

supported the Assembly Resolution for the partition of Palestine. Events then took a different course. But there have been more recent examples of co-operation between the Great Powers on this issue, most notably the five resolutions adopted by the Security Council earlier this month. Two of these Great Powers are members of the Palestine Conciliation Commission. Indeed it was the permanent members who were responsible for selecting the Commission. That is the kind of precedent which I hope will be followed again.

There are other possible areas of co-operation between the Permanent Members which remain to be explored. One would be an agreement to control the flow of arms to the Middle East. An all-important by-product of such an arrangement would be the application to economic and social development of some of the resources otherwise spent on maintaining substantial armed forces. It seems self-evident that shipments of food are more important than shipments of arms. The Canadian Government for its part will continue its policy and practice of not sending military supplies to the countries directly involved in this dispute.

A vital step forward in the achievement of durable peace and stability in the Middle East is to ensure that justice be done to the Palestinian refugees. These people for too long have been losers in the tragic conflict of interests in the area. The problem is however of such magnitude that only a combination of methods can produce a solution. It would be an illusion to go on believing that the problem of the refugees will simply be solved on the basis of their return to Israel. Similarly the Arab States could not be expected to shoulder alone the burden of re-settling and integrating in Arab countries those refugees who might make this choice. An international effort in a United Nations context directed at regional economic development in the Middle East and related to re-settlement is a prime requirement which members of the United Nations have an obligation to consider. Canada is prepared to play its part in such an international effort.

The conclusion I draw is that the stakes are simply too great, the dangers too obvious for the international community and the Great Powers, in particular, to let matters drift. The incidence of violence in the world has already reached the limits of international tolerance. Those of us who do not bear the responsibilities of world power may urge those who do exercise this power to do so with restraint and with wisdom. In addition, I suggest, all nations have an obligation to act with restraint and in particular not to threaten or take actions which carry the danger of widening a local conflict and of spreading the flames of war. If peace is indivisible then the highest loyalty is that which we owe to the welfare and security of the people of the world as a whole, and to the obligations we have solemnly contracted under the United Nations Charter.