

success of the United Nations, which has motivated Canada's role in the world Organization.

It has been an exemplary role, based, of course, on your sincere dedication to the aims of our Charter. But I believe it has also derived much of its vitality from this great country's distinctions: the rich diversity of your culture, the wide range of your international contacts and the understanding of world affairs which you command.

It has been suggested to me—from your side—that I should speak to you about the possibilities relating to Canada's future role in the United Nations and not deliver an encomium on your contributions in the past. The suggestion reflects an appealing modesty and generosity, yet it would be inappropriate for me to omit a reference to all that Canada has done to help the United Nations meet the difficult challenges facing it.

The break-through in 1955 in the deadlock which had frozen the composition of the United Nations, the innovative response in 1956 to the situation created by the Suez Canal crisis, your participation in almost all peace-keeping operations launched by the United Nations, your positive contributions to the work of every committee or commission set up since 1945 to deal with the issue of disarmament—these are only the most outstanding instances. Long before the issue of achieving greater balance in the world economy assumed its present prominence, Canada was among the pioneers of the idea of technical assistance programs for developing countries being undertaken by the United Nations.

Let me, therefore, pay my heartfelt tribute to Canada's loyal and consistent support of the endeavours of the world organization. Solidly based as it is on a national consensus, sustained as it has been through your successive administrations, it provides a graphic illustration of the capabilities of countries, other than the permanent members of the Security Council, to advance the work of the United Nations. I might parenthetically mention here that it has become conventional to call countries such as yours the medium-sized ones. The phrase is hardly descriptive of a number among them. Canada, for one, is large not only in territory but also in spirit and intellect, in its resources of statesmanship and in its philosophy of practical co-operation in international life.

As I stand before you today, looking ahead in this year of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, I feel that the future appears to hold even better prospects for the decisive role of countries such as yours. A dynamic United Nations system provides you with a unique instrument for wielding a collective influence on the resolution of outstanding global issues. It is true that major decisions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security depend on the agreement of the permanent members of the Security Council. But in our age of interdependence, other countries have an equal stake in peace and cannot, therefore, be bystanders. A privileged position is conferred on a few, but responsibility rests with all.

[*Translation*]

Ladies and gentlemen, I am sure you are aware of the increased dissatisfaction being expressed in certain circles with the way the United Nations operates. It is said, and there is some truth in this argument, that the UN has been steadily losing credibility. I have said as much, if not more so, myself. However, can the world afford to sit back after making such a judgment? Credibility requires that we provide purpose and direction to the multilateral dialogue on issues that give rise to tension and threaten to cause conflicts between nations.

Since in the world forum that is the United Nations, the dialogue is an international one, it is incumbent on those who express dissatisfaction to bring to this forum the requisite practical and methodical approach and appreciation of urgency and consistency which together may be expected to produce concrete results. An organization like the UN cannot afford to maintain a purely rhetorical stance. It cannot afford to prevent the free expression of the aspirations, fears and grievances of the peoples of this world. It is important that each Member State consider the success or failure of the UN as the success or failure of a personal undertaking. Small and medium-sized powers have various avenues open to them for making good use of the capability of the UN to promote negotiations leading to lasting agreements. These countries can influence the climate of debate and play a moderating role in international conflict. They can formulate specific and realistic suggestions and put them on the agenda of the international community. Through discreet diplomacy they can help fend off threats to peace. The United Nations offers many opportunities for consultation and contacts between ministers of Foreign Affairs and heads of government, which can be used to seek a meeting of minds, to explore avenues that may lead to an agreement on major issues and to analyze the world situation.

I have mentioned earlier the idea of peace-keeping by the United Nations and the part that Canada has played in its conception and development. Peace-keeping operations have conclusively shown the resilience and responsiveness of the United Nations and its capacity for conflict control. The very idea of launching a peace-keeping mission with the help of member states that are not permanent members of the Security Council puts a focus on the responsibility of these states for the maintenance of international peace and security.

But the responsibility does not end with containing a conflict; it extends to resolving the underlying cause of the conflict. Peace-keeping without peace-making can be but a palliative. The cooling-off period which peace-keeping operations manage to secure is of little avail if it serves only as a prelude to a more violent eruption.

I do not have to cite any particular regional conflict: the proposition holds true of all that, without a credible movement toward a just and lasting settlement of an international dispute, pent-up passions accumulate and distrust mounts. Frequently, such a situation runs the risk of dangerous escalation