

continue to show our independence, and our position would be strengthened if we could be somewhat more courageous somewhat more often.

Although we shall possibly have to accept the fact that until the United States and the Soviet Union have worked out some new bilateral understandings, agreement cannot be reached in the United Nations on the composition of effective bodies to deal with disarmament and other important issues or to enable the Security Council to deal effectively with all items on its agenda, nevertheless, we should not give up trying. We should continue our strong opposition to the Soviet proposals for "parity" on the grounds that a scheme of this kind is noxious in principle and would tend to harden the United Nations into a series of rigid blocs. Nevertheless, we should try to persuade the Americans and the Europeans that the previous pattern of composition is unfair, that our intransigence on the subject matches the intransigence of the other side and that we would at least look better in the eyes of the uncommitted if we proposed a composition which seemed to them equitable. We might try to persuade them, and ourselves as well, that life is possible without a guaranteed majority in the United Nations. We have to take our chance on winning majority support in the same way that the Communist countries or the Asian countries have to take their chances and the consequences of losing out a few times in the voting are not as disastrous as they may seem because the United Nations has the power only to recommend and not to legislate. It may be, furthermore, that the knowledge on the part of the Asians and Africans that it is within their power from time to time to win a vote in the Assembly will increase their sense of responsibility because they will realize more clearly the uselessness of passing resolutions which have no chance of being obeyed or carried out.

One practice which we might try to persuade our major friends to abandon, except in cases of dire emergency, is the practice of using our automatic majority for procedural purposes. Although it has become a routine practice for the Americans to use their majority in order to secure priority for their resolutions, it is a practice which causes much ill-will among not only the Communist but also the Asian and African countries. It is also sharp practice not consistent with the spirit of the Charter even though it may be in accordance with the letter of the Rules of Procedure. We should recognize also that we are storing up trouble for ourselves when an increasing number of Asian and African members will be able to turn these same procedures ruthlessly against us.

In our discussion of the issues in the Assembly, we might consider renouncing our policy of seeking soft-soap resolutions on such issues as Cyprus, Algeria and West Irian. These efforts have in some cases done some good in creating a better spirit for change or for negotiation or in putting the right amount of pressure on one or other party to the dispute. Nevertheless, there may be virtue in not concealing differences which exist. It may be, also, that with the passing of time the Assembly has grown tired of this kind of activity and that to continue it longer would serve only to bring the Assembly into disrepute. Too long association of our own Delegation with this kind of activity can also affect our reputation for integrity and intelligence. This is not to say, however, that the role of Canada as a mediator and a seeker-out of compromises in association with the Scandinavians and other friends has lapsed. There is a difference to be recognized between palliative resolutions on political issues which cannot be solved in the United Nations and genuine compromise proposals which achieve a reasonably satisfactory basis of cooperation. Examples of the latter are more likely to be found in practical fields such as the creation of the Special Fund or the establishment of UNEF or UNWRA. There are times also when a resolution, the text of which is pretty meaningless, is of value simply because it represents the association of sponsors of the countries whom we are trying to reconcile. The Middle Eastern resolution in the Special Assembly last year is a good example of this. Action by the Canadian Dele-