for our membership in the United Nations, would not have entered into the ambit of our preoccupations. It has become for a vast majority of its members the repository and custodian of their aspirations for a peaceful and prosperous world.

The world has never been static. As the philosopher Heraclitus put it, "you cannot step into the same river twice". And our world today is perhaps less static than it has ever been before. If the United Nations is to continue to reflect the needs and aspirations of all its members, it too cannot afford to remain static. Those of us who have a stake in the continuing viability of the United Nations have a twofold responsibility towards the organization. First, we must endow it with the capacity of serving as an instrument of peaceful change. Second, we will need increasingly to learn to identify our national interests with those of the world community at large, of which the United Nations is and remains the most important institutional symbol.

I should like now to say something about two issues on which there can surely be no conflict of interest in our day: the enlargement of world peace and security, and the creation of tolerable conditions of life for those three-quarters of mankind who do not at present have such conditions within their grasp.

Problem of Peace and Security

If we speak of peace and security, we can look at the problem in two dimensions. First, we are bound to think of the accumulation of destructive weapons which has taken place on both sides and which has led to what is sometimes described as a balance of terror. For the first time in our history, we have achieved something close to absolute military power. It may be -- and I put it no higher than that -- that the consciousness of the destructive power we wield will deter us from ever using it. That, at least, is the philosophy that lies at the root of the term "nuclear deterrent". But there are two reasons at least why we cannot be satisfied with the present state of things. First, the possession of the "nuclear deterrent" is no longer confined to three or four countries. The recent explosion of a nuclear device by Communist China is indicative of a trend that is likely to continue -- if only as a matter of chain reaction -- unless it is halted by positive action. Second, it is surely ludicrous that, in a century which has seen man achieve greater control over his environment than in any preceding century, we should not be able to build a better, more secure and more peaceful world order except under the compulsion of the law of fear. These considerations underline the need for meaningful progress in the field of disarmament. The agreement last year to ban all nuclear tests except those conducted underground was an important first step in that direction. We are entitled to hope that further progress can be made towards a balanced reduction of arms under proper international inspection.

I have spoken of disarmament as one of the dimensions of the problem of peace and security. The peace-keeping operations conducted under the aegis of the United Nations are another. These operations have had as their purpose to prevent fighting from breaking out or to put an end to such fighting where it has already broken out and to restore conditions that will allow a political settlement to be achieved. Canada has participated in all these peace-keeping