

to think that a conference is a substitute for a policy. That temptation is a very real one to-day in respect of our negotiations through the United Nations.

There is a tendency,--and it has been very noticeable in the last two to three months, to avoid,--and I am not talking about any one government or any one country--facing some of the realities of national policy in foreign affairs by saying we will leave it all to the United Nations. This is illustrated, I think, very well by our discussions in New York on the Middle East. This, in its turn, often puts burdens on the United Nations which are almost too heavy for that organization to bear. We must not use it as an escape from our own absence of policy or from our own difficulties. United Nations' discussions are no substitute for wisely conceived and intelligently executed national foreign policies. I am one who really believes strongly in the United Nations as the hope of humanity in the long run, because if we cannot work out something through an organization like the United Nations for peace, there is not going to be very much cause for optimism in our future. But as one who does believe in the United Nations, I deprecate this tendency to leave too many things to the Organization and to misunderstand what it can do and what it cannot do.

I have noticed in reading newspapers and listening to discussions in and out of Parliament, a growing misconception of the power and the authority, of the functions of the United Nations. I have noticed a growing criticism of it, born of its frustrations and weaknesses, and of the dangers of international affairs generally. I have noticed a growing tendency to complain - "why doesn't the United Nations do this, why doesn't it do that and why doesn't it take action and why doesn't it order so and so out of such and such a place." The basic fact about the United Nations, one which we should never forget, is that it is not a super-state, it can pass no laws, it has no army to enforce its recommendations, and there is no body of international law behind them, although we are trying to develop that. The United Nations is merely a collection of national governments trying, through international discussion, to secure certain ends by a majority vote - by a two-thirds majority vote. The United Nations - I am talking now about the United Nations Assembly in particular - can act only through recommendations which have nothing but moral force behind them, though moral force can, on occasion, be pretty strong and pretty important.

Therefore, the United Nations can only do what two-thirds of its members wish it to do by voting for a resolution. We had a good illustration, not long ago in the Assembly, of what the United Nations can do and what it cannot do when we were discussing the question of the United Nations Emergency Force for the Middle East. Those were very dramatic and tense