

we have the United Nations Organization, itself, which consists principally of the Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, and which deals with the fundamental and immediate questions of war and peace.

So far as the specialist agencies are concerned, I would suggest that the United Nations machinery is working well. There are seven or eight of these agencies, and they are functioning, I think, on the whole pretty effectively. The reasons for their comparative success are not hard to find. They are technical bodies, dealing with technical concrete problems, through technicians. They have not, for the most part, any executive power, as they merely make recommendations to governments. It is, of course, much easier to make a recommendation that has no binding force to a government than to accept a resolution which involves automatic action. Furthermore, none of these technical bodies grants, in its constitution, the right of veto to any single power. In the organizations dealing with the fields of food and agriculture, finance and aviation, for instance, there is no one power or no group of powers that can legally prevent action recommended by a substantial majority. That leads me to another reason for the comparative success of these technical organizations. Not all states are represented in them. That seems to be a rather discouraging idea, but it is the truth. The very lack of universality in some of the organizations means that they are more likely to include only those states which are determined to see that they work. For instance, the Soviet Union is not a member of the United Nations organizations for food and agriculture, for finance and banking, for aviation. But the absence of the Soviet Union, which is to be greatly deplored on political grounds and which is not the fault of the other countries, has not prevented the functioning of those organizations. Indeed a cynic might say it has assisted in this regard.

Important though these technical agencies may be, however, the United Nations stands or falls on the success or failure of its Assembly and Security Council. The specialist agencies contribute to the welfare of the common man. They contribute, I hope, to his progress and prosperity. But you will never get freedom from want in a world where you have not got freedom from war or the fear of war. That's the job of the United Nations Organization itself, to banish war and the fear of war from the world.

Well, when you start looking at the results of the United Nations in this field, it's difficult to be very cheerful. It is only a little over two years ago that the United Nations was born at San Francisco. Those of us who were there at that time had high hopes that it might succeed where the League of Nations had failed. It is of interest and value, to look back and see what has happened during these two years. Most of our high hopes have been dashed. Possibly they were too high. After all, we met at San Francisco at the end of war on the eve of victory. We worked in the elation of that victory and under the shadow of desolation and destruction of war which accompanied it. War and victory always give us a new opportunity and a new urge to work out our international problems. Then the feeling of hope and horror begins to wear away; of determination to convert complete victory into sure peace. We drift back into the bad old normal state of things; national prejudices, national fears, national suspicions. International affairs become more difficult to conduct; international relations less co-operative. So it is now. Our hopes may have been too high two years ago. If they were, they are not too high now.

On the credit side, you can say that the United Nations is still a going concern. It's also only fair to remember that the United Nations was faced, at the new beginning of its career, with some of the toughest problems that any international agency has ever had to face. Almost before it had a chance to get established, before the members had a