

power, he said, was but one symptom of a disease which was the "division of one co-operating world into two parts"; the emphasis in the United Nations had been transferred from "collective responsibility" to "individual sovereignty" and debates reduced to "ideological brawls". These difficulties, while serious, did not mean that Canada should "give up the United Nations as a too difficult, if not too good a job". The long-run answer, he thought, consisted in the provision of the United Nations with adequate forces to carry out decisions and to serve as a deterrent to any would-be aggressor. This, he realized, would take a long time to accomplish. He foresaw three possible courses: "to carry on as we have in the hope that the international situation would improve and that great power unity would once more become a reality"; to amend the Charter or, if this did not prove possible, to form another organization which would work. As opposed to these extremes, Mr. Pearson suggested a limited collective security system within the United Nations and in accordance with the letter and spirit of the Charter. His actual words were:

" There is a third way which is much to be preferred ... though it is not nearly so satisfactory as an agreed limitation of the veto by convention or by amendment of the Charter but would frankly recognize that within the present United Nations certain members were determined to form a collective system which would really guarantee their own collective security, even if this could only be done on a limited basis of membership ... such a limited association for collective security - within the letter and spirit of the Charter - would not be an offensive and defensive alliance of the old type. There could be nothing 'offensive' about it because it would be bound by all the obligations of the Charter."

18. Three months later, in the House of Commons on April 29, Mr. St. Laurent went somewhat further, saying that some of the free nations of the world might soon find it necessary to consult together as to how they might establish a collective security league composed of states which were willing to accept more specific and onerous obligations than those contained in the Charter, in return for greater national security than the United Nations could give. At the same time he promised that Canada would continue to give every assistance to constructive efforts to make the United Nations into the instrument for security and co-operation which it was originally designed to be and would utilize its possibilities to the fullest extent. Canada's faith in the United Nations as an effective organization for peace and security had been "severely shaken" but it was nevertheless important that the United Nations be kept in existence and that every possible use be made of the high degree of vitality it had shown.

19. The statement for the guidance of the Delegation to the Third Session of the General Assembly in 1948 reflected the discussions which had already begun leading to the signature of the North Atlantic Pact. The statement began by noting that the United Nations had "reached the point where progress is impossible in any political undertaking which depends for its success upon the co-operation of the Government of the Soviet Union". Despite this attitude, the Delegation was instructed to give expression to the following points:

- (a) "The Government intends to fulfil its obligations under the Charter and is willing in company with other Members of the United Nations to enter into agreements and commitments toward the progressive establishment of a system of collective security".