

Prime Minister, the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson, to the Canadian Society of New York on March 5, 1965. Mr. Pearson said, "Today we cannot afford any 'permissible' kinds of international violence. All must be outlawed. As I see it, the struggle in South East Asia today is basically an attempt to establish the principle that armed assistance from outside to 'Wars of Liberation' constitutes aggression and must be checked."

In the Canadian view these events illustrate the need to ensure that any declarations which may be adopted in the field of non-intervention will have the full weight of the world community behind them and are broad enough to embrace one of the most significant and dangerous types of intervention which has become a feature of present day international relations. I refer in particular to intervention which begins in a clandestine way and employs the techniques of subversion and terrorism. It seems to my Delegation that rules and principles about States' behaviour must be such as to involve the full commitment of the international community to them. The United Nations must ensure that any statement or declaration it adopts in this field carries with it the full commitment of States to respect and observe those principles as a basis for their relations with their neighbours and other States. For a resolution or a declaration of the General Assembly to have this effect it should receive the overwhelming support of the membership as a whole. Any resolution adopted by a substantially divided vote or which failed to carry such support would be much less effective in achieving this end.

In the accomplishment of this task the Canadian Delegation believes that greater attention must be paid to the drafting and achieving of a consensus. The Special Committee on Friendly Relations, which met last year in Mexico City, had undoubted success in achieving a consensus about the meaning of the principle of the sovereign equality of states and almost achieved a consensus on the principle concerning the non-use of force in international relations. The Special Committee proved to be an effective forum for exploring the differences among states in these fields and being able to bridge those differences so as to achieve general understanding about the meaning of key principles of international law. While the same degree of success did not result from the Committee's efforts to define and develop the principle of non-intervention, it is expected that the Special Committee will meet again in 1966 and will have as a part of its specific mandate the achievement of a consensus or statement of principles about the meaning and scope of the concept of non-intervention. It seems to the Canadian Delegation that if the various proposals now before this Committee are to