willing to co-operate with the European Recovery Program and the Western European Union.

In the United States, this idea of the United States government promoting the progressive development of regional or collective arrangements for self defence has received the endorsement of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Such arrangements if concluded on the basis of the Charter,