

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 65/24

CANADA AND WORLD PROBLEMS

Text of a speech by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the Twentieth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on September 24, 1965.

Mr. President, I should like first of all to congratulate you on your election to the presidency of the Assembly. The overwhelming support which you have received testifies to the high esteem in which you are held. The Assembly is fortunate in having as its presiding officer a statesman of world stature and a political philosopher of international renown. As a member of the Government of Canada, which has many close and friendly links with Italy, it gives me great pleasure to greet her distinguished representative at this time.

I wish also to welcome to our company the delegations of the Gambia, the Maldives Islands and Singapore. It is essential to the welfare and future of this organization that it should represent the peoples of the world wherever they have attained sovereign independence. The addition of these three new members marked a further step in the achievement of its goal.

I listened with great interest to the address of Mr. Gromyko, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. Mr. Gromyko is one of a very limited number -- and I happen to be among them -- who attended the first meeting of the United Nations in Church House in London in 1946. Indeed, Mr. Gromyko was one of those who likewise participated in the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations in London in 1945, and he has been a persistent attendee at our deliberations since that time.

I noted with great satisfaction that, as the spokesman for his country, he said that the Soviet Union will do all within its power to bring about a fruitful solution of the questions facing the United Nations at this time. It is the judgement of my country and my Government that this Assembly is one of greatest importance not only for the peace of the world, but for the continued successful operation of the United Nations, and certainly at this time, in this century. We in this room today represent governments pledged to the principles of the Charter, governments capable of decisions and actions which could change the course of human history. It is with a sense of both our opportunity and the dangers that will flow from failures to take advantage of this opportunity that I would like to discuss, at this start of the twentieth session of the General Assembly, some of the problems which I regard and my Government regards as being of uppermost consideration at the moment. So I

propose to direct my attention to five of the major problems facing the world at the present time -- the dispute over Kashmir, the war in Vietnam, the maintenance and strengthening of the peace-keeping and peace-building capacity of the United Nations, disarmament and the containment of the nuclear threat and, finally, means of maintaining the momentum of the international assault on poverty, ignorance and disease.

I would begin by saying that, in my Government's view, the primary concern of the General Assembly must be with the disputes which at this moment are disturbing international relations with incalculable consequences for world peace. It is a sobering reflection that 20 years after the foundation of an organization intended to establish and maintain peace and security, we should have been confronted with wars tragic in their reality and alarming in their implications.

How can we devote the attention which we all want to apply to economic and social developments and to the promotion of fruitful international co-operation when before us is the appalling spectacle of death and waste in war? Our spectrum of anxiety is world wide, for war in any region of the world is an affront to our insistence on peace and a challenge to our crusade for collective security and human betterment.

Are we in danger, I ask, of forgetting the harsh lessons of the past? How many times have we heard it proclaimed, here and elsewhere, that war must no longer be an instrument of national policy? Pressures and temptations exist to breach this high principle: temptations to extend an area of influence or to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations, even to seek to obtain an objective by use of force.

The conflicts with which we are faced in Asia at this moment differ in important and obvious respects. Their most significant common characteristic is that either situation could widen the area of conflict and create danger of spreading war in Asia and beyond. The elimination of that risk is the supreme task of the international community, the supreme opportunity that lies before this body now; and that is the view not only of my Government but of the vast majority of the people of my country.

I turn now to the events which have gripped the world's attention in recent weeks: the conflict between two close friends of Canada -- India and Pakistan.

The news that the cease-fire between India and Pakistan has come into effect has been received with profound relief throughout the world, and nowhere more so than in my own country. During the previous seven weeks the Canadian Government and the Canadian people had been saddened and dismayed by the rapid intensification of this tragic conflict between two countries, partners in the Commonwealth, with which we have formed increasingly close bonds since they attained their independence. The Secretary-General, who in this matter has again served this organization with energy, imagination and wisdom, received widespread support for his first appeal for a cease-fire. The support that his appeal commanded was demonstrated by the readiness with which a number of world leaders offered their services to assist in bringing about a cease-fire. The Prime Minister of Canada -- a well-known figure in

this Assembly, a former President of this organization -- was among those offered his assistance, and I have his authority to say now that, should that assistance be desired by the parties in the search for a negotiated settlement, it will be forthcoming.

The unanimity with which the Security Council adopted its resolutions of September 4 and September 6 reflected the determination of all members of the organization that fighting be stopped. The broad endorsement for these resolutions and the firm support extended to the Secretary-General as he carried out the mandate entrusted to him by the Council gave further evidence of the fervent wish that bloodshed cease.

The cease-fire which has been achieved is, of course, the first and paramount necessity. The world can now breathe more easily, but the cease-fire, as we have been told by others at this podium, is not enough. The United Nations and the Indian and Pakistani Governments now have a new opportunity, which they must not fail to grasp, to search for and achieve an honourable and equitable and lasting settlement.

The consequences of failure to find a lasting settlement have never been more clearly evident than during the past few weeks. The Secretary-General stated the dangers starkly when he said:

"Inherent in this situation are all of the phenomena -- the aroused emotions, misunderstandings, long pent-up resentments, suspicions, fears, frustrated aspirations and heightened national feelings -- which throughout history have led to needless and futile wars."

In its resolution of September 20 the Security Council reaffirmed its responsibility to bring about a settlement of the political problem underlying the dispute. The Council has, of course, made attempts before. Indeed, 16 years ago, the Canadian representative, General MacNaughton, on the Security Council, in his capacity as President of that organ, played a special role in the search for a solution to the Kashmir problem, which was then two years old. The imperatives of the situation demand new efforts which should be pursued not only by the Security Council but also by every member state in a position to make a contribution to a solution.

The settlement, if it is to be durable, must carry the assent and the acceptance, difficult though they may be to achieve, of both Pakistan and India. An arrangement which meets the aspirations of one side only will never provide a stable solution. Perhaps -- and I say perhaps -- and in an explanatory way, a most promising course might be for the United Nations to assist the two governments to return to negotiation at the point where they last had agreement, picking up from there the difficult task of bringing an end to this grave dispute.

So far as Canada is concerned, we have, since the establishment of the Observer Group in 1949, provided military officers to serve along the cease-fire line in Kashmir. During the past 48 hours since the cease-fire was agreed on in the Security Council, the Canadian Government has been considering certain additional requests which have been addressed to us by the Secretariat. I have already announced the dispatch of 10 additional Canadian observers to the

United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan itself. We shall also provide 12 observers for service with the new Observer Group, and in addition, a number of aircraft, a senior staff officer, and air crew for service with both observer groups in the region. In undertaking to meet these requests, the Government of Canada expects that the new Observer Group will, of course, be withdrawn as soon as changing circumstances in the area make this possible.

Furthermore, as I have already indicated, if there are any ways in which Canada can assist in facilitating the initiation, continuation and, as we devoutly hope, completion of negotiations, we stand ready to do whatever we can.

I come now to the situation in Vietnam. This situation has not arisen from any lack of clear international directives for achieving stability. If the cease-fire provisions agreed to in 1954 had been fully observed, the tragedy and danger we now face in that part of the world would not have occurred. But they were not observed.

One of the two basic provisions of the Agreement was non-interference between the two zones, and it has been progressively disregarded. The ensuing instability, and the measures introduced to correct it, have not resulted in any new and more satisfactory balance. Instead, as we all know, the situation has spiralled upwards, imposing untold suffering on the Vietnamese people and creating an increasing threat to the peace of the region and of the world.

There are obvious reasons why up to now the Security Council has been able to act over Kashmir but has been powerless to intervene usefully in Vietnam. Speaking for Canadians, I can say that it is a matter of deep concern that the United Nations has been prevented from effective action in the crisis in Vietnam. This is a test for the General Assembly of the United Nations. We cannot abdicate this responsibility in this grave situation. It is the duty of this Assembly, in our judgement, to express clearly and forcefully the collective conviction of the United Nations that the war in Vietnam must be brought to a negotiated settlement.

There can be no doubt of the right of the people concerned to settle their destiny free of intimidation, subversion and military pressure, called liberation. Surely this is a cardinal principle of any settlement.

I can only trust that as the real issues in the Vietnam war become clearer to everyone, and as the realization of the common interest in ending the war grows, there will emerge a desire for compromise and negotiation. The United States response to the appeal of the unaligned nations last April established, in the view of my Government, the willingness of the United States to negotiate without preconditions for a settlement.

This Assembly of the United Nations must use whatever influence it has to help to bring about a negotiated settlement. Intransigence must yield to the appeals of justice and humanity. A military solution alone is neither practicable nor desirable. Once that is recognized, we can seek a mutual accommodation of interests and objectives and, above all, a guarantee that the people concerned will be able to proceed with the support and encouragement of the international community to choose for themselves the path they wish to follow.

The third point I wish to discuss is that of peace keeping. We are all aware that, because of disagreement among members of the Assembly over the financing of certain peace-keeping operations, the General Assembly has passed through a painful period of frustration. I will not recall the circumstances or attempt to ascribe now the responsibility. What is important is that the General Assembly is functioning normally again. A new period of creative action lies before us. This prospect is a matter of satisfaction to my Government. For, notwithstanding the acknowledged importance of the Article 19 issue, we have to consider that the vital need for the United Nations and for this Assembly is to come to grips with compelling world problems. We must not permit this Assembly to be paralysed in the light of these contemporary issues.

Let me give you my Government's view on the future of peace keeping, and I think we have a right to give some advice on this matter because we have participated in every one of the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations. First, we cannot accept the proposition that the Charter reserves the preservation of peace and security exclusively to the permanent members of the Security Council, although we do not for one moment question that co-operation among the great powers is fundamental to the full implementation of the Charter. But in the absence of such co-operation, the membership as a whole must, in our view, have the opportunity to recommend what is to be done when no other course is open.

The Charter explicitly provides that the maintenance of international peace and security is a collective responsibility. This means that when the United Nations acts to keep the peace, a general responsibility rests upon the membership to support that action. We have always believed that the logical consequence of this is an equitable system of sharing the financial burden. If it is right and proper for the Security Council to have the primary responsibility for decisions to establish peace-keeping operations, it is equally to be expected that the members of the Council, and particularly the permanent members, should pay their rightful share of the cost, preferably on the basis of collective assessment. But if this is not possible, then contributions must be forthcoming voluntarily from each member to the best of its ability in common acknowledgement of the obligation we all share to help keep the peace. The alternative is that the burden of peace keeping will fall upon a few member states. I have no doubt that this alternative will be categorically rejected by most countries and that the United Nations peace-keeping operations will not falter through lack of the necessary resources. But I would remind the Assembly that it nearly did falter when the Security Council, by its unique arrangement, provided an opportunity for the establishment of the force in Cyprus.

Our first and most immediate challenge is to restore the organization to solvency. A number of countries, including my own, have already demonstrated their faith that the membership as a whole will respond to this need, and contributions approaching \$20 million have been forthcoming. I am sure that, in the course of the next few weeks, the balance of the membership will respond in full measure to the appeal of the Secretary-General.

What further practical steps can be taken by this body and by its individual members to reinforce the capacity of the organization to keep the peace? Last year the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report proposed a study of advanced planning of peace-keeping operations. No action has been possible on this proposal, but I would hope that the organization will be able to come to grips with this problem in the months ahead.

As we all know, a small number of countries have earmarked military units for United Nations service, but without central planning and without additional offers, the effectiveness of such measures is necessarily limited. Canada continues to believe that the earmarking of units with appropriate central co-ordination is a technique of value to our organization in its task of keeping the peace.

But peace keeping by itself is not enough. Peace building is even more important. The Charter outlines a whole range of procedures for use in achieving the pacific settlement of disputes. The British Government has inscribed an item on this subject and I wish to record the readiness of my Government to collaborate in studies to develop this important aspect of the activities of this organization.

But machinery for peaceful settlement will be of no avail unless governments are determined to make use of it when disputes arise. The time has come to ensure that peace keeping is intimately linked with peaceful settlement. The former, essential as it is, should not be permitted to obscure or divert the purposes of the latter. The precedent of providing for mediation at the same time as for the dispatch of a force, on the model of the first Security Council resolution on Cyprus, is a good one. But it is important that the related measures aimed at achieving a political settlement be vigorously pursued. The parties to a dispute should not expect to enjoy the benefits of United Nations intervention without accepting responsibility to settle their differences and thus facilitate the earliest possible termination of peace-keeping measures.

Mr. Gromyko spoke of disarmament. I should like to say something about this matter likewise. Turning from peace keeping, I think it is to be recognized that this is another field of the greatest importance. We are all agreed in this room that general and complete disarmament is the goal we must reach in order to have a secure and peaceful world. This goal was spelled out in a resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1959. It remains our goal, notwithstanding the measure of the limited achievements of our discussion. We have tried over the years to make progress. When agreement on general disarmament eluded us, we turned our attention to collateral measures. We have come to recognize that, while we have been exploring this path, the underlying peril has been growing. Nuclear weapons are now in the possession not of one power or two, but five, and many other governments are acknowledged to have the capacity to make them.

The Secretary-General, in his report of September 20, has described the spread of nuclear weapons as the most urgent question of the present time. He has urged that it should remain at the very top of the disarmament agenda. My Government fully supports this judgement. Although it has the capacity, it has not engaged in the building of nuclear weapons.

Last August, the United States presented to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee a draft treaty designed to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Canada had a share in the preparation of this document. We hope that the submission of this treaty, which had been called for by many non-aligned nations, would open the way to progress, but we were disappointed. I listened with great care a few moments ago to what the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union had to say on this point. I should point out that the Soviet Union refused to discuss the draft treaty and has sought to place the onus for its refusal on members of the North Atlantic Alliance. This position of the Soviet Union does not seem to me to be a reasonable one. While the European members of the North Atlantic Alliance are under threat of potential nuclear attack themselves, it cannot be argued that they should have no right to participate in decisions on how such an attack is to be deterred.

It has been made clear by the representatives of non-aligned nations in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee that the world cannot be permanently divided into nuclear and non-nuclear states. Why, it is asked, should states which do not now have nuclear weapons give up in perpetuity their sovereign right to take such action as may be necessary in order to preserve their national security, if the nuclear powers do not begin to exercise restraint in the manufacture of nuclear weapons and their vehicles, to reduce their stockpiles and thus embark on a course leading to general disarmament? I think that the proposal made yesterday by Mr. Goldberg, the representative of the United States in the United Nations, is one that will be carefully studied and I hope that it will produce a corresponding agreement. While agreement on non-dissemination should not wait on such action by the nuclear powers, it cannot long be maintained unless the great powers begin to reduce their nuclear armaments.

It is of cardinal importance to press vigorously for the extension of the partial nuclear test-ban treaty to cover nuclear tests underground. From the outset Canada has consistently supported moves to ban the testing of all nuclear weapons, subject to arrangements for effective verification. We shall continue to support sensible proposals leading to the attainment of this important policy objective. Important advances have been made in recent years in the detection of underground events by seismic methods. Some progress has also been made in distinguishing between the seismic waves caused by earthquakes and other events and those caused by nuclear explosions underground. This field -- the detection and identification of seismic waves transmitted through the earth's crust -- is one in which Canada has a special interest. Because of our geographical position, favourable rock formations and seismic detection facilities, Canadian scientists are in a position to make a positive contribution to experimental work which, after further investigation and study, may create the conditions for progress towards a treaty which would prohibit nuclear tests underground.

At the recent session of the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee, Sweden and other countries made important suggestions for international co-operation looking to further progress in the field of verification. In Canada's view these proposals deserve serious consideration and study. The Canadian Government is willing to join with other nations in international efforts linked in an appropriate way with the United Nations to help to achieve a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

On June 15 of this year the United Nations Disarmament Commission adopted a resolution requesting this Assembly to give urgent consideration to the holding of a world disarmament conference. My Government accepts in principle the idea of a world disarmament conference. We believe that such a conference will require careful and thorough preparation. Over the years certain principles have been accepted for the conduct of disarmament negotiations. It is the view of Canada that the agreed principles adopted by the Assembly in 1962 should continue to govern discussions at the world disarmament conference.

The Secretary-General has suggested in a recent speech that progress on disarmament, whether general or nuclear, would hardly be possible so long as one of the major military powers, which has recently developed some military nuclear capacity in its own right, did not participate. He went on to indicate that when the world disarmament conference is held it should take place under conditions which would make it possible for all countries, if they so wished, to participate in its deliberations. This is the view also of my Government. If a world disarmament conference takes place, Canada hopes that the People's Republic of China will be invited to take part in the discussions.

I would like to come to some aspects of economic and social development. For, in our anxiety over the great questions of war and peace, we must not overlook the connection between those matters and the economic and social circumstances which are the pre-conditions of order and stability. The past 20 years have witnessed the awakening of man's social conscience and the start of an unprecedented assault on poverty, disease and ignorance.

But that is not enough. The gap between the per capita incomes of the developing and developed countries has been widening; the population explosion demands a rapid increase in the momentum of economic development; and debt repayment problems are threatening programmes already launched. The fact is that the flow of development assistance has been levelling off at the very time when the need for it is quickening. This requires resolute action by all of us, collectively and individually.

Speaking for my country, I can say that our recognition of this need is indicated by our response. Last year we more than doubled our bilateral aid programme. This year we are increasing it again. I can state today that, provided a satisfactory charter can be worked out and subject to parliamentary approval, we will join the Asian Development Bank and make a contribution of up to \$25 million to its subscription capital. Elsewhere, we are prepared to embark on the second stage of our special arrangements with the Inter-American Development Bank whereby earlier this year we made available for lending in Latin America the sum of \$25 million; I am now glad to announce that an additional \$10 million will be put at the disposal of the Bank for lending at terms which may extend up to 50 years at no interest charge.

In addition to official governmental contributions, it is significant to note that the people of Canada are becoming increasingly involved, in a more personal way, in helping the developing countries. With government support, more and more funds are being mobilized, and a growing number of trained and talented young Canadians is working in a variety of ways in overseas countries where help is needed.

I want to affirm our strong support for the amalgamation of the Special Fund and Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance on satisfactory terms in a co-ordinated United Nations Development Programme, and for the continuance of the World Food Programme. Canada wants to see the projected new targets for these programmes adopted. I should expect that our own contribution will be in keeping with these United Nations objectives.

Aid alone, however, cannot suffice to meet the growing needs of the developing countries. All countries -- developed and developing alike -- must redouble their efforts to find ways and means of expanding trade and foreign exchange earnings to support essential development programmes. This is why Canada has strongly supported the establishment of the permanent new machinery of UNCTAD, which is starting on its tasks with vigour, imagination and patience, and under able and imaginative direction.

There are no easy or simple answers to the trade problems of the developing countries. One thing, however, is clear. Collective and co-operative answers are better than solutions sought in isolation. This is not a matter of idealism but of practical realism. Things which it would be difficult or impossible for countries to do individually can often be done more satisfactorily if many states take concerted action and share the necessary adjustments. This is true, whether one is talking of tariff reductions or of improved access to markets or commodity arrangements, or the many other important and complex subjects being discussed in the Trade and Development Board.

A modest but promising start has been made. The task calls for the best efforts of both developed and developing countries, and it is one which we must pursue relentlessly.

I cannot leave this podium without referring briefly to the question of human rights, which is of the greatest interest to my fellow countrymen. We cannot concentrate only on material progress, as if this were the only key to human welfare. The dignity and unique value of the human spirit are even more fundamental and can flourish only under conditions of equality and freedom.

The determination we therefore express in the Charter "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights" is a vital part of the total crusade in which we are engaged. Canadians attach particular importance to the maintenance and extension of individual rights, to the protection of the institutions of family and faith, and to the removal of all forms of discrimination based on race, colour, sex or religion.

Our concern for human rights arises also from our diverse national origins. Many Canadians still retain a profound interest in the lives of their kinsmen in other lands. Where respect for human rights and freedom and self-determination is not fully assured, or where it is deliberately denied, Canadians deplore these conditions -- believing as we do that those rights and freedoms must be of universal application.

Because of these convictions, we are particularly concerned that the role of the United Nations in the human rights field should be enhanced, and that recent proposals to this effect should be pursued. We support the appointment of a High Commissioner for Human Rights, as proposed by Costa Rica, and will join in co-sponsoring any resolution to this effect. Human rights are of universal significance; their violation must be of universal concern.

In speaking of human rights and freedoms and the general interest in peace and welfare, I am particularly aware of the parallel interests of the United Nations and of churches and other organizations. The institutions in which the religious and philosophical beliefs of mankind are embodied have much to contribute on the many issues we are debating.

Canada notes with the greatest satisfaction, therefore, the intention of His Holiness Pope Paul VI to visit the United Nations and to address the Assembly. He will be welcomed not only as the leader of his own church but as a man whose breadth of sympathy for those of other religious persuasions has been welcomed and reciprocated.

His decision to come can be understood in the context of the developments initiated by his illustrious predecessor, John XXIII, who, in his Encyclical "Pacem in Terris", expressed with perception and prophetic vision the inherent rights of man in his relations with human society and his longing for peace. His visit bears witness to his confidence in and support for the vital role which the United Nations is called upon to play in world affairs.

I have reviewed some of the major international issues with which, in our opinion, this Assembly must now concern itself -- and I do so, jubilant at the thought that procedural controversy does not stand in the way of our getting down to business. What we do about these issues, and how effectively we respond to the responsibilities and opportunities confronting us, depends on our ability and willingness to reach a consensus on policies and actions.

How do we bring this about? What is the most promising approach to decision-making in the General Assembly of the United Nations of 1965? There seem to be two possible answers to this question. One is for the members to think in terms of debating points, votes, and victories for the record. That path, in our opinion, leads to cynicism and sure frustration.

The other approach is for the United Nations to think in terms of undertakings and shared responsibilities -- to strive, in other words, to realize in their collective deliberations that same sense of achievement and responsibility which governments demonstrate in the conduct of their own domestic affairs. That way, in our opinion, lies promise and progress.

A key element in the search for effective consensus is the relationship between the great powers and the balance of the membership. It is a fact, of course, that the special status of the great powers is generally acknowledged. The Charter makes provision for this. But this recognition is accorded with the expectation that those who enjoy the capacity for effective action will accept its accompanying responsibilities; that they will persist in their continuing search for reasonable accommodations; and that the great powers will in turn

recognize that the remaining members each have a role to play which, although differing in degree and sometimes in character, is of great importance. The caste system which characterized the world community of the nineteenth century is vanishing. In its place we are creating a new collaboration among the nations of the world. And I hope that, as events in Asia unfold, it may prove possible, in the interests of this organization and of mankind, to make progress towards what the Secretary-General, in his annual report, has described as "the imperative need for the United Nations to achieve universality of membership as soon as possible".

Finally, we have arrived at a crossroads in the history of mankind's efforts, through the League of Nations and the United Nations, to develop international institutions capable of providing peace. We have come a long way since those unhappy days earlier in the century when faith in collective security appeared to have collapsed with the outbreak of a Second World War. We have been impeded, however, by major clashes of national interest, by the competition of political systems and by our own failures to realize how much had to be done.

We have abandoned, seemingly, the disposition to vituperative debate for more objective discussion. There is no doubt that we have made progress both in our manner and in our posture.

Now we have the opportunity to resume our advance towards the goals set forth in the Charter of the United Nations by a resolute attack upon the chief problems before us. We have it in our power, in this Assembly, to arrest the dangerous course of events and to move on to that peace to which our generation solemnly committed itself after the bitterest episode in human history.

s/c