

political system the ammunition with which to attack it and we have no way of securing similar information from them. We cannot possibly restrict our liberties on this account, and we must simply accept the disadvantage of our position, and at the same time that our own people will not unnecessarily expose us to attack by gratuitous distortions of the facts about our country. We shall have also to face in the United Nations the problem created by deliberate efforts to destroy the organization by making it ineffective. This is a danger which we face in our own political life at home, and it is interesting to see the same techniques being used to impede the working of international political organizations. The United Nations is based on essentially democratic conceptions but our democratic political organization is subject to the weakness that a determined minority can make use of its privileges to discredit it and destroy it. We are all familiar with this technique as it is applied within our own community. We have seen small groups in meetings who, because they could not get what they wanted, prevented the majority getting what it wanted. We have seen meetings break up in angry confusion because of the deliberate interference of a handful of people who knew precisely how to use the rules of procedure in order to prevent any procedure taking place. Exactly the same tactics are being used in the United Nations itself and we shall have to make up our minds there, as at home, that we will not let our political institutions be distorted and discredited in this manner.

I have been speaking to you about the difficulties we are encountering in the United Nations because of the division between the Eastern European States and the rest of the world. There are other difficulties which are inherent in the nature of the organization itself. A great deal has been said and written for example about the veto power. This is the common expression for the voting procedure in the Security Council. It requires seven out of eleven votes for any important motion to carry in the Security Council, but a motion is lost, no matter how many votes it receives, if one of the five permanent members of the Security Council votes against it. It applies only in the Security Council, because that body is the only organ of the United Nations which has been given the power to enforce its decisions. It is a rough and not very satisfactory solution to a very difficult problem. The United Nations is, as I said, based on democratic principles, and in a democratic community one man has one vote. But the inequalities amongst states are so great, not only in power and resources but also in responsibility that the principle can not be fully applied. It is impracticable to suggest that a number of small states by their votes should be able to put in motion the resources of the large ones. It was therefore decided that before action could be taken in the Security Council the votes of all the large states should be required. The word "action" was so liberally interpreted that in practice it was impossible to secure any decision in the Security Council if any permanent member were opposed. This voting procedure is generally unpopular and a number of suggestions have been made for its modification, including some very useful Canadian proposals. No one, however, has proposed a satisfactory alternative, and I do not think it probable that any essential modification will be made in this procedure until the United Nations has gained a great deal more stability and wisdom than it has yet