and co-operation, will not, and cannot, accept indefinitely
and unaltered a Council which was set up to ensure their
security, and which, so many feel, has become frozen in
futility and divided by dissension".

The most recent example of what the Prime Minister
had then in mind was the sad spectacle of the Security
Council's indecision over the Iranian issue, a week ago
today. Stalled in a tangle of legalistic arguments and
evasions, the highest body of the United Nations on that
occasion was unable to muster the minimum seven votes for
the most moderate of resolutions calling upon the parties
to the dispute to discuss their differences.

In April 1948, in the House of Commons, our Prime
Minister admitted that Canadian faith in the United Nations
as an effective organization for peace and security had
been "pretty severely shaken". But, Mr. St. Laurent added:
"What is unshaken in our determination to make of it (the
United Nations), or within it, an effective organization
for this purpose. Unshaken also is our faith that this
can be achieved".

With certain other nations of the Free World,
Canada these past two years has pressed on toward the
objective of genuine collective security in two ways:

first, by creating the North Atlantic Treaty
Organization - NATO;

second, by action within the United Nations
itself to increase the United Nations capacity to
deal effectively with acts of aggression.

Within the United Nations the most significant
step was the "Uniting for Peace" resolution passed by the
General Assembly, during its fifth session in November
last. This resolution was a direct result of the Korean
crisis. It was designed to meet the conditions of just
such a crisis in which the Security Council might fail to
discharge its responsibilities because of lack of unanimity
among its permanent members.

The core of this resolution was that "if the
Security Council ... fails to exercise its primary
responsibility for the maintenance of international peace
and security in any case where there appears to be a threat
to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression,
the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately".
The effect was to put much larger powers and much greater
responsibilities in the General Assembly. From then on
frustration in the Security Council needed not imply in-
action and defeat; the Assembly had the right and duty to
act.

These two developments - the establishment of
NATO and the new authority vested in the General Assembly
to act in the face of aggression, have added materially
to the effectiveness of collective means for the main-
tenance of international peace and security.

Canadians believe in the principle of collective
security. And, because they believe in it, Canadians
are willing to support responsible and reasonable proposals
for giving it effect. At the same time most of us
recognize that the present world situation compels us to