

Furthermore, the accusing overtones of the statement by Mr. Gromyko when he presented the U.S.S.R. resolution, a statement which alleged aggression on the part of the United States and the United Kingdom, were clearly designed to be destructive, and held no hope or promise for reasonable and moderate discussion in the Assembly free of propaganda of the cold war.

The Soviet resolution, was the only one that at that time was before the emergency session of the General Assembly, and may I also say here that it had no prospect of adoption because the majority of delegations recognized that this emergency session of the General Assembly had been convened to do much more than simply arrange for the substitution of United Nations action for national action in Lebanon and Jordan.

That was the only resolution. By reason of that fact, the narrow and negative basis of the Soviet resolution, several countries wondered whether they could not offer to the General Assembly a resolution that would be more constructive, one that would be much more satisfactory, than the one that had been proposed by the U.S.S.R.; a resolution that would lay the ground work for a comprehensive consideration of the problems of the Middle East; a resolution that would use the Secretary-General as its instrument, the instrument of the United Nations in this particular field of trouble and excitement; a resolution that would lay the foundations for durable peace and stability in the area.

Canada-Norway Resolution

So, as so often happens, it fell to certain middle powers to undertake the difficult task of devising a resolution which would seek to attain this objective, while at the same time taking into consideration the many widely divergent points of view and conflicting interests. So Canada and Norway found themselves playing a leading role in presenting to the General Assembly a type of resolution that would be constructive and comprehensive as compared with the essentially negative one that had been presented by Mr. Gromyko of the U.S.S.R.

I seize this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to pay a tribute to the devotion and the vision of the Norwegian Delegation, and I single out among that delegation the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Mr. Hans Engen, for his hard work, his tact, and his vision with respect to the formulating of a resolution that would accomplish those objectives to which I have referred. While that was going on and we were formulating this Canadian-Norwegian resolution there were other representatives particularly in the Afro-Asian group, who were active in drafting their own resolution which reflected their overriding reoccupation with the question of troop withdrawal. The Norwegian and Canadian Delegations, on the other hand, were striving, as I have indicated previously, for something much broader both in terms of Assembly support and of what would enable the United Nations to attempt something by way of a permanent settlement; a resolution that would enable the United Nations, through the Secretary-General and otherwise, to get at the basic roots of the Middle East problem and not to deal