

What did we do in New York? You may tell me that the United Nations is no good, that it has failed here and failed there. I will admit everything you say, but please tell me what you would put in its place? I saw the representatives of fifty-one nations sitting around a table. We sat in a horse-shoe: Canada was here, Byelorussia was there, China was there; and we sat there every day for weeks and weeks and discussed the agenda. You may say that we never got any thanks. Oh yes, we did. Let me tell you what happened at one committee. On the legal committee I sat next to the Byelorussian delegate. We started at three o'clock in the afternoon to define the word "meeting". This is a meeting; but under the charter that is not the way the word is used. According to the charter a "meeting" has to fulfil some purpose; it may sit twenty times, but it is still the same meeting. For the election of a member to a committee it is necessary to have the votes of not less than two-thirds of all the members. As there are fifty-one nations, thirty-four votes are required before you are elected; if only twenty-five cast their votes you cannot be elected. In order to establish a definition which would avoid misunderstandings we discussed the matter. Fifty-one nations—one representative from each—took part, and the discussion lasted from three o'clock until twenty minutes after six, when we agreed unanimously on a definition, and adjourned. We met the next afternoon at three o'clock to approve the minutes. The secretary, or rapporteur, as they call him—I call him "secretary"—read the report, and it was exactly as we had agreed on. But would Russia accept it? Oh no. The Russian delegate got up and for two hours pounded the table to hammer home his views. It was not two hours of one continuous speech, but only one-third of that time. The other two-thirds were taken up by the English and French translations. Perhaps I should not say it, but to me the speech did not mean much more than a device for delaying time. Then the representative of the "United Kingdom", as Great Britain is called, proposed an amendment changing four words. The amendment did not change the meaning but merely improved the grammatical construction. The amendment was seconded by the United States delegate, and after a little more discussion, came on for a vote. I turned to my advisers, three or four fellows telling me what to do. They said to vote for the original motion, against the United Kingdom and the United States. I said that I agreed with that. I knew that the United Kingdom motion would carry and so did everybody else. It got about thirty-one votes. Then they asked for those who were not in

favour, up went my hand. The delegates from Byelorussia always sit next to Canada, and one of them turned to me. He could not converse in English, but he said, "My God, you vote against the United Kingdom!"

That describes the situation. However, nothing that you could write between now and doomsday could convince that man as to what I did that day. I did not do it because I was trying to convince him. That was not the idea. I turned to his interpreter, a young lady, and I said: "You tell your delegate that not only on this committee but on other committees, Canada votes against the United Kingdom or the United States or anybody else when she thinks they are wrong, and that what they propose is not in the interest of this organization". I give that as an illustration of one of the benefits of meeting these men, because they think of Canada as part of the British Commonwealth in the same way as they do of Byelorussia or of the Ukraine, countries which are part of Russia and which have their independence in everything except in matters of war and armies and foreign policy. Those men learned it the hard way in New York. I saw it myself every day—how Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India and Great Britain would vote and do what they thought was best in the interests of world peace. Naturally, we tried to see eye-to-eye with the United States. Naturally, we tried to see eye-to-eye with Great Britain and with Australia; and we endeavoured to see eye-to-eye with all democratic countries, because we knew that the democratic countries had something that the dictator countries never had. However, even then sometimes we could not agree.

Honourable senators, let me go a little further. The next thing that strikes one at that meeting is the number of coloured people there are in the world. I did not know there were so many coloured races until I went to that meeting. I was very much surprised to learn that the largest part of the world's population is coloured. When the colour question comes up, believe me, it comes up; and whoever is against it just goes down!

That brings me to the veto. Anybody can argue in favour of the veto in principle, but any practical person of understanding who has attended any of those meetings will admit that without the veto there would be no United Nations. All would end in chaos.

I wish to pay a compliment to my honourable friend, the leader of the government, because he deserves it. There were six committees, and he was chairman of the Trustee Committee. He made an address before that committee which was a credit to Canada.

Some Hon. SENATORS: Hear, hear.