

CANADIAN MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS

CAUTION: ADVANCE TEXT

PRESS RELEASE No. 33

September 27, 1967

FOR RELEASE ONLY ON DELIVERY

Press Office 866 United Nations Plaza Suite 250 New York, N. Y. 10017

PLaza 1-5600

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

Text of Statement to be made in the General Debate of the 22nd Session of the General Assembly by the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs and Chairman of the Canadian Delegation, the Honourable Paul Martin, P.C., Q.C., M.P., on Wednesday, September 27th, 1967.

Mr. President, I wish to congratulate you most warmly on your election to the Presidency of this body. My Government regards your election both as a tribute to your own person and to the distinctive contribution which Romania is making to world affairs. I look forward to close cooperation with you over the coming weeks. May I also take this opportunity to acknowledge the service rendered by your predecessor, Ambassador Pazhwak of Afghanistan.

Introduction

If we are to judge by the pace of our activities since the conclusion of the 21st session, the United Nations is a vigorous and healthy institution. Two special sessions of the Assembly, an intensive series of meetings of the Security Council, not to mention the normal activities of other United Nations bodies, testify to the continuing vitality of this organization.

While this record of activity is enœuraging, some will no doubt say that the results at which we have arrived are disappointing and that the United Nations has only confirmed its reputation as a forum for debate rather than an instrument for action. What have been called the "interlocking stalemates" on our agenda remain much as they were before. And yet, if talk is cheap it is certainly better than resort to the use of force. It should be of some encouragement to us that our agenda is crowded and that the world so often turns to this organization with its troubles. As far as Canada is concerned the future of the United Nations is linked to its capacity to become a universal forum in which all the conflicting interests, ideologies, and points of view of mankind can be brought together. Without contact

there can be no co-operation. Without debate there can be no reconciliation. Moreover, the United Nations was able to bring about a ceasefire in the Middle East and the United Nations did assume responsibility for South West Africa. The fact that we proceed slowly and that frequent stops have to be made on the way should not be blamed on the vehicle, but on the road we have to travel.

All of us subscribe to the high ideals of the Charter by the very fact of our membership. Where we go wrong and where we are apt to be disappointed is in putting these ideals into practice. Clearly, there must be a willingness to negotiate compromises. I am encouraged by the fact that at the two Special Sessions of the Assembly this year there were genuine and persistent efforts on all sides to negotiate. Failure to reach agreement was perhaps understandable in the circumstances. What we must ensure is that we do not accept frustration; on the contrary we must make frustration a spur to further efforts in the continuing search for agreement on outstanding issues.

This morning I shall review the main areas of concern to the United Nations at the present time, to point out where we have made progress in other areas and to suggest ways in which we can develop our common interest in realizing the principles and purposes of the Charter.

Middle East

The Middle East is of major concern to the United Nations at this time. My country has followed developments there with anxiety for the future of this historic area of the world and with sympathy for the thousands of innocent people who are, as always, the first victims of war. Canada has been directly involved in the affairs of the Middle East through our membership on the Security Council and our participation in the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. We are a major contributor to the programme of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency. Nothing illustrates better the vital contribution the United Nations has made to the area than the fact that two of these organizations continue to have an indispensable function to perform in relieving suffering and helping to maintain a relative tranquility.

It is clear, nevertheless, that we have failed to establish the foundations for a lasting peace. The securing of such a settlement has been Canada's abiding concern ever since 1947. We witnessed the opportunity slip away in 1949.

The state of the s

In the early months of 1957 we emphasized again and again in this Assembly the vital importance of action to remove the causes of war. When tensions were mounting once more in the Middle East last spring we sought, together with others, to have the Security Council urge restraint on all the parties involved. Now again it is incumbent upon all of us, and particularly the Permanent Members of the Security Council, to make every effort to lay the basis for a long-term settlement.

Speaking at the Fifth Emergency Special Session on June 23 last, I said that in Canada's view "the withdrawal of Israeli forces, vital as it is, must be related to the other basic issues involved." This remains our view. These other issues include: respect for the territorial integrity of all the nations of the area and the ending of claims to belligerency; respect for the rights of all nations to innocent passage through international waterways; justice for the refugees; and arrangements for the preservation of the special spiritual and religious interests in Jerusalem involving, I would hope, some form of international supervision by the United Nations.

The first priority must be to see whether the efforts which were made at the Special Emergency Session in July to work out a resolution combining some or all of these principles can be resumed and carried to a successful conclusion. If an agreement on principles could be reached we should also take the advice of the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report and give him an appropriate authorization for the designation of a Special Representative to act as a much-needed channel of communication between the parties and as a reporter and interpreter of the events there for this Organization. Even if it should prove impossible to reach agreement on a statement of principles I believe that the United Nations should nonetheless send out to the area a Special Representative of the Secretary-General without delay with a broad mandate to establish and maintain contacts with all sides and assist in the return of peaceful conditions. His appointment would not be a victory for any party but a genuine demonstration of the responsibility of the United Nations to encourage the peaceful settlement of disputes.

I wish to say a special word about the refugees. The most recent report of the Secretary-General, based on the findings of his representative, brings us once again face to face with our responsibility to preserve and strengthen "the dignity and worth of the human person." His report points to the urgent need for more international assistance

of all kinds and the Government of Canada is considering how it can help further with this requirement. Whatever generosity we can summon, however, and I know that many governments have been generous over the years in their response to the needs of the refugees in the Middle East, will not be sufficient to solve the underlying problem. It is essential that justice be done to the rights and claims of the refugees in the framework of a general settlement.

The principles of compensation, repatriation, and re-settlement enunciated in previous resolutions of our Assembly provide the necessary guidelines for settling the refugees in permanent homes. The parties directly concerned have moral and historical obligations towards the refugees which must be recognized. But it would be unrealistic to expect that they could in present circumstances carry out alone an effective programme of this kind.

I would, therefore, hope that this Organization might give serious study to the establishment of a co-ordinated plan of international action, aimed at regional economic development on an ambitious scale. It would help provide a basis for a solution of the refugee problem and could lead to a new era of peace and prosperity in the area. It would require the full support of the members of this Organization as well as the co-operation of the countries of the Middle East. Such a plan might encompass agricultural and mineral development, a co-ordinated approach to the development and utilization of water resources and, if feasible, projects for desalination and the production of electrical power.

It would appear essential that an international programme along these lines be carried out in conjunction with a settlement of other outstanding questions, if it is to have any prospect of success. Nevertheless we should not delay for this reason an attempt to develop a practical programme and to establish the appropriate machinery.

Africa

Another principal area of concern to the United Nations over the past year has been the situation in Southern Africa, particularly in Rhodesia and South West Africa. Canada supported—and I wish to reaffirm that support—Resolution 2145 which terminated the mandate of South Africa over South West Africa and brought South West Africa under the direct responsibility of the United Nations. We participated actively as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee for South West Africa in the search for practical means of

implementing that resolution. This search has not led to arrangements for the transfer of the administration of South West Africa. I would hope that the Assembly will now consider alternative approaches to the problem, including the idea of undertaking preliminary consultations with the peoples and de facto authorities of South West Africa. This might be done through a representative of the Secretary-General as suggested by a number of delegations including Canada.

The attitude of the Government of South Africa gives us cause for concern. My Government would consider invalid any attempt by South Africa to take action which would have the effect of dividing the territory into smaller parts or of incorporating it into South Africa. The international character of the territory and the interests and well-being of its inhabitants must be the paramount considerations which guide our actions. At the same time, we have no choice but to take into account in whatever we do the actual capacities and resources of the United Nations.

In December 1966 the Security Council took far-reaching decisions to apply mandatory sanctions against Rhodesia. Canada has repeatedly expressed her conviction that Rhodesia must not be granted independence before majority rule is attained. We have complied strictly with the terms of the Security Council's decisions. Indeed, there is a total ban on trade between Canada and Rhodesia. I am disturbed, however, at indications that the Security Council decision is not being fully implemented. Without full co-operation from all states, the purposes of the United Nations will be frustrated. We therefore look forward to receiving the Secretary-General's report or the implementation of sanctions. Once this is available the Security Council will be in a better position to decide what further measures should be taken.

Clearly, one of the principal obstacles to the effective implementation of United Nations recommendations relating to Southern Africa is the continuing lack of coperation from the Government of South Africa. Whichever way we turn, whatever direction we look for solutions, we find the same implacable opposition. My Government is fully conscious of the dilemma; on the one hand we cannot ignore the implications of South African policies for the world community as a whole, but on the other hand to invite a physical confrontation now with South Africa carries grave implications. It is evident that such a confrontation would impose a heavy burden on those states which would have to accept the principal responsibility for taking the necessary measures. We have a legitimate interest in doing

A second control of the control o

And the set of the set

all we can to banish apartheid as an intrument of South African policy. At the same time we must recognize that the real interests of the United Nations are best preserved by measuring our ends against our means.

Vietnam

It would be encouraging and indeed deeply gratifying to all of us at this Assembly if we were able to note that the thunderclouds of war had lifted from Vietnam since, one year ago, we gathered in this same forum to review the problems of the world. That is not the case. The suffering and destruction continue unabated. Despite all the efforts, including those of my own country, to seek a basis for negotiation the issues behind the conflict seem to remain as intractable as ever.

Once again we face the question, therefore, of whether this organization can help to bring the Vietnam conflict closer to a peaceful and mutually acceptable conclusion and to foster political stability and economic progress in an area of the world where both are so badly needed.

There are, of course, reasons which militate against immediate and formal action being taken by the United Nations at this time. We cannot escape the obvious fact-and it is a fact that I regret-that some of those most directly concerned with this conflict are not represented in this Organization. I do not wish to suggest that if it were otherwise, we would automatically find ourselves closer to a concrete solution to the Vietnam problem. Whether this situation will change in the foreseeable future I cannot tell, but I do not believe that efforts for peace need be held in abeyance until it does.

A second important reason for the inability of this Organization to contribute constructively to a solution is that the great powers are divided on the causes of the conflict and on the measures required to terminate it. As we all know, the Security Council can only function effectively if its members will unite their strength to maintain international peace and security, as the Charter calls upon them to do. I can see no immediate prospect of this unity being found.

To be realistic in assessing our present ability to act collectively and as an organization must not be regarded as a justification for apathy and inertia by each of us individually. This I think has been the conviction of the Secretary-General, who has made repeated efforts to find a

indiv.

solution. This has also been Canada's conviction. We must strive to bring into play whatever channels and whatever forms of peace-seeking machinery may be available to the international community. Our goal must be the restoration of peace, and making it secure. That surely was the over-riding concern which gave birth to this Organization.

As members of the United Nations, partaking as we do of common objectives and obligations, I think we must register our concern in terms clear enough and unequivocal enough for all those directly involved in this conflict to hear and understand. And at the same time we must work with all the resources of ingenuity, imagination, flexibility, and above all with a sense of justice, towards devising whatever means may be mutually acceptable for bringing the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table. Whether the path we select as the most direct route to that conference table bears a name derived from the Charter, or from the Geneva Conference machinery, matters less to my mind than our assessment of its likelihood of leading to an end to the war. For its part, the Canadian Government, which has a special interest and responsibility because of Canada's membership in the International Control Commission, will, as in the past, continue to explore all possibilities of making use of that Commission membership or acting in conjunction with its Commission partners to try to lead the parties to the conflict towards negotiation.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the first step in that direction will involve the question of the bombing of North Vietnam. It seems clear that all attempts to bring about talks between the two sides are doomed to failure unless the bombing is stopped. This is a matter of first priority if we are to start the process of de-escalation and to open the door to the conference room as several representatives who have preceded me at this rostrum have pointed out.

But let us not for a moment pretend that a halt in the bombing would, in itself, bring the war to an end. There are no magic formulas; there are no simple prescriptions for the settlement of problems as complex as the issues behind the hostilities in Vietnam. In a speech in Ottawa on April 11 of this year, I made certain suggestions as to how a start might be made on the road away from war by a progressive return to the cease-fire arrangement worked out at Geneva in 1954. I proposed that the following steps might be taken:

(1) As a first step towards disengagement, the bombing of the North might be terminated and the demilitarized zone restored to its intended status subject to effective international supervision;

- (2) a freezing of the course of military events and capabilities in Vietnam at existing levels;
- (3) the cessation of all hostilities between the parties, that is, a cease fire;
- (4) following the cease fire, withdrawal of all outside forces whose presence in the area of conflict was not provided for at Geneva, and the dismant-ling of military bases.

I recognized then, as I have elsewhere, that there is no hope for progress towards a peaceful settlement in appeals or proposals which place the total burden of responsibility for making essential concessions on only one side. That sort of approach is relevant only in circumstances of military victory and defeat.

If, therefore, we are to recognize a halt to the bombing for what it is, namely the key to a solution, the starting point in the process of solving the Vietnam problem, let us be very clear in our own minds that it is only one side of a military equation and that we cannot proceed, if we are to have any hope of success, as if the other side did not exist. No attempt to bring an end to the conflict can disregard either the political or military inter-relationships in the area. Canada is, I repeat, ready at all times to accept its responsibilities in the International Control Commission—to act in conjunction with its Commission partners in helping to lead the parties to the conflict in Vietnam to the conference table and to assist in every way to achieve the establishment of an equitable peace in Vietnam.

Trade and Development

At a time when our Organization is beset with difficulties in fulfilling its Charter responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security, we can draw encouragement from the increasingly effective part which the United Nations is taking in the great task of economic and social development. Hunger, disease, poverty and ignorance threaten the peace just as surely as disputes over frontiers or relations between races. And here the United Nations is making steady progress. It devotes by far the largest portion of its total resources to promoting economic and social progress. But obviously much more is required. Peoples around the world will judge our actions in large measure by our success in helping to provide an adequate response to their most vital needs. Indeed the future of the United Nations system as an effective instrument of

international co-operation is directly related to its ability to make an increasing contribution to overcoming the glaring disparities in living standards which mark today's world.

In Canada we are deeply conscious of the need for more aid on better terms. This has been reflected in a greatly expanded development assistance programme. In a period when, unfortunately, the total flow of resources to developing countries has tended to remain static, we have taken the decision to expand our contribution to international development progressively so as to approximate the target of one per cent of our gross national product by 1970-71. Moreover, we are constantly seeking to improve the quality of our aid programme. We attach particular importance to the expanding role of the United Nations Development Programme to which we are a major contributor. We also intend to play our full part in the replenishment of the International Development Association and hope that the resources available to this important agency will soon be significantly expanded.

As we seek to give new impetus to international cooperation in the field of development at this Assembly, preparations for the Second United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, which will convene in New Delhi soon, will be uppermost in our minds. I believe that the signal achievement of UNCTAD to date has been the way in which it has brought donors and recipients together in the study development process as a whole, and placed in perspective the relationship between its financial and trade aspects. As a result of UNCTAD's work we appreciate more clearly the fundamental truth that economic development is a joint endeavour, depending for its success on synchronized action by both developed and developing countries. I am sure that the Conference itself will mark an important step forward towards new measures of international co-operation in this all-important field.

Disarmament

There have been three important developments in the field of arms control since my address to the 21st Session--(1) the approval of the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space; (2) the conclusion of the Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons in Latin America; (3) the tabling of draft treaties on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by the USA and USSR on August 24 in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee.

A substitution of the control of the c

ġ. .

With its imminent entry into force, the Outer Space Treaty will soon be an established and far-reaching fact. It ranks among the important achievements in the arms control sphere since the establishment of the United Nations.

I congratulate the States of Latin America and the Caribbean for reaching agreement to establish the first nuclear-free zone in an inhabited part of the world. This treaty will, I feel sure, lend impetus to the non-proliferation negotiations, which have now been intensified in Geneva and will be pursued in this Assembly.

Non-Proliferation Treaty

The conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty is vital, urgent and of paramount importance. I urge that this Assembly endorse the results of more than two years of effort so that a treaty can become a working reality in the very near future. The treaty may not be a measure of nuclear disarmament but it is a vital step towards nuclear arms control, in itself an important pre-requisite to ultimate nuclear and general disarmament. It will help to prevent a new nuclear arms race, greatly reduce the danger of nuclear war and contribute to conditions in which the nuclear powers can address themselves to the problem of reducing their nuclear arsenals. Far from perpetuating a nuclear weapons monopoly, the international forces generated by this treaty will bring pressure to bear on the nuclear powers themselves to undertake further measures of nuclear arms control.

We are confident that the treaty will not inhibit collective defence arrangements nor the civil nuclear programmes of non-nuclear signatories. On the contrary in our view the treaty will enhance nuclear development for peaceful purposes in non-nuclear states. However, we are firmly convinced that it should prohibit non-nuclear signatories from developing so-called peaceful nuclear explosive devices. There is no distinguishing between military and civil nuclear explosive technology, between the destructive power of a nuclear bomb and a nuclear excavating charge. A more permissive provision for peaceful nuclear explosions would in our view represent a fatal loophole hygmeans of which non-nuclear states could acquire military/technology. That is not to say that we should not expect the nuclear powers, perhaps in this Assembly, to give an explicit undertaking to extend nuclear explosive services on reasonable terms upon request once they become technically feasible.

We also believe that non-nuclear signatories should have some parallel assurances from the nuclear powers against nuclear blackmail and hope this Assembly will be

And the state of t

able to agree on appropriate measures. Finally, we hope that an equitable safeguards formula can soon be agreed upon which can be accepted by all interested parties. Such an article would do much to promote the extension of international safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities and strengthen the mechanics of nuclear arms control.

Secretary-General's Report on Nuclear Weapons

In the next two or three weeks we should receive the Secretary-General's Report on Nuclear Weapons, in which the Secretary-General's staff and a number of experts have been engaged for the past six months. Such a report--the product of so much knowledge and experience--must command the careful attention of all member governments and of all people interested in the development of a rational and stable world order.

Conventional Arms Control

My Government endorses the right of all States to take whatever measures they deem necessary to ensure their self-defence, but we would urge the suppliers and recipients of arms to exercise restraint in their sale and acquisition so that a serious imbalance of arms does not develop in any area where it might lead to the outbreak of fighting. The United States has recently proposed the registration of arms shipments to the Middle East. Canada does not supply arms to the Middle East, but we think this a practical, constructive and forward-looking proposal to which the United Nations might well lend its good offices. We would hope the principal arms suppliers to the area could give it serious consideration.

Anti-ballistic Missile System

I should now like to turn to a specific measure of arms control in which there was reason to hope that the nuclear powers might be expected to make progress in the near future. Some months ago the United States proposed to the Soviet Union that they enter into discussions designed to limit offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons systems and in particular the deployment of antiballistic missile systems. To date these talks have not started and we understand the USSR has not responded to USA efforts to get the talks under way. Meanwhile the Soviet Union has continued to develop the anti-missile defences of Moscow. The United States has recently announced its intention of going forward soon with a limited and light armament defence oriented against a potential Chinese nuclear threat foreseen for the early nineteen seventies.

As the representative of a middle power vitally concerned about nuclear arms control and disarmament I must state that it seems unreasonable to expect progress in this direction if the nuclear weapon powers are not at least prepared to discuss limiting their own nuclear weapons. I therefore appeal to those powers concerned to pursue their efforts to reach agreement on measures of self-restraint with the same diligence that they are promoting the non-proliferation treaty. As the United States Secretary of Defence so aptly expressed it what the world requires is not a new race towards armament but a new race towards reasonableness.

Human Rights

We will be considering this year the important proposal to establish a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. I believe that the establishment of such a post will greatly contribute to the co-ordination and implementation of the human rights legislation adopted by the United Nations in the past 20 years.

This development, together with the recent action of the General Assembly in adopting the Human Rights Covenants and the Convention on the elimination of racial discrimination, will be a fitting introduction to the celebration throughout the world of the International Year for Human Rights in 1968. The International Conference on Human Rights in Tehran in April will provide a major opportunity to take stock and to seize the opportunity provided by the focus of world attention on human rights so as to ensure that the Universal Declaration remains a relevant and living creed.

Areas of Future Work

I would like to conclude this address by mentioning a number of areas of our work which I believe are important to the future of the United Nations but which have been neglected or which despite our efforts remain to be fully cultivated.

<u>Peacekeeping</u>

My Government has always been actively interested in peacekeeping, not only because Canada has contributed military personnel and financial support to United Nations peacekeeping operations for many years, but because we attach the greatest importance to the work of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security. Along with several other governments, I think we can claim the

sample of the const

right to contribute a special knowledge of peacekeeping to our discussions. My Government regrets therefore that the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations was not able to meet this summer despite the encouraging signs of progress in its work which were beginning to appear some months ago. Recent developments in the Middle East and elsewhere strengthen our belief that this Organization has an important task to perform in the maintenance of peace and security.

Some may feel that the issues are so difficult and the disagreements so profound that there is little point in the Special Committee continuing to meet. We do not take this view. We would have been surprised if progress were not to be slow. The questions under study are amongst those which challenge the most deeply held beliefs of member states about the nature and purposes of the United Nations. We cannot afford the luxury of cynicism. Moreover, at the last series of meetings of the Committee concrete proposals were made which deserve to be explored further. I have in mind particularly proposals relating to a special scale for the financing of peacekeeping operations and proposals for the advance planning and co-ordination of logistical and other arrangements for peacekeeping. I have in mind, too, proposals which have been made relating to the Military Staff Committee and the role it might play in this whole area.

Our reasons for holding these views have been confirmed by the observations which the Secretary-General has made in his Final Report on the United Nations Emergency Force in which he summarizes clearly and effectively the essential nature of peacekeeping forces in general. I have noted his statement, for example, that "in these operations none of the planning and preparation which are expected of normal military procedures can be counted upon" and his subsequent commentary on the difficulties this creates for the United Nations. I would suggest it is time, 11 years after the decision to organize the first peacekeeping force, that we should be able to count upon at least some of the normal planning procedures which each of us would take for granted in our own countries. Training should be standardized and equipment should be available when needed, to mention only two items.

It takes no foresight on my part to predict that the United Nations will be called upon again to supply peace-keeping forces or observer groups in crisis situations. That is the reason we believe forward planning is necessary. Even if continuing disagreement here prevents the United Nations from doing this planning my Government

intends to explore how peacekeeping arrangements can be improved and we would hope to consult other traditional participants in this regard. We want to be sure that if and when we are called upon again to take part, and if it is feasible and appropriate for us to do so, we shall be ready to respond.

Peaceful Settlement of Disputes

Another area of our work I should like to mention concerns the peaceful settlement of disputes. Unlike peacekeeping, this subject has, I believe, been neglected too long by this Assembly and I was glad to read the cogent observations of the Secretary-General in the Introduction to his Annual Report. The peaceful settlement of disputes is a vital concept of the Charter and must be an essential technique of modern diplomacy. It is easy to pay lip service to the concept of peaceful settlement, however, and more difficult to suggest how in practice it might be implemented by states. It would be fruitless to expect that, even if there were agreement on the means of implementation, these would always be used. I do not therefore raise this subject on the assumption that good intentions are all that is required. On the contrary, we have a responsibility to take a close look at the procedures we have used in the past, to decide whether they are adequate and if necessary to make recommendations for new procedures. In this respect I welcome the work that has been done by the Government of the Netherlands on the subject of fact-finding. If our discussion of these proposals leads to some constructive result then we shall have made a good start towards the kind of review I have mentioned.

Security Council Meetings of Foreign Ministers

May I also suggest that we take up and implement the proposal made by the Secretary-General for periodic meetings of the Security Council under Article 28 of the Charter and in particular that a meeting at the level of Foreign Ministers be held during the 22nd Session when so many Ministers are here. The Secretary-General has said that he would be prepared to suggest a tentative agenda for such a meeting. I would hope that he will be authorized to do so. We must not let this Session end without having done everything in our power to find solutions to the problems which confront us.

Cyprus

I might appropriately refer in this context to the recent meeting between the heads of government of Greece and Turkey on the question of Cyprus and to the steps which have

been taken on the island to facilitate a return to normal conditions. This evidence of a willingness to find a peaceful solution to the dispute is of great encouragement to my Government which has always emphasized the close connection between the assumption of peacekeeping responsibilities and the parallel search for durable solutions to international disputes. I would urge that these negotiations be resumed and brought to a fruitful conclusion.

Universality

My Government also believes, Mr. President, that the objective of universality of membership is one which we should keep before us even though the prospects for reaching this objective may not be bright. I would repeat what I said on this occasion last year: "if this Organization is to realize its potential capacities all nations, and especially those which, like continental China, represent a significant proportion of the world's population, must be represented here." I outlined then what we considered to be a reasonable basis for the seating of a representative from continental China in the United Nations. While we were disappointed by the response to our suggestions we continue to believe that they represent a reasonable and just solution of the problem of China's representation. I would also hope that the question of the relationship of non-member states with the United Nations can be re-examined and I welcome the repetition of the Secretary-General's suggestions on observer status in his Annual Report.

Conclusion

Mr. President, I know you will permit me a brief reference in conclusion to the centenary celebrations which are taking place in my country this year. "Man and His World" is the theme of Expo 67, at Montreal. Expo has given Canadians renewed confidence in our ability to accomplish great things together and to solve our own problems by our own efforts. It is an achievement which has fired the enthusiasm of our many visitors and helped to reveal to them man's unity and diversity, his shared goals and unique responses. Expo has demonstrated graphically how national styles and national pride can be made subordinate to a larger whole and a wider good. That must also be the first task of this Organization—to reconcile conflicting national interests with the common good and on the common ground of the Charter.