

that each national government is under an obligation to pursue consistent policies in the United Nations and in the specialized agencies. The economic and social problems with which the world is confronted are so difficult and vast that they can be solved only if all the international bodies concerned work in harmony: if these international bodies get in each other's way, refuse to cooperate, pursue conflicting policies, the difficulties of solving the problems will be greatly increased. But, since the policies of the agencies are the result of policies advocated by national delegations at the meetings of those agencies, the policies of the agencies will not conflict if each government follows a consistent policy in the United Nations and in each of the agencies. Each Member of the United Nations must, therefore, accept the responsibility of ensuring that its delegates to specialized agencies and to the various organs of the United Nations carry with them instructions which harmonize with each other. The work of the agencies will be co-ordinated if each government co-ordinates its own political, economic and social foreign policy. Co-ordination begins at home.

Towards the beginning of my talk I said that, in view of the deficiencies in the Charter, it would have been possible for Canada after San Francisco to have taken the line that the Charter needs radical amendments, but that the Canadian Government, like the governments of almost all the other Members of the United Nations, had considered that to press for radical amendments at the present time would be a sterile task since amendments can come into force only when they are approved by all the great powers and there is today no possibility of all the great powers approving amendments of any importance. The government had therefore concentrated on the practical though undramatic task of making the best of what we have in the United Nations. In my talk I have outlined some of the things which Canada has tried to do in order to make the best of what we have in the United Nations.

The question which some people ask is whether such a policy ought to be continued much longer. Should we not, they ask, press for far-reaching changes in the Charter of the United Nations in order to make it a more effective instrument for maintaining peace? Some advocates of changes would be content with the abolition of the great power veto. Others go a good deal further; they advocate proposals, the adoption of which would mean the creation of a world government in a limited sphere.

The supporters of all the proposals for far-reaching changes in the Charter realize that, under present circumstances, their proposals could not be adopted except at the expense of the secession from the United Nations of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European states.

Such a secession would mean the destruction of the only constitutional structure which now exists which includes both of the two worlds into which our one world has now so tragically been divided. It seems to me that as long as that structure remains in existence - faulty and weak as it is - there is some hope that the two worlds can learn to live together. If that structure goes the changes of the two worlds learning to live together will become much more remote.

A rejection of proposals for immediate, drastic revision of the Charter does not necessarily mean that those states of the Western world which are willing to commit themselves to a much closer degree of union than that embodied in the Charter should not, if they so desire, work out such arrangements. Indeed, they have already done so. The mere fact that the Soviet Union has not so far been willing to cooperate in international organizations charged with dealing with food and agriculture, aviation, refugees, international lending, monetary questions, education, science and culture has not prevented the other nations of the world from establishing F.A.O., I.C.A.O., the I.R.O., the Bank, the Fund and U.N.E.S.C.O.