

Canada, it will be recognized, has played a role in the past in enabling the membership of this organization to be more universally representative. Our action then has made it possible to bring to the table many new countries whose representatives are participating in the discussion today. The representatives of those states are responsible statesmen in whose wisdom and sense of justice we must have confidence.

Without going further into the details of the Danish proposals, my Delegation agrees that they are wise in suggesting that the responsibility for considering steps suitable to influence the South African Government lies with the Security Council. While there is a need to modify the structure of the various United Nations Councils, the fact remains that the permanent members of the Security Council, because they have greater responsibility in many aspects of international affairs, are often able to exert decisive influence. Many states, notwithstanding their opposition to the policy of apartheid, do not believe that in the present situation the Security Council would be wise to impose sanctions under Article 41. Nevertheless, the Security Council is the body of the United Nations specifically empowered under Chapter VII of the Charter to decide upon action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace and acts of aggression. It also has a responsibility under Chapter VI for making recommendations in respect of situations the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. The division of responsibilities between the Council and the Assembly was carefully considered at San Francisco and the balance set forth in the Charter is the result of exhaustive negotiation. My Delegation believes that this balance is one which we should all seek to preserve in the interest of the organization and of peace itself.

Emphasis has also been given to the need for more study of alternative possibilities for the future in South Africa. One such alternative, which, in the view of my Delegation, it would be unwise to reject out of hand, is a solution in South Africa based in some measure on a federal approach. To succeed, the scheme would have to be divorced from the apartheid philosophy of white supremacy, which is rightly rejected by all other members of the United Nations. It would have to be in terms which do not offend human dignity and are equally acceptable to all segments of the population. It would also be necessary for the South African Government to consider an equitable division of the great natural resources of South Africa.

It could be that out of a serious re-examination of the pattern for the future there could emerge a strong and united Southern Africa which, by combining the abilities of four distinct races on the basis of equality and respect, could be accepted as a welcome and strong member of the African community of nations and could resume its place as a member in good standing of these United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, the views I have expressed are the result of the most searching review of all the conflicting considerations involved in this difficult problem. Last Friday Canada voted with the overwhelming majority on a resolution dealing with a specific aspect of the apartheid problem. We did not do so lightly, for a principle was at stake which could have incalculable consequences if applied to other states in which the concern of this organization about the domestic policies of one of its members was less clear and less justifiable. We were aware that other examples exist of similar shortcomings in the practices of other member states. We voted to join in the condemnation of South Africa because we wished to reaffirm our total opposition to a policy which is an affront to human dignity. In short, we concluded that this was a situation in which the conscience of mankind was so aroused that no other honourable course at this juncture was open to the 106 members who expressed their condemnation of this policy.