

Court of Justice has no jurisdiction over legal disputes between two states unless both states have formally accepted its jurisdiction. The Trusteeship Council has no jurisdiction over any territory until the states concerned have put that territory under its jurisdiction. The Assembly can make no binding decisions except on such matters as the internal organization of the Secretariat. It can merely make recommendations.

It would have been possible for Canada after San Francisco to have taken the line that the Charter needs radical amendments. The Canadian Government, like the governments of almost all the other Members of the United Nations, has, however, considered that to press at the present time for radical amendments would be abortive. Amendments can come into force only when they are approved by all the great powers. There seems today to be no possibility that all the great powers would approve amendments of any importance.

Canada, recognizing that there is no short-cut to salvation, has concentrated on making the best of what we have in the United Nations. This is not a dramatic policy but it is practical. It can give results. It has already given results.

The Charter of the United Nations is not the whole constitution of the United Nations. It is only a framework. It could not become a working instrument for international cooperation until it had been supplemented by rules of procedure for the various organs, by financial regulations, and staff regulations, by the establishment of sound precedents, and by the drawing up of precise agreements between the United Nations and its member states and between the United Nations and the various specialized agencies. In the early years of the United Nations, therefore, Canada has concentrated on trying to secure the best possible development of the constitution of the United Nations within the framework of the Charter as it is.

One of the most fruitful lines of development has been in the drawing up of the rules of procedure for the various organs of the United Nations - the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. Anyone who has been at an international conference recognizes the importance of rules of procedure. Without unambiguous and detailed rules, an international conference will become embroiled in long and fruitless debates on procedure which frustrate or delay the accomplishment of its real tasks. The San Francisco Conference did not have unambiguous and detailed rules of procedure. Consequently half the time of the conference was taken up with procedural debates - debates not on what the conference should decide but on how it should go about making a decision.

It is probably not an exaggeration to say that Canada has played a larger role than any other country in the development of the rules of procedure for the Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council. The Canadian and Australian delegations also tried without much success in the meetings of the Executive Committee which preceded the first meetings of the Assembly to persuade the Executive Committee to draw up for the consideration of the Security Council as complete as possible a set of provisional rules of procedure. These efforts failed because of the opposition of the United States and the Soviet Union. The confusion which existed at the early meetings of the Security Council was in part the result of this failure.

Having failed to secure in London, in September and October of 1945, an adequate set of rules of procedure for the Security Council, the Canadian delegation returned to the attack a year later at the Assembly in New York. Various suggestions were made at that Assembly