

permit, having regard to the requirements of individual and collective self-defence and internal security and to the total burden and sacrifice assumed by it in support of the Charter."

None of us would contend that it is possible in the present state of the world to undertake, on a universal basis, extensive commitments against hypothetical contingencies. On a regional basis some of us have gone a good deal further, again in accordance with the principles of the Charter, and specifically under Articles 51 and 52. As the third report of the Collective Measures Committee recognizes, one of the most important questions which we must face is the inter-relationship between our regional agreements and arrangements and our universal objectives in keeping the peace and maintaining ourselves in readiness to resist aggression from whatever quarter. There is, I believe, a genuinely reciprocal and mutually sustaining relationship between arrangements for regional or collective self-defence and United Nations collective security. Until we reach a stage when it may be possible to implement all the procedures on which the Founding Fathers at San Francisco expected the collective security of members of the United Nations to be based, this mutual support between the regional and the universal systems will have to continue.

That this is only a second best we would freely admit; but that it is in any way contrary to Charter principles or objectives we categorically deny. For whatever misrepresentations of Western motives, the record is, I think, sufficiently clear that the regional arrangements with which my Government has been associated have been, are, and will be purely defensive, directed against no country or group of countries but solely against aggression itself. Our object in building up the collective strength we consider essential for our survival has been, is, and will be to deter and to prevent war in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Charter.

To keep alive the principles of United Nations collective security and to pursue such further studies as the Committee may deem appropriate in accordance with the past directives of the Assembly, my Delegation believes the Collective Measures Committee should be continued. In continuing the Committee on this basis, the Assembly would, so to speak, be paying its fire insurance. A fire insurance policy is a good thing to have; for none of us these days can, I believe, pretend that we live in a fire-proof house. The time was, not so many years ago, when many Canadians thought that we lived in a fire-proof house and that we did not need to pay the premium of international co-operation in the field of collective measures. Events of the past fifteen years, however, have convinced most of those who held this view, in Canada and elsewhere, that they were wrong - that the absence of effective collective measures in the thirties led not to peace but to war, and that the achievement of effective collective security now would lead not to war but to peace.