

All foreign ministers, of all countries, are accused of being mealy-mouthed, of not speaking out boldly on behalf of the causes that are dear to the heart of some of the citizens of their countries and even to their own hearts. It is an occupational hazard from which, so far as I can see, there is no escape. Condemn, they are urged - take the issue to the United Nations - break diplomatic relations - enforce sanctions - retaliate. There are occasions, very few though, when this is an effective course to follow. But in international affairs, as in domestic affairs, discretion is more often the better part of valour and it is usually more useful in the end to proceed with patience and forbearance in pursuit of justice, amity, co-operation and understanding among peoples.

The international community is not like a gentleman's club that can expel a member who offends the code of the majority. Severance of diplomatic relations with a country does not make it disappear; it continues to share the globe with the rest of us. In nearly every case it is better to continue contact than to break it off, thereby giving up whatever opportunity there might be to influence the course of events there.

The international reputation of a country depends on its effectiveness. One essential element of effectiveness is to speak and act within the limits of one's powers. There are Canadians who, from time to time, call upon their Government to take a public stand on some issue that Canada cannot influence. To do this is simply to make a noise and at the same time to diminish our credibility in the international community. The effect is very much the same if Canada, or any other member, brings a resolution to the United Nations that has not the least possibility of gaining a reasonable measure of support. The reaction is that the member concerned should have been able to foresee what would happen. By going through the motions such a country will be judged either uninformed or imprudent. Its international influence will be reduced, its capacity to act effectively on some other issue lessened and the finding of a genuine solution may be jeopardized.

As you will have gathered, I do not have easy answers, for there are none. The search for peace and harmony among men is a never-ending search. All I can say is that it must be pursued even more relentlessly than ever before, because the consequences of failure to make progress could be so appalling.

As I see it, there are two directions in which we must move. The first, perhaps the most important in the long run, is to break down the barriers of prejudice and ignorance that divide men needlessly. This you understand. It is your objective. The second is to develop means for the settlement of international disputes and conflicts without war. There is no country which has given and continues to give more support to this objective than Canada. But I would be less than frank if I did not say that progress is slow and halting and sometimes there is none at all. Nor is this surprising. It is a reflection of the fact that mankind has not yet developed a world view or the means of bringing such a view to bear. But gradually, inexorably, all the forces of science and technology are moving us in that direction. Today we divide the air-waves among the nations; we make inter-