

United Nations is a world forum, it is also an instrument for diplomatic negotiation.

For this reason, I cannot agree with Lord Beaverbrook's view that we should keep our foreign ministers at home. On the contrary, I think it would be most desirable to have government leaders in more continuous attendance at United Nations sessions. The number of foreign ministers not appearing in person or making only brief flying visits seems to be on the increase. It is obviously not possible for them to be in New York for weeks and months at a time. On the other hand, surely some orderly arrangement of debates could be worked out so that they might be able to participate personally in the discussions of the most crucial problems.

The U.N. -- Our Hope For The Future

The United Nations is by no means a perfect instrument. Like all things contrived by humans, its Charter must be looked at periodically to see whether it is capable of improvement. Indeed, such a review was specifically provided for eight years ago at San Francisco. As you know, Article 109 of the Charter stipulates that if a conference to review the Charter has not been held before the tenth annual session of the Assembly -- that is in 1955, the question of holding such a conference is to be placed on the agenda of that session. A review conference will then be held, if this is so decided at the tenth session, by a majority vote of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

At the present session in New York, Canada has joined with other countries in supporting the initiation of appropriate studies by the Secretary-General and by member governments because we feel there are real advantages in having a preliminary look at the problems involved in revising the Charter well in advance of the decision to be taken by the Assembly in 1955.

Here is a fruitful field for thought and study both by governments and by voluntary associations such as your own which have a deep interest in seeing that the Charter is developed as a more useful instrument for the purposes of peace.

But I do not think that any one of us believes that the Charter revision is a panacea for the deep-rooted ills of international life. The ultimate success of the United Nations will not be a matter of revising the Charter, however important this may be. Peaceful settlement of the world's problems depends not on votes or vetoes but on a spirit of agreement and acceptance on the part of the nations concerned. If a nation is not moved by a sincere desire for agreement or is not prepared to accept a proposed settlement and carry through its own obligations, it little matters how it votes.

With all its shortcomings, the United Nations still carries the hopes of humanity for a better life. We must not forget that the United Nations did not create the acute division that now exists between East and West. The division would most certainly exist, and in all likelihood in a more explosive form, if there were no world