Canadians -- as citizens of a nation which itself has emerged from colonial status in comparatively recent times -- have a special appreciation of the national ambitions that motivate dependent peoples. However, while we are in sympathy with these natural aspirations, we recognize from our own experience the danger in these matters of premature action. The United Nations must also seek at all times to balance the legitimate aspirations of dependent peoples against the desirability and the necessity of not impinging on the domestic jurisdiction of the parent states. One of the most vital services the United Nations can perform in this age of transition is to help direct the explosive forces of nationalism along orderly and non-violent paths.

Strengthening Our International Machinery

For me, for every delegate who is sent to speak for his fellow-citizens, there can be no doubt about our resolution to make the United Nations and all its agencies serve the cause of humanity. While we can take encouragement from the progress I have noted, there are still a number of ways in which our task might be made easier and our hopes for success improved.

The most evident difficulty, of course, is the continued intransigence of the U.S.S.R. Machinery has now been set up to cope with the Soviet veto by providing a means whereby the General Assembly can deal with any future act of aggression in the event of a deadlock in the Security Council.

But the basic conflict between East and West remains. This is a problem that will not be solved overnight. We must be patient. We must discuss. We must arbitrate. We must adjudicate. It is perhaps too much, at this stage, to hope that any words or deeds of ours can influence those trained in the sorry statecraft of the Soviet. As I have said, however, great importance can be attached to the fact that the United Nations provides for a constant exchange of views, however opposed they may be, and that this exchange helps to prevent the two blocs from withdrawing into a state of hostile seclusion in which disagreements could the more readily lead to conflict.

There is, indeed, even consolation in the fact that the debates of the United Nations are so often bitter an contentious. If our discussions were ever to deteriorate into a meaningless exchange of diplomatic courtesies we would have real cause for concern. For then, the real attitudes and true feelings of member states would be bottled up and obscured, perhaps to find expression elsewhere in some violent form.

A deficiency of the United Nations that comes forcibly to one's attention -- and this is a procedural weakness -- is the lack of orderliness in the debates. There are too many speeches that are needlessly long -- and here I am conscious that I am a prime offender myself. As an editorial writer for the Ottawa Journal once put it, taking his cue from one of my speeches: "U.N. speeches begin on page 15". For myself -- and this is a personal view -- I should like to see fewer formal speeches and more consultation and informal discussion, not necessarily always in the glare of the public spotlight. While the