

but rather in the form of a suggestion put forward for consideration and discussion. In this form it goes somewhat further than the Italian resolution, because it lays down certain guide-lines — if I may use that word — which would influence the examination which is about to be made. It suggested that that examination should not be carried on by a committee of the Assembly, because it would be difficult indeed to get a satisfactory committee. The suggestion was that this be carried out by the President of the Assembly himself, with all the help he can get from the many sources available to him, and particularly from the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

This proposal, which was put forward yesterday, embodied a policy which goes a long way back before this session of the General Assembly. I believe it will continue after this Assembly rises. It is not embodied in a resolution. Had we made this suggestion in the form of a resolution (and we had been considering that right up until the last few days) it might have been, and indeed I think it would have been, defeated by a large majority as going too far for some and not far enough for others. With the Italian resolution which is on the order paper providing for an examination, such a proposal by Canada might have received an inadequate number of votes and, that particular kind of a proposal having been defeated in the form of a resolution, it might have been more difficult to resurrect later. However, in the form of the proposal as made in a statement by the Canadian Delegation, it is now open for discussion and consideration.

More than one speaker this afternoon has asked how the Government of Peking and its policies have changed so as to warrant the Canadian Delegation putting forward a proposal of this kind at this time. There is no one who can be optimistic, in the light of events, that it would be possible to find any resolution which would be acceptable to the Peking Government, except one in the terms of the Albanian resolution, which we could not support because of its expulsion clause. We have no illusions about that and we have no illusions that Peking's policy has suddenly changed or that the Government of Peking by any change would suddenly become eligible for participation in the United Nations as a peace-loving nation within the terms of its Charter. If one applied that standard literally to all the members of the United Nations today, or to the nations who may apply in future, I do not know how many members of the United Nations would be able to subscribe to such terms without some qualification.

The question is not whether the policies of the Government of Peking have suddenly changed in a way that makes it an acceptable representative at the United Nations which has no revolutionary or aggressive instincts, or that it has suddenly abandoned certain policies which could hardly be called peace-loving. That is not the question which faces the United Nations at this time. The question is whether or not the United Nations is going to take its responsibility in doing its best to see that a suitable basis can be found in that world