

the United Nations be kept in existence, and that we make every possible use of the very high degree of vitality which, in spite of these divergent opinions, it has shown. There are, for example, subjects such as the dispute in Kashmir, to which I have referred, and the difficulties which have arisen in Indonesia, which are not directly within the area of conflict between the eastern European states and the rest of the world, and where the machinery of the United Nations has been used very effectively.

Our willingness to stand for, and our ability to secure. election to the Security Council last September was an earnest of our desire to play our full part in the United Nations. That part involves us in discussions and decisions on matters which once may have seemed to be remote from our interests. Although we know, as I have already said, that this remoteness is illusory, nevertheless, this does not alter the fact that during the next year and a half Canada, as a member of the Security Council, will, at times have to declare its position publicly on certain matters which previously might not have come to the attention of the government at all, or might have been dealt with confidentially through diplomatic channels.

The position of a power of the middle rank on the Security Council is under any circumstances a difficult one. A small power is in a sense by its very smallness relieved from much of the responsibility which participation in decisions involves, and which the implementations of such decisions requires. At the other extreme the great powers can protect their positions with the veto. A "middle country" such as Canada, however, is in a different position. Its economic strength and political influence are of importance, and its prestige is high. The material and moral contribution which Canada can make to collective action, as the last two wars have shown, is significant. The judgments which the Canadian Government express on United Nations matters must therefore be made with care and a sense of responsibility, especially since Canada is a country the views of which are taken seriously and which has the reputation of conscientiously carrying out the commitments into which it has entered.

Canada's position on the Security Council, as a middle power, would be an important one in any circumstances. The special nature of our relationship to the United Kingdom and the United States complicates our responsibilities, though it also enlarges our opportunities for influencing developments. Canada will be expected by some to follow the lead of the United Kingdom; by others to follow the lead of the United States. The fact that these two states are now in general agreement on fundamental questions eases but does not remove our particular difficulties. Unfriendly observers will write us off as a satellite of both, hoping in this way to minimize the effect of our independent action. More objective observers will tend to assume that it will be hard for Canada to follow a policy of its own. The fact that Canadian interests will often naturally be identical with those of the United Kingdom and the United States, without any suggestion or influence from these states, in a sense makes Canada's position more ambiguous. It will not be easy to secure credit for independence and honesty of argument and decision. Nevertheless we will continue to make our decisions objectively, in the light of our obligations to our own people and their interest in the welfare of the international community.

I come now to the question of Palestine.

There is not time for me now to discuss this question at length, and honorable members may wish to examine the more detailed account of the discussions in the general assembly which will be included in our report to parliament on the United Nations. I should like, however, to summarize a few of the principal considerations which have influenced Canadian policy on this subject since it came before the United Nations.