

I shall give one further quotation only. In the statement last September in Ottawa, Mr. St. Laurent, in announcing the fact that Canada would be prepared to accept a position on the Security Council, used the following words: "In spite of its shortcomings, we in this country continue to believe that the best hope for mankind lies in the establishment of a world organization for the maintenance of peace. We, ourselves, in this country have built a nation which is as wide as the continent and which is based on the consent of many diversified groups. There is no reason to believe that our experience here and the experience of other peoples who have built political organizations over wide areas cannot be repeated amongst the nations. We believe that, particularly for a people such as our own which wishes to maintain its freedom and to leave other people in the enjoyment of theirs, the greatest hope for our survival lies in the development of machinery for international co-operation."

These quotations make clear the extent to which we have been committed to this venture in world government. The United Nations as it now stands is little more than a tentative first step in that direction, but we have taken it along with 56 other countries, and unless the policy of the government changes, we have stated our willingness to travel the road so long as the path is discernible and we are reasonably sure that we are not stepping on any land mines.

It is still too early to take stock of the United Nations in any definitive way. If, three years after Confederation, someone had been asked whether or not the Dominion of Canada would survive, I think we could have done little more in response than point out the evident dangers and at the same time try to discern the elements of vitality and say if there was anything there to live or if survival were possible. Perhaps we may do the same thing now with the United Nations. Is there any heart there to beat? Are there any lungs to breathe - spart, that is, from the countless ones which provide the wind-power for some of the longest and most repetitive debates in history? Most important of all, perhaps, has it a backbone, or is there at least somewhere within the enveloping and lumpy flesh of this organization a little gristle that might grow into a backbone?

Let us, at the beginning, admit the enormous difficulties. These spring partly from natural causes. After all it is no simple thing to hold together the political organism with which we are familiar - ones as well founded and as homogeneous as Canada or the United States. The United Nations experiment is vastly more complex. Basically, however, the greatest danger lies not in our administrative or constitutional problems, but in the political division which has grown up between the Eastern European States and the rest of the world. The United Nations was created in the hopeful atmosphere of wartime co-operation. The Allies had raised and deployed and carried into action a great international military force, and the auspices seemed good for similar co-operation in peacetime. But we are now confronted with this great division, which--both political and philosophical--is so complicated and pervasive that it reaches down into