



CANADA

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 67/30

CANADA AND THE UNIVERSAL FORUM FOR PEACE

An Address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York on September 27, 1967, by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Paul Martin.

...If we are to judge by the pace of our activities since the conclusion of the last session, this organization is a vigorous and healthy one. 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 the United Nations.

While this record of activity is encouraging, 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 stale-mates" on our agenda remain 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 my country 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. And, moreover, this organization was able to bring about a cease-fire in the Middle East, and this organization 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 that we are here. Where we go wrong and where we are apt to be disappointed is in putting those ideals into practice. Clearly, there must be 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.

Middle East

The Middle East is of major concern to us at this time. My country has followed developments there with anxiety for the future of that 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, as you know, 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 in helping to maintain a relative tranquillity.

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. 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 in the spring, with others we sought to have the Security Council urge restraint on the parties involved. Now, again, it is incumbent on all of us, and particularly on 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 the 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 should hope, some form of international supervision by this organization.

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, I think, 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 for this organization. But, 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 -- and do so without delay -- with a broad mandate to establish and maintain contacts with all sides and assist in the return of peaceful conditions. This 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 concerning 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 my country is considering how it can help further such assistance. Whatever generosity we can summon (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), this will not, however, 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 resettlement 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 should, therefore, hope that we might give serious study to the establishment of a co-ordinated plan of international action aimed at regional 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 in 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 electric 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 the practical programme and to establish the appropriate machinery.

Africa

Another principal area of concern to this organization over the past year has been the situation in southern Africa, particularly in Rhodesia and in South West Africa. Canada supported -- and I wish to reaffirm that support -- Resolution 2145 (XXI), which terminated the mandate of South Africa over South West Africa and brought South West Africa under the direct responsibility of this organization. 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 should hope, however, that the Assembly would now consider alternative approaches to this problem, including the idea of undertaking preliminary consultations with the peoples and the

de facto authorities of South West Africa. They might be done through a representative of the Secretary-General, as my country and a number of delegations have already suggested.

Frankly, 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 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 its 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. 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 every member state in this organization, the purposes of the United Nations will be frustrated. And so we look forward to receiving the report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of sanctions. Once that is available, the Security Council will be in a better position to decide what further measures should be taken.

Now, clearly, one of the principal obstacles to the effective implementation of United Nations recommendations relating to southern Africa is the continuing lack of co-operation from the Government of South Africa. Whichever way we turn, in whatever direction we look for solutions, we find the same implacable opposition. My Government is conscious of the dilemma: on the one hand, we cannot ignore the implications of South African policies for the world community as a whole; and, on the other hand, to invite a physical confrontation now with South Africa carries the gravest 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 all we can to banish apartheid as an instrument of South African policy. At the same time, we must recognize that the real interests of this organization are best preserved by measuring our ends against our means.

Vietnam

Now I want to say a word about the vital and worrying problem of Vietnam.

It would be encouraging and, indeed, deeply gratifying to all of us at this Assembly if we were able to note that the thunder clouds of war had lifted from Vietnam since one year ago, when we gathered in this same forum to review the problems of the world. That is not the case. The suffering and destruction in Vietnam 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, 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 this organization 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 the United Nations. I do not wish to suggest that, if it were otherwise, we should automatically find ourselves closer to a concrete solution to the problem in Vietnam. Whether this situation will change in the future I cannot say, 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 in Vietnam 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 function effectively only if its members will unite their strength to maintain international peace and security, as the Charter indeed calls upon them to do. And I can see no immediate prospect of that unity being found.

And so to be realistic in assessing our present ability here 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 solution, as have others. This has also been the conviction of Canada. 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, at the earliest possible time. That surely was the overriding concern which gave birth to this organization; and I am one of the very few in this hall who attended that birth.

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. At the same time we must work with all the resources of ingenuity, imagination and flexibility, and above all with a sense of justice, towards devising whatever means may be mutually acceptable for bringing the conflict in Vietnam from the field of hostilities to the conference table.

Yesterday, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Britain said:

"We are ready to meet with the Governments of the Soviet Union, India, Canada and Poland, as proposed by the President of the World Federation of the United Nations Associations..."

I should simply like to say that my Prime Minister, in the name of the Government of Canada, has indicated our willingness to attend such a conference.

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 our part, the Canadian Government, which has a special interest and a special responsibility because of our membership in the International Control Commission, will, as in the past, continue to explore all possibilities of making use of that Commission or acting in conjunction with its Commission partners, Poland and India, to try to lead the parties to the conflict towards negotiations.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind now 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. That 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 -- in particular the Prime Minister of Denmark and the Foreign Minister of Sweden.

But we must not for a moment pretend that a halt in the bombing would in itself bring an end to the war. I believe it is now the first step. 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. On April 11 of this year, in our Parliament, I made certain suggestions on 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 then that the following steps might be taken:

First: 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;

second: a freezing of the course of military events and capabilities in Vietnam at existing levels;

third: the cessation of all hostilities between the parties, that is, a cease-fire; and, finally,

fourth: following the cease-fire, withdrawal of all outside forces whose presence in the area of conflict was not provided for at Geneva, and the dismantling of military bases.

I recognized then, as I have elsewhere, that there is no hope for 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 the military interrelationships in the area. Canada is 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. I believe that, as long as that war continues, it serves as an obstacle to the settlement of other vital issues that concern us all.

Trade and Development

At a time when our organization is beset with difficulties in fulfilling its 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 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 itself 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, Canada has taken the decision to expand its contribution to international development progressively, so as to reach the target of 1 per cent of our gross national product by 1970-71. 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 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 co-operation in the field of development at this time, 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 recipient countries together in the study of the 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.

Disarmament

There have been three important developments in the field of arms control since I spoke to the General Assembly at the twenty-first session: first, the approval of the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space; second, the conclusion of the Treaty to Prohibit Nuclear Weapons in Latin America; third, the submission of draft treaties on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons by the United States and the Soviet Union on August 24 in the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee.

With its imminent entry into force, the Treaty on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space 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 am sure we should all wish to 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 lend impetus to the non-proliferation negotiations, which have now been intensified in Geneva and will shortly be before this Assembly.

Non-Proliferation Treaty

The conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty is vital, urgent and of paramount importance. I urge that the General Assembly endorse the results of more than two years of effort, so that a treaty can become a working reality soon. The treaty may not be a measure of nuclear disarmament, but it is a vital step towards nuclear arms control, in itself an important prerequisite 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 or the civil nuclear programmes of non-nuclear signatories. On the contrary, in my view, the treaty will enhance nuclear development for peaceful purposes in non-nuclear states.

My country, by the way, has long had a nuclear capacity, but it determined from the very beginning to use its nuclear know-how for peaceful purposes only.

We are firmly convinced that this treaty 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 represent a fatal loophole by means of which non-nuclear states could acquire military nuclear 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 we hope this Assembly will be able to agree on appropriate measures. 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 shall receive from the Secretary-General his report on nuclear weapons. Such a report -- the product of so much knowledge and experience -- must command our careful attention; it must command the careful attention 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 the 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 recently proposed the registration of arms shipments to the Middle East, for instance, and we think that this is a practical, constructive and forward-looking proposal to which this organization might well lend its good offices. We should hope that the principal arms suppliers to the area would give it serious consideration.

Anti-ballistic Missile System

I should now like to turn for a moment 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, as we know, 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 anti-ballistic-missile systems. To date those talks, I gather, have not started, and we understand that the Soviet Union has not responded to United States efforts to get the talks under way. Meanwhile the Soviet Union has continued to develop the anti-missile defence 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 1970s.

As the representative of a secondary 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 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 Defense so aptly expressed it, what the world requires is not a new race towards armament but a new race towards reasonableness.

Peace-Keeping

My Government has always been actively interested in peace-keeping, not only because Canada has contributed military personnel and financial support to UN peace-keeping for many years, but because we attach the greatest importance to the work of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security. And I strongly support what my colleague Mr. Brown said yesterday. Along with several other governments, I think my country can claim the right to contribute a special knowledge of peace-keeping to our discussion. 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. But I do not take that view. We would have been surprised if progress were not to be slow. The questions under study are among those which challenge the most deeply-held beliefs of member states about the nature and purposes of this organization. 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 peace-keeping. 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 clearly summarizes the essential nature of peacekeeping forces in general. I have noted, for example, his statement 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 should 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 made 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 peacekeeping forces or observer groups in crisis situations. Peace-keeping in this organization is not dead because of incidents that occurred within the past few months. It will continue to be a very necessary and useful function for this organization. And that is the reason why 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 should hope to consult other traditional participants in that regard. We want to be sure that, if and when we are called upon to take part, and if it is feasible and appropriate to do so, we shall be ready to respond.

Peaceful Settlement of Disputes

Unlike peace-keeping, the peaceful settlement of disputes has been neglected too long by us. I was glad, therefore, 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 of this organization; it must be an essential technique of modern diplomacy. It is easy to pay lip service, of course, to the concept of peaceful settlement, and more difficult to suggest how in practice it might be implemented. It would be fruitless to expect that, even if there were agreement on the means of implementation, these would always be used. And so I do not raise this subject on the assumption that good intentions are all that we require.

We have a responsibility, on the contrary, 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 regard, 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 twenty-second 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 should hope that he would be authorized to do so, and I agree that there must be careful preparations for such a meeting. I believe that we must not let this session end without having done everything in our power to find solutions to the problems that divide us, that concern our peoples and that now test the acceptance of this organization in many countries of the world.

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. I should urge that those negotiations be resumed and brought to a fruitful conclusion. The peacekeeping force in Cyprus is one with which my country has had something to do and in which it plays a part. We must ask ourselves whether or not the continuation of the force serves in any way as a bar to a settlement. I have been assured that it does not. But it would be encouraging if a political solution to the problem by those concerned could be effected.

Universality

My Government believes that the objective of universality of membership is one which we should ever keep before us, even though the prospects for reaching that objective may not be bright. I should like to say again 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 say this in the light of the turmoil that exists in mainland China at the present time. Last year I outlined 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 continued to believe that they represent a reasonable and just solution of the problem of China's representation. I should also hope that the question of the relationship of non-member states with the United Nations could be re-examined, and I welcome the repetition of the Secretary-General's suggestions on an observer status in his annual report.

When I say that we should welcome, because of our conviction the validity of the principle of universality, the membership of continental China, I should like to emphasize, of course, that, if one supports that membership, one likewise must, as a supporter of the principle of universality, recognize the right of Formosa to a place in this organization.

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 their ability to accomplish great things together and to solve their own problems by their own efforts. It is an achievement which has fired the enthusiasm of many visitors and helped to reveal to them man's unity and diversity, his shared goals and unique responses. Expo, as we call it, 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 of the United Nations.