

procedure. The United Nations is only now beginning to make use of the machinery it has been creating.

The reply both to the cynic and to the over-optimistic must be that it is still too early to judge the ability of the United Nations to achieve the goal its founders set out to reach.

We are well aware that nationalism is still a very great threat to the existence of the United Nations. We know only too well the entangled relationships between colonies and between former colonies and metropolitan powers. We have come up against the terrible split between Eastern Europe and the Western nations time and time again in United Nations work. The failures of the Council of Foreign Ministers have left open wounds in several important areas of the world and have been terrible disappointments to those of us who hoped for much from the wartime cooperation of the allies.

As members of the Atomic Energy Commission we know how little has been accomplished on that basic question of international security. We have tried along with other nations to reach an agreement that would be the cornerstone in a security system which involved limitation of armaments and the provision of forces for the use of the Security Council. Little of that has yet been accomplished. But the United Nations has not been able to await agreement in these fields before taking any action in the many disputes and complicated situations brought to its attention. The Security Council and the General Assembly have had to act in the belief that members would in an emergency support the final decisions of the United Nations. It would be fatal to allow the tragic paralysis of will and confusion of judgment that overcame the League of Nations to destroy the United Nations even before all its organs have been fully set up.

The title, United Nations, is misleading in one respect. It indicates the hoped-for result, not the accomplished fact. It is impossible for an organization which attempts anything as comprehensive as general world security to start with anything more than a small measure of unity. We must build on the common fear of war and not allow the dissident policies of some nations to wreck our attempts. We must hope that the nations who because of power, influence, political experience and close bilateral understandings can take the lead will continue to do so. To drift along for several years hoping for a mystical unity among the nations based on economic rehabilitation or education is apt to be a most dangerous course. It is becoming more and more clear which nations really desire to see the United Nations work for all and which nations want it to work in their interest only. There should be no doubt as to where Canadian sympathies lie. These are not the happiest circumstances in which to set about the building of international order, but he who awaits an improvement of circumstances before acting may find in the end that he has lost his ability to act at all. If the United Nations is not to have universal support then let us make it quite clear that it is no failure of nations such as Canada to follow a constructive policy which is responsible. If we cannot achieve a complete world league at present then let us strive for the strongest possible association of freedom-loving and law-abiding nations that is possible. Let us maintain the ideals of the Charter of the United Nations as the banner of that association and not allow them to be wrested from their true position by the distortions of propaganda and the unbending chauvinism of the totalitarian ideologies.

Our Prime Minister, Mr. King, has recently made Canada's stand in this respect quite clear. You will probably recall the quotation that I would like to bring again to your attention: