

every cause it claims to serve. The international community, which is pledged to eliminate war as an instrument of policy, can hardly accept terrorism as a tolerable aspect of international life.

Resolution 32/8, adopted by consensus at the last session of the General Assembly, dealt with a specific aspect of terrorism — hijacking. That resolution called on governments to take joint and separate action to ensure the safety of civil aviation, and it was strongly endorsed by the Canadian delegation. We have continued to stress the need for further international action to combat terrorism in all its manifestations. Prime Minister Trudeau's initiative in developing and presenting a declaration on hijacking at the Bonn "summit" in July clearly underlined Canada's commitment to take action to deal with this problem. The declaration commits the seven governments to suspend air-links with countries that do not extradite or prosecute hijackers who come within their jurisdictions.

Participants in the Bonn meeting urged other governments to associate themselves with this commitment. Many governments have indicated that they are prepared to do so. We urge all other members of the international community to follow this course as well.

Security Council

As Canada nears the end of its latest term on the Security Council, I inevitably have mixed feelings. We have welcomed the opportunity to play a direct part in contributing towards the resolution of the issues of peace and war brought to the Council. We have participated — I believe effectively — in some very important decisions. But we have also felt some frustrations, which I suppose are shared by most non-permanent members. Periods of service on the Council are too infrequent to build an extensive background of experience or to have much impact on the way the Council meets the responsibilities set out for it in the Charter.

We have been impressed by the progress the Council has made since our last term ten years ago. There has been the adoption of quietly-effective negotiating techniques, which have encouraged a sense of co-operation and collegial spirit in its work. We think that, for the most part, the Council has done a good job in dealing with the matters before it.

But we have not changed our view that the Council is too passive. All too frequently, it turns a blind eye to situations that clearly constitute a threat to international peace and security. It continues to ignore its responsibility under the Charter to try to head off such threats before they arise. In my statement before this Assembly a year ago, I expressed the belief that informal and private exchanges between political leaders represented on the Council would help it to fulfil its responsibilities. In all candour, I must report that we found that some of our colleagues were opposed to this approach. However, I continue to be convinced of the value of the conception of periodic meetings of the Council at ministerial level. Such meetings could give the Council the high-level political direction that is essential if it is to take the initiative in preserving peace when conflict is anticipated, as well as restoring it when conflict has occurred. I know that I am not alone in expressing these views, and I urge those members of the