

in the Charter can only be resolved by amendments to the Charter arrived at between Member States. While it is still premature to raise this issue, I need not remind members of this Committee that Article 109 provides a procedure for this.

Thus, while recognizing that there may be no final answer at this time to the question of the authority of the United Nations in any particular situation, I venture briefly to state our views on this tangled question. Canada has repeatedly asserted its faith in the United Nations as a cornerstone for peace. It follows that we would welcome developments which would strengthen and enhance the United Nations as an instrument for peace. Contrariwise, we would deplore developments in the United Nations which would derogate from its prestige and moral authority. On the basis of these criteria, we try to judge individually the question of including any specific item on our agenda. We are always prepared to listen to arguments that the time is not ripe to examine a given problem or that negotiations of great delicacy could be upset if a question were brought up here. Once a question has been included on our agenda, however, we accept the Assembly's competence to discuss it. The right of discussion, however, should not be abused. It must not become the right to slander, the right to incite revolt or rebellion, the right to use the forum of the United Nations to give encouragement to political parties or movements in a given country with whose views one happens to agree. Such an abuse of the right of discussion would be harmful to the United Nations and we should have to reconsider our position on the question of discussion if it appeared that the United Nations was being weakened and its prestige was being damaged in this way.

We also appreciate that the line to be drawn between legitimate discussion and intervention in matters where the competence of the United Nations is in doubt is a very fine one. In the absence of an opinion from the International Court, my delegation intends to use its judgment, which it hopes may be wise, in deciding whether any given resolution goes beyond the limit of the general articles of the Charter and constitutes an intervention which Article 2(7) specifically prohibits. On the assumption that discussion possibly leading to some form of recommendation is not precluded in the matter before us, there remains the second question of how the United Nations should go about its task.

...Although, as I have said, we have no first-hand knowledge of conditions in Tunisia, we are not unfamiliar with the outlook and aspirations of colonial peoples. In relatively recent times Canada itself was a colony. Possibly our experience in the achievement of full sovereignty may throw some light on these discussions. Through its continuous growth since four small colonies agreed to share their destinies by Confederation in 1867, and through a process of constitutional evolution, Canada has become a nation. Independence was not won by revolution. There was no hard, bitter physical struggle by which our sovereignty was gained. It was essentially through a process of normal maturity, mainly in the political field but also in the economic, social and cultural fields. Our experience is therefore different from many countries represented in this Committee who are proud of their revolutions and of the way in which they gained their liberty. We have taken another road; so have great countries like India and Pakistan.