

West. Internationally, that same process is beginning to lead to an emphasis on the problems of economic development, and a need for aid not only through technical assistance and capital grants and loans, but through adjustment of the terms of trade.

These things, it seems to me, are not only inevitable but reasonable and desirable from the point of view of humanity as a whole. If pushed irresponsibly too far or too fast, by voting majorities which do not include the significant trading and donor nations, they might not be effective except in weakening or destroying the international framework. On the other hand, if the legitimate aspirations of the underdeveloped nations are ignored they could prove even more dangerous. I have seen no disposition among Canadians to regret the role which we played in 1955 in broadening the membership of the United Nations toward the goal of universality. The problems ahead of us, in this area, are admittedly difficult. They are also important. The problems of underdevelopment and population explosion would be with us whether or not the U.N. dealt with them. It seems to me good that the world organization should get its teeth into these tasks too.

Canada's main concern thus far, however, in the United Nations -- and we make no apology for this -- has been in the field of peacekeeping. Here too we have seen an opportunity to use situations of danger and international crisis, to get acceptance of creative responses for the development of institutions and habits which can prove useful in themselves things which should have been developed irrespective of the immediate dangers which alone made their establishment politically acceptable by the powers that be. Korea was one example. We played a minor part in that, but we did what we could to help, and welcomed American leadership in the action for collective security.