

on to a global plane, with immediate ramifications for the entire international community.

The Charter of the United Nations lists all conceivable means for the pacific settlement of disputes. At present, in situations where direct negotiations are difficult or impossible for one reason or another, states rarely feel encouraged to avail themselves of such means as mediation, the good offices of an impartial third party, or adjudication. This is one of the cardinal manifestations of disorganization in international affairs. However, the failure is by no means terminal. Member states of the United Nations can exert a collective and benevolent pressure for the rational settlement of international disputes.

In this regard, the bulk of these states, compared to the world powers, have the advantage of greater flexibility because they are less entangled historically in the causes of the conflict. Alone, none of them can expect success in mediating a dispute: together, their voice can be persuasive and may well prove irresistible.

I would urge influential states like Canada to use the opportunities afforded by the United Nations for giving a fresh impulse to encouraging the comprehensive and durable settlement of regional conflicts. I do not underrate the difficulties involved but, even with the small signs of realism and fluidity that can be discerned in certain situations, the climate may be more propitious now than it has been in recent years. In some situations, the United Nations or the Secretary-General remains essential to communication between the parties. I think, for example, of Cyprus, over which at the moment I am engaged in a new personal effort to find a solution, of Afghanistan, the Iran-Iraq war and South-East Asia.

Another very important area in which a country like Canada can play a most useful role is the promotion of the North-South dialogue. I do not believe that there is a primordial or inherent conflict between the interests of the developing countries and those of the industrialized ones: all will benefit from a more efficient, less unbalanced and less crisis-prone global economy. If the positions respectively formulated by the two sides seem irreconcilable, a more imaginative approach can help to bridge the gulf. What is important is that the dialogue should be free from the tone of confrontation.

Canada has been second to none among the industrialized countries in acknowledging the necessity of making the world economic system more responsive to poverty in large parts of the globe. Your statesmen have urged a less fractious approach to the process of giving a more balanced meaning to the idea of economic interdependence. The objectivity and breadth of vision that inspired their appeal can be most helpful in stimulating some progress in the North-South dialogue.

[*Translation*]

One of the main concerns of our society today is the existing situation with respect to human rights. Paradoxically, at a time when the United Nations, after tremendous efforts, has

succeeded in giving the provisions guaranteeing the protection of human rights force of law internationally those very rights are still being violated on a wide scale. For the first time in history, the States that make up the international community and are signatories to the Charter of the United Nations are committed to work together to promote and foster respect for human rights and basic freedoms for all. Such instruments as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and related covenants prescribe those standards against which the international community may judge the behaviour of a State in that context. Various procedures have been established to make it easier for the States to adhere to those standards. Unfortunately, many regions of the world still violate them, and that is one of the most disturbing characteristics of mankind. This problem ought to be tackled with tact, and the method most likely to give positive results ought to be adopted. In my opinion, countries such as Canada can contribute to strengthen the means available to the United Nations to allay the great sufferings caused by the denial of human rights and dignity.

In conclusion, may I allude to the concern which, in the minds of people the world over, is by far more extant than any other: the apprehension stemming from the unrelenting expansion of the nuclear arsenal. Here again Canada has the advantage of being a country which, however advanced in the realm of nuclear technology, is not equipped with nuclear weapons.

In that capacity, you are in a position to give invaluable assistance to overcome the technical obstacles which stand in the way of the implementation of effective measures to limit and, ultimately, eliminate nuclear arms. Mankind's foremost objective must be to reverse the trend towards nuclear overarmament. This is not the proper forum for me to attempt to analyze the various reasons why no progress has been made to that end. However, it seems to me that the human mind has now become a prisoner of a new form of determinism, even more paralyzing than fatalism—a believe in predestination, to which the fall of the glorious civilizations of the past has been attributed. I am speaking of the subjection to the ruthless advance of military technology.

Technology should be at the service of mankind and not be the ruler of its destiny. If private corporations can maintain control over their industrial technology and use it sensibly in their own financial interests, there is no reason why States cannot maintain control over the technology of destruction in the interests of peace. However, such control requires reciprocal agreements to put an end to the arms race. Without these agreements, science can play the role of the sorcerer's apprentice as far as armaments are concerned; if we want the gnome to stop before all of us are swept away by the flood, we need an order from our political leaders.

As a matter of fact, the arms race among the major world powers was prompted by their serious concerns about their own security. However, the concept of security cannot be solely military; its other aspects, whether economic, social,