

We think not only of Asia but of all countries whose peoples desperately need help, impartially and unconditionally given.

One group of nations, Mr. President, one group of members of the United Nations who consider themselves developed do nothing at all about these problems except exploit them for propaganda. They are not even willing to belong to the various specialized agencies. We who do want to tackle the needs of the under-developed areas want you who speak for those peoples at this Assembly to understand our present difficulties. It is not because we are unwilling to lay upon ourselves as heavy burdens of taxation as others, but because of the large part of my Government's budget which has to be spent for the unprofitable, unproductive but wholly necessary purpose of providing our people at this time in the history of the world with a minimum of security - a minimum insurance premium that we consider it prudent to devote to the up-keep to our freedom and to the prevention of a third World War.

To quote my Prime Minister again, we hope and believe "that once the measures for our own safety and the safety of all freedom loving peoples with which our own is bound up, have been reasonably secured from the formidable threat that still shows no signs of diminishing, Canadians will want to participate to a greater degree than they can today in helping their less fortunate fellow human beings to improve their lot in life", and yet we are convinced that the measure of the contribution that we are making at this time is not without significance.

I have linked the extension of our programmes of economic development and technical assistance with the question of disarmament and collective security. In the simplest terms, most of the water must come out of the same well for one or for the other, and we are inevitably faced with the problem of priorities. The balance is not easy to find but we must, according to our lights, do our best to keep it. And I am not ashamed of the contribution that my country is making.

In this opening statement I have tried to develop a certain concept of the United Nations and to use it as a guide to the policy which my delegation will follow in threading our way through all the subtle and often conflicting legal interpretations to which the Charter of the United Nations is likely to be subjected. Perhaps we might make more use of the advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice to guide us. There is, however, one issue on which I hope and believe there will be very general agreement, though this may not be enough for a solution. That is the question of the admission of new members.

I have no doubt whatever that the United Nations was intended by the great majority and probably all the founding fathers at San Francisco to be, in due course, a universal organization. True there were restrictive provisions concerning ex-enemy states but these were not intended to debar them forever. This is not the place for a detailed argument as to the reasons but let me simply state my belief that neither the veto nor Article 4 were ever intended to keep out of the organization any independent state worthy of the name. I am not speaking in favour of a "deal", but, as the Secretary-General has expressed it in the introduction to his Annual Report, of "real universality". As he has said, surely, despite the deadlock on other issues, we should be able to make some progress on this issue at this Assembly, although the Assembly alone cannot resolve the deadlock among the Great Powers.