

than to be engaged in an enterprise which is not prospering. We should indeed be misrepresenting the situation if we did not make clear our realization that we are standing for membership on a body with a discouraging record. We must not delude either ourselves or anyone else about the fact that membership on the Security Council will embody greater risks and responsibilities and fewer rewards and honours than it seemed to offer two years ago when Canada withdrew its candidacy in the original elections, in order to enable Australia to be elected without further contest.

The Security Council was established in the hope that it would provide means to dissolve threats to the peace through that gradual process of negotiation and discussion which is at the heart of the democratic process. It was founded in the faith that there is no problem in human relations which it is beyond the power of human ingenuity and intelligence to solve. It was also established in the belief that the nations which constituted it would be able and ready to judge world problems, not only in the light of their own national interests but in terms of the welfare of the world community.

It is a great disappointment to us all that the organization has fallen so far short of realizing these expectations. The Security Council has become a forum in which the issues of world politics have been subjected to public debate. It has so far failed to provide a conference table at which reconciliation might be achieved through compromise. There has been little evidence of sincere desire to reach agreed solutions. All too frequently, on the other hand, there has been the continual restatement in uncompromising terms of inflexible positions. The misuse of the veto, which we all so much regret, has been a disturbing symptom of the failure to reach agreed solutions on any of the major problems brought before the United Nations.

I would not like to suggest that, in seeking membership on the Security Council, we feel ourselves in a position to provide the remedy for these difficulties. The remedy can only lie in the attitude of the Permanent Members of the Council. There is no form of words, nor method of procedure which will be proof against the determination of any state to misuse its position as a Member of the Council. The Security Council is essentially a democratic political device. It is basic in democratic practice that no member of a democratic community shall so use his privileges that the system by which his community is governed is weakened or discredited. In a true democracy there is no end which justifies a means that brings into contempt the instrument of government. It is only by the practice of these restraints that the Security Council can be redeemed.

We have, of course, our own ideas about the ways in which the operations of the United Nations could be improved and we shall make these views known, wherever and whenever it is possible, in our contacts with that organization. In this respect, I think our record is particularly good. From the very inception of the United Nations, Canadian delegations have advocated methods of procedure which would simplify and expedite its work. We shall continue to make these views known and to press for the improvements in organization which we think would be beneficial. We have views, also, about constitutional problems such as the veto. We realize that this provision of the Charter was a necessary expedient for resolving, on a temporary basis at least, the basic problem of voting procedure in a world of unequal powers. We shall never be