

a matter which should be regarded as a threat to the maintenance of peace and security; and, when effective action to deal with it was blocked by the veto of the Russian representative in the Security Council, we considered it was proper to endeavour to find means under the Charter to have it effectively dealt with by the General Assembly.

As you know, when this matter was first brought before the Security Council, a committee of enquiry was appointed to investigate the facts and after doing so, this committee by a majority finding of eight to two, reported that on the basis of the facts as it had found them, it was its conclusion that Yugoslavia and to a lesser extent, Albania and Bulgaria, had supported the guerilla warfare in Greece. Now when it was thereupon proposed in the Security Council to take measures to prevent the continuation of such conduct, the Russian representative blocked them on the ground that such action would be "contrary to the sovereignty of the states concerned".

When the matter was afterwards brought before the General Assembly, the Canadian Delegation and most of the other nations felt that under appropriate sections of the Charter, it was the duty of the Assembly to enquire into the matter and to recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of the situation.

It was no doubt this example which suggested to the United States delegation to propose, as Mr. Marshall did in his first speech at the General Assembly of 1947, that a continuing committee of the Assembly might sit between sessions in order that greater use might be made of the powers of the Assembly whenever the Security Council failed to act. This proposal is still under consideration and Canada is giving it full support.

It is doing so because Canada has taken the position that the abuse of the veto power might well destroy the United Nations because it destroys all confidence in the ability of the Security Council to act effectively and to act in time. When I stated that position on behalf of the Canadian Delegation before the General Assembly, I added that our peoples could not be expected to accept indefinitely and without alteration voting procedures and practices which in the name of unanimity underlined disunity and which in the quest for agreement on action more often than not resulted only in inaction. I also added that nations in their search for peace and co-operation might, if they were forced to do so, attempt to achieve their goal otherwise than through a council frozen in futility and divided by dissensions. The solution adopted for the Greek border difficulty and the establishment of a continuing committee of the Assembly may be one such way and may also serve to convince our Russian friends that the Charter can be made to work even over and in spite of their objections.

Should they come to that conclusion- and they must if they stay in- and I think they will- they are apt to modify their attitude in the Security Council. Coming to the conclusion that decisions can be made and implemented without their concurrence, they may prefer to have the controversies discussed and dealt with in the Security Council where they are one of five permanent members and one of the total membership of eleven, rather than see them go to a committee of the Assembly where they are only one of fifty-seven members.

It is with such hopes for improvements that the Department of External Affairs faces its task of providing Canadian representation on the Security Council to which we were elected by an overwhelming majority three weeks ago.

Our duties on that Council, though more onerous than hitherto will not be entirely new. Canadian representatives have been associated with some of its most important work for the last fifteen months or more. You will remember that there was constituted about a year and a half ago