

that the United Nations may be strengthened into a useful supranational authority to maintain peace. This is in line with our historic commitment to generous and wholehearted co-operation in solving, through the United Nations, other grave international problems: disarmament, technical and economic assistance to underdeveloped countries, atomic radiation, atomic power for peaceful uses, and others.

The Prime Minister, in his historic and important broadcast to the Canadian people on November 4, underscored this commitment:

We realize, however, that a permanent settlement between Israel and its neighbours arranged by the United Nations was the only way in which peace could be preserved in the long run.

And later in the same address:

We have advocated that a settlement of the issues relating to the Canal which directly affected so many countries should be achieved under the auspices of the United Nations and that there should be no resort to force.

Now, although our reliance upon the United Nations is honest, sincere and indeed courageous, and although our support of the United Nations is deliberate, open and conscientious, we are realistically alive to the calculated risks we must take in working through the United Nations. These risks the Canadian people must know, and must accept in a realistic manner.

For example, the effectiveness of the UN Security Council can be immobilized by the right of veto. The historic UN Security Council intervention in Korea was possible only because the USSR had absented itself and was not present to exercise its veto prerogative. This immobilization can and probably will happen again unless a Charter amendment were to remove the veto principle, which is not likely.

To by-pass a stalemated Security Council, a two-thirds vote is needed in the General Assembly. One can foresee the Assembly rendered impotent by some coalition of nations, even on the present Suez issue.

Further, any nation may deliberately choose not to accept a majority decision of the Assembly on some issue. For example, the USSR and Hungary have refused, so far, even to permit the UN to investigate conditions in Hungary, on the pretext or reason that what happened there is a domestic affair.

During the last parliamentary session I raised an over-arching calculated risk always present when one considers the progress that can be made by a federation of the now 79 national governments, namely, that

the reconciliation and harmonizing of multitudinous shades of opinions and expectations is a slow and time-consuming business.

Knowing these risks, and predicating our answer on past history and on events which have lately taken place in the Middle East, we do face this pertinent question:

With all its weaknesses and imperfections, is not the United Nations the only international vehicle which may yet be able to forestall further aggressive intervention, get the Canal opened, secure the withdrawal of the armed forces from the Suez area, assure the future observance of the spirit and the letter of international law and the sequential international freedom of the Canal without endangering the security and sovereignty rights of the Egyptian people and without further antagonizing the Arab world?

What other international authority can conceivably be upraised to a level that can attract and hold the allegiance of all the Middle East contestants, and thereby eventually bring peace to a very troubled area?

I may be accused of belabouring this point; but truthfully, what is the realistic and logical alternative to this near-universal forum for multilateral discussion and negotiative settlement? In parentheses, are we guessing correctly that nations or even groups of nations will hardly risk being opposed to an organized, international United Nations mandate, if it is bulwarked by the determined support of the peace-loving nations of the world?

It is imperative, too, that Canadians understand the cardinal importance of the role of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the maintenance of international peace and security. As we all know, this organization functions as a 15-member agency for collective defence and as a further instrument for the deterrence of aggression.

It may be well to quote two significant summarizing statements from the address of General Charles Foulkes, Chairman, Chiefs of Staff, at the annual dinner of the Canadian Industrial Preparedness Association:

... NATO has achieved the defensive aim it set out to do. It has succeeded in deterring aggression in the NATO area, and the fact that the Soviet Union is now busy doing an end-run around NATO confirms the success that the alliance has accomplished in deterring aggression in the NATO area ...

... there are many advantages in belonging to this kind of alliance; we believe that the best way of defending Canada is as a member of NATO.

The revived Soviet tough, cold-war tactics and the Soviet threats of intervention appear to have jolted the West into renewed preparedness, giving to NATO a new feeling of purposive urgency. This renewed urgency may enable the nations concerned to focus