

among warm friends of the United Nations to blame governments in such conditions for taking action outside the United Nations, on the ground that this weakens the organization. But one cannot permit deadlock to persist indefinitely, or allow the Security Council to become, instead of the guardian of the peace, the obstructor of settlement. Members of the United Nations should seek to use its machinery on all proper occasions; but if the machinery sticks, for instance because of the operation of the veto, they should not be blamed, as they have sometimes been blamed, for going ahead on their own. To do otherwise would be to surrender to the will of a minority.

CANADA SUPPORTS THE UNITED NATIONS

I have been asked to say something about the Canadian attitude to the United Nations. There has been no uncertainty about it. The geographic position of Canada, her world-wide trade, and her specially intimate relations with the United Kingdom and the United States have brought home to Canadians the truth that both peace and prosperity are indivisible. Mindful of the weakness of the League of Nations, which was in fact only a league of some nations since it never included the United States, Canadians shared the ardent desire in many countries that the new world organization should include all states of any real importance.

Nowhere more than in Canada was there welcomed the vigorous support of the United States for the establishment of the United Nations and the other specialized international bodies. Canadians are not afraid of the use to which the United States will put its power and its responsibilities in world affairs. The people of no other country will applaud more warmly strong and wise leadership by the United States. In the changing distribution of power throughout the world, Canadians hope against hope that a just basis of agreement will be discovered between the main centres of power, in spite of differences of ideology and aim.

As in the United States, support for the United Nations in Canada is not a party matter. At the San Francisco Conference and at each meeting of the Assembly Canadian delegations have included both Cabinet Ministers and leading members of the opposition parties in Parliament. There would be general agreement in Canada, I think, that the following extract from a recent editorial in the Ottawa Journal summarizes fairly the Canadian view today:

"Scoffers and cynics there are who say that UN is already a spent force. They are wrong. UN has not yet fulfilled all our hopes for it, but those who would write it off had better remember that in history two years is less than a heart-beat, and that man's advance along the path of progress, often retarded but never stopped, has not been won without patience, and not much helped by the timid or the cynical. At any rate, our task, as a people, is to give UN the fullest trial, to devote to it our best brains and heart".

CANADIAN VIEW OF THE VETO

During the weeks to come, we shall be hearing at Lake Success a great deal about the veto, the use of which, and especially its use in ways contrary to the understandings laboriously achieved at San Francisco, has underlined the most serious defect in the Charter. In passing, however, let me note that even if long debate on a major issue before the Security Council ends in deadlock, the time and effort have not necessarily all been wasted; for the public exposure of the issues, and the alignment of Council members into majority and minority, can serve to bring about changes in policy and to impose restraint.

The Canadian Government has never liked the veto. At San Francisco and before, their view was made known. They accepted it with reluctance as the necessary price of agreement. They would now support any practicable improvement. They hope the Charter may be amended before long, but they are not optimistic that this will come about very soon, because the veto applies