

It is discouraging to us that our efforts, like those of others, have not yielded the results intended. None the less, it continues to be the conviction of the Government of Canada that efforts to promote a peaceful settlement of this war should not, and must not, be abandoned, and, as I said a moment ago, I have carefully noted the statement made yesterday by Ambassador Goldberg and particularly the significant questions which he addressed to the Government in Hanoi. Against this background, it is all the more essential that channels for contacts between the two sides be developed and maintained to prepare the way for negotiations whenever they are possible. We also believe that such channels are important in circumstances where the risk of misunderstanding and miscalculation is ever present. In my Government's view, it is essential that the attention of the world community should not be diverted from the urgent necessity of a diplomatic solution. For these reasons, we believe that a continuing effort must be made through whatever openings may be available to us, individually or collectively, to explore any possible avenues that may lead to a reversal of the present course of events in Vietnam.

However, it is a fact that the capacity of this organization to play a useful role in the Vietnam conflict will be called into question as long as certain parties involved in that conflict are not members of this organization and are not bound by the terms of the Charter. I am not saying that, if they were members, the United Nations would be able to settle the conflict. I am saying that the organization would have a better chance of doing so if those parties were sitting here today. I know that there are fundamental obstacles -- great obstacles. Where two governments claim sovereign and, therefore, exclusive jurisdiction over the same people and territory and, more particularly, where each refuses any rights to the other, then we cannot oblige them to sit down together in these precincts. Nevertheless, I feel bound to say that there is a growing opinion in my country that, if this organization is to realize its potential capacities, all nations, and especially those which, like continental China, represent a significant portion of the world's population, must be represented here.

I noted what Mr. Goldberg had to say on this subject yesterday and I would like to think -- and I am expressing my personal view -- that he advanced the position of his country considerably in his statement of yesterday.

A solution to this problem of representation has eluded us for a long time; in spite of impelling reasons, I cannot say whether it will be possible for us to resolve this question within the next few weeks, or within the next few months. However, universality must remain our objective.

Peace keeping and, for that matter, all machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, is essentially responsive to specific situations. Men have long dreamed of a more positive concept, the development of a world-wide peace and security system in which individual nations would abandon possession of the means of waging war. This is all the more necessary in view of military developments over the past two decades, and especially the acquisition of devastating military nuclear power by a few countries.

So it is from the point of view that Canada has approached disarmament negotiations. We share, of course, the common objectives of an agreed system of general and complete disarmament which would give security to all nations and