

the powers vested in it under Chapter VII of the Charter, and the number of major disputes in which the UN has been powerless to intervene in any way and the secondary character of its role in most of those where it has had a part to play are sufficient proof that the expectations of 1945 in this vital area have had to be significantly modified.

It is a sad fact that the value of the contribution by the UN to peace and to the prospects for settlement of disputes has been considerably diminished in the eyes of many Western nations, and particularly the United States and Canada, by the war of words that has gone on in the General Assembly and in most of the other forums available in the UN family of organizations – particularly, but not exclusively, over the Middle East situation. But I venture to suggest that there are some offsetting factors that should not be lost sight of. It has contributed to the air of crisis that has made the major powers face up to the fact that they must make vigorous renewed efforts to help the “protagonists” find a solution. It has brought home to the Western world the primordial importance attached by most members of the UN to the notion that the occupation of the territory of one power by another is intolerable. And it has made it crystal clear that, in the case of the Middle East, peace will be unattainable unless the legitimate interests of the Palestinians are met.

Irrespective of what we think of this aspect of UN concern with issues of peace and security, continued UN involvement is indispensable. We, for our part, shall continue to accept the necessity to support those actions that we think are right and to oppose those that are bad – not only in the UN itself but in our relations with other governments.

As a further example of fundamental change, let me cite the elimination of colonialism, which, in 1945, was a largely-unrealized dream. Today, although the old colonial empires are gone, we are confronted with a new awareness of the terrible problems of southern Africa. At the same time, we have to acknowledge that, in many lands where colonialism has ended, viable alternatives to the old colonial economic system have not been found. Political institutions have proved to be fragile, and new abuses of human rights have taken the place of old.

So far as southern Africa is concerned, we must expect that it will continue to be a major preoccupation at the United Nations so long as the independence of Rhodesia and Namibia under governments based on the principle of minority rule is denied, and so long as *apartheid* persists in South Africa. The African nations, having obtained their own freedom and a voice in the organization, have pressed the issue during the past ten years with increasing effect, until every member state has joined in invoking sanctions against Rhodesia and denouncing South Africa for its policy of *apartheid* and for its illegal occupation of South West Africa (Namibia). Now the Africans are demanding that the Security Council should invoke Chapter VII of the Charter to impose an arms embargo and sanctions against South Africa. Thus far, Canada and most Western nations have not been prepared to contemplate such action.

For Canada, the problem of southern Africa involves a number of factors in addition to the question of sanctions, all of which have to be taken into account as matters

---