

and smaller powers in the world could generally subscribe. For the United Nations has almost certainly enhanced the opportunities of this group of powers to bring their views and their influence to bear on important international issues.

But the face of the United Nations is changing. In saying this, I do not have in mind so much the very substantial increase in the membership of the United Nations, which has expanded from 51 founding members to 114 today. What I do have in mind is that the problems and preoccupations of this new membership are different from those of the founding members. And, if the United Nations is to attract the full commitment of the new nations, I suspect that we shall have to arrive at a new balance in our conception of what the United Nations is and what it should be doing.

Among the founding members there has been a tendency to look upon the United Nations as primarily an instrument of security and stability in the world. Now I am not saying that security and stability are not of direct interest and concern to the new nations. But they are not the only attributes of world order which are of concern to them. We must remember that these new nations have emerged into a world which they do not regard as being fully responsive to their aspirations. On the contrary, they regard it as a world in which social injustice and economic inequity are far more prevalent than they should be. They are looking for change -- peaceful change if possible, but change nevertheless. And they look upon the United Nations as the rightful instrument of change.

In a recent article, Mr. Adlai Stevenson put this argument as cogently as I think it can be put:

"The world has known periods of relative peace and order before. Always the order was assured by a system designed to preserve the status quo. And this is precisely why the system of order broke down -- because the status quo is indefensible in the long run. What the world needs is a dynamic system or order -- a system capable of bringing about not just a precarious halt to hostilities but a curative resolution of the roots of hostility. This is to say that a dynamic system of order must be one which helps parties to a dispute to break out of rigid stalemates, to adapt to new times, to manage and absorb needed change."

This, in essence, is what the new nations are asking for. They argue that peace and prosperity are two sides of the same coin -- that we cannot reasonably expect to achieve real peace or real security in a world in which two-thirds of the human race are living at the margins of mere subsistence. I suggest to you that this is an argument which we cannot afford to leave out of account. It is an argument that must find full reflection in our policies as regards the United Nations if we want those policies to be relevant to the realities of the world around us.

For my part, I am convinced that the problems of peace and prosperity must be tackled as part of the same problem. I made this the keynote of my address to the General Assembly last December. Since then, we have been looking closely at the part Canada should be playing in the United Nations in the face of the shifting priorities and preoccupations of an overwhelming majority of its member states.