



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION

DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 65/17

## CANADA AND THE EVOLVING UNITED NATIONS

An Address by the Honourable Paul Martin, Secretary of State for External Affairs, to the United Nations Association of Canada, Montreal, June 4, 1965.

I am honoured that you have asked me to join you at your annual meeting and to speak to you this evening. As some of you know, my connections with the United Nations Association reach back to its predecessor, the League of Nations Society. That is now a period of some 40 years. Thus I think I can fairly say that I know the good work you are doing. I may also claim to have some understanding of the problems you are facing.

If I may paraphrase a passage from a recent essay by Mr. Livingston Merchant, the former United States Ambassador to Canada, the diplomacy we conduct in the modern world is no longer a dynastic diplomacy; it is a democratic diplomacy. This means that those concerned with foreign policy must always bear in mind that their work is subject, in the final analysis, to the approbation or disapprobation of public opinion. This is inherent in the democratic process, but it also underlines the need for public opinion to be fully informed. I know this is one of your main objectives as far as the United Nations is concerned and I think you have met it with excellent results.

I should like to single out in particular your work amongst young Canadians. I am pleased to see that you give priority to them because your efforts in that direction will help to assure the interest of coming generations in world affairs. It will help to assure their continued support, in the years ahead, for the principles and purposes of the United Nations.

I should also commend you for the help you have given to certain programmes of the United Nations. In this International Co-operation Year, I am especially conscious of your efforts in sponsoring the organization of ICY in Canada and the part that you continue to play in putting across its aims and objectives. ICY has caught the imagination of Canadians and Canadian organizations have undertaken more than 100 projects in its name. Without discounting the part the Government has played in promoting the conception of ICY, I am happy to acknowledge that it is the private organizations which have given real dimension to it.

That is as it should be. For the United Nations is an organization of people. It is "we the peoples of the United Nations" who stand committed to the pledges and determinations set forth in the Charter. It is fitting, therefore, that Canada's efforts in International Co-operation Year should,

in the main, be those of the people of Canada acting on their own initiative and out of their own generosity.

I was also much impressed to learn from Mr. Rogers that the Hallowe'en Shell-Out Campaign for UNICEF had yielded \$1 million, an increase of well over \$200,000 over the previous year. This is a very significant contribution, indeed, which will go far in promoting the welfare and relieving the suffering of children throughout the world.

But it is important not to lose sight of the fact that your capacity to aid useful activities is directly related to the strength and resources of your own organization. Raising money to meet the needs of the United Nations Association may not have as much appeal as some of these other causes. We must always remember, however, that the mother who starves herself to feed her children ultimately does harm to them as well. The Canadian Government can and does help your work with an annual grant. As you know, the grant was increased substantially in the current year. But the main responsibility must continue to rest with your Association, drawing its strength and support from Canadians in all walks of life.

Encouraged by the interest and endorsement of Canadians, which is in no small measure due to the work of your Association, successive Canadian Governments have, over the past 20 years, sought to advance the purposes and aims of the United Nations. In the search for international peace and security we have continued to look upon the United Nations as a focus and foundation-stone of Canadian foreign policy.

If we look into the reasons for this strong Canadian support of the United Nations, we enter upon large questions to which it is perhaps not possible to give more than tentative answers. I should suggest that the most enduring reason for Canadian support of the United Nations may also be the most obvious. The United Nations, like the League before it, was founded in the aftermath of a long and destructive war in which Canada had been deeply engaged. In 1945 Canadians were sickened by the waste and destruction which the war had left in its wake. In common with people in all parts of the globe they were determined, as the Charter has it, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". Twenty years later this view still holds in Canada. It still compels the support of the Canadian people for the United Nations.

We started out with great expectations for the future, and it is right that we should have done so. We created the United Nations to be an instrument of world order -- to be a centre, as the Secretary-General reminded us only the other day, for "harmonizing the actions of nations" in the attainment of common ends. In the face of continuing ferment and friction in the world, we can see no reason for abandoning the aspirations that attended the United Nations at its inception.

But we have had to recognize that, in the final analysis, the United Nations is an instrument in the hands of governments. If it is to be an effective instrument, governments must be willing to invest it with the powers and prerogatives that will make it effective. If it is to be an instrument of peace, governments must be willing to have recourse to peaceful procedures for settling

their disputes. I do not say that an institution like the United Nations cannot be more than its constituent parts. I think experience has already taught us the contrary. But I do say that there cannot be an excessive disparity between the pace of progress of the United Nations as an international instrument and the pace at which its member governments are prepared to move forward towards a sensible world order.

The United Nations record in the matter of peace keeping illustrates the predicament. It is a record which I do not think I need to rehearse before an audience such as this. Suffice it to say that, in innumerable situations over the past 20 years, the United Nations has been able to make its influence felt for peace. It has been able to insulate situations of conflict and to help lay the basis for peaceful accommodation. That process is still going on in a number of areas from Korea to Cyprus.

We in Canada have looked upon the development of an effective United Nations capacity to keep the peace as vital and we have done what we could to support and sustain it. But a turning-point has now been reached. The whole basis of the United Nations peace-keeping role has come under review, and we cannot yet predict what the outcome of that review will be. It is my firm hope that the course we have charted in this matter of peace keeping will not be reversed. Our own efforts will certainly be bent in that direction.

Meanwhile, in at least two situations of actual armed conflict, the United Nations has not been able to play the part it should have been playing. Of course we are all aware of the factors which have made a United Nations intervention in one of these situations impossible and placed considerable limitations upon its effectiveness in the other. Nevertheless, I have said -- and I say it again today -- that this must be a matter of deep regret to all those who are concerned about the maintenance of peace and security in the world.

In saying this I do not want to be thought unrealistic. I appreciate the limitations within which the United Nations must necessarily operate in prevailing circumstances. But it is a part of realism, I think, to recognize that, in the world as it is constituted today, there are certain responsibilities in respect of the maintenance of peace and security which can best and most safely be assumed by the international community acting through a collective instrument. And I should go on to say that it is also a part of realism to recognize that, if the United Nations were to be crippled in one of its most important functions, its influence would then inevitably be diminished over the whole range of its other responsibilities.

I have spoken of Canadian support for the United Nations as an instrument of peace. If we are to be candid, we must recognize that Canadian support for the United Nations has also been forthcoming because, by and large, it has acted as we would have wished it to act. We have experienced no issues like Suez, Hungary, the Congo, Kashmir, or apartheid on which United Nations action has cut across our national objectives. I should hope that, even if that had been the case, our support of the United Nations would have continued undiminished. But it has not been the case. The course followed by the United Nations has been in line with what I may call our enlightened national interest. In associating ourselves with its activities and respecting its resolutions we have gained much and lost little. I should like to think that this assessment is one to which the middle

and smaller powers in the world could generally subscribe. For the United Nations has almost certainly enhanced the opportunities of this group of powers to bring their views and their influence to bear on important international issues.

But the face of the United Nations is changing. In saying this, I do not have in mind so much the very substantial increase in the membership of the United Nations, which has expanded from 51 founding members to 114 today. What I do have in mind is that the problems and preoccupations of this new membership are different from those of the founding members. And, if the United Nations is to attract the full commitment of the new nations, I suspect that we shall have to arrive at a new balance in our conception of what the United Nations is and what it should be doing.

Among the founding members there has been a tendency to look upon the United Nations as primarily an instrument of security and stability in the world. Now I am not saying that security and stability are not of direct interest and concern to the new nations. But they are not the only attributes of world order which are of concern to them. We must remember that these new nations have emerged into a world which they do not regard as being fully responsive to their aspirations. On the contrary, they regard it as a world in which social injustice and economic inequity are far more prevalent than they should be. They are looking for change -- peaceful change if possible, but change nevertheless. And they look upon the United Nations as the rightful instrument of change.

In a recent article, Mr. Adlai Stevenson put this argument as cogently as I think it can be put:

"The world has known periods of relative peace and order before. Always the order was assured by a system designed to preserve the status quo. And this is precisely why the system of order broke down -- because the status quo is indefensible in the long run. What the world needs is a dynamic system or order -- a system capable of bringing about not just a precarious halt to hostilities but a curative resolution of the roots of hostility. This is to say that a dynamic system of order must be one which helps parties to a dispute to break out of rigid stalemates, to adapt to new times, to manage and absorb needed change."

This, in essence, is what the new nations are asking for. They argue that peace and prosperity are two sides of the same coin -- that we cannot reasonably expect to achieve real peace or real security in a world in which two-thirds of the human race are living at the margins of mere subsistence. I suggest to you that this is an argument which we cannot afford to leave out of account. It is an argument that must find full reflection in our policies as regards the United Nations if we want those policies to be relevant to the realities of the world around us.

For my part, I am convinced that the problems of peace and prosperity must be tackled as part of the same problem. I made this the keynote of my address to the General Assembly last December. Since then, we have been looking closely at the part Canada should be playing in the United Nations in the face of the shifting priorities and preoccupations of an overwhelming majority of its member states.

I am sure all of you have been struck, as I have, by the fact that, in the two great current crises (in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic), the need has been acknowledged for the injection of significant economic resources as one means of restoring long-run stability. I have made it clear that Canada would play its full part in carrying forward the tremendous task of economic development in Southeast Asia. And I also indicated, in the House of Commons last week, that we should be prepared to consider whether there is a part for Canada to play in what will inevitably be a long and difficult process of rehabilitation in the Dominican Republic.

But there is surely a lesson to be learned from all this. And the lesson, it seems to me, is this: in a world which is so unevenly divided into areas of affluence and poverty, a world in which whole societies are undergoing radical transformation, situations of crisis are bound to occur. It is right for the world community to develop the machinery it has for containing those situations and bringing them under control. But it is also indispensable for the world community, in the longer run, to mobilize the immense resources at its command to deal with the sources of crisis, to see that the expectations of men and women the world over for a better life in larger freedom do not turn into frustration and disenchantment. That, too, is a matter of enlightened national interest for us, and I should think it is something that is vital to the whole future of the United Nations.

Here in Canada, as in the United States, we have declared a war on domestic poverty. We have done that because we have realized that the energies and the loyalties of our people cannot be properly harnessed to the task of nation-building in circumstances where there are great gaps in incomes and opportunities. If we are trying to harness the energies and the loyalties of the new nations to the concepts of international law and order, and of an international community, the time has surely come to extend our approach to the international plans.

I must now summarize the issues facing the United Nations as I see them:

First, it is essential that the United Nations be restored to solvency. This calls for an equitable solution to the present financial crisis. We are prepared to make our contribution to such a solution.

Second, we continue to attach the highest importance to the United Nations as an instrument of international peace and security. We shall do our utmost to help preserve the capacity of the United Nations to intervene effectively in the cause of peace. We are seeking to achieve this by the adoption of broadly acceptable constitutional arrangements and by improvements in the efficiency of United Nations forces.

Third, we recognize that, in a changing world, the United Nations cannot remain immune from change. We recognize, in particular, that a majority of the members of the United Nations look upon it as an instrument for peaceful change. We must be prepared to embrace that conception and to see it reflected in our policies.

Fourth, there is an urgent need to press forward with the social and economic objectives of the Charter. This is what the new nations expect of us, because it reflects their own highest priorities. If we fail to meet those priorities, we run the risk of weakening their commitment to the United Nations. And the prospects of peace and security in the world will diminish because peace and security cannot be left to rest on a basis of social injustice and economic stagnation.

The groundwork of international co-operation has now been laid. Over the past 20 years, the United Nations system has served as its main focus. If we believe that international co-operation is relevant to an interdependent world, if we believe that peace and prosperity are indivisible, if we believe that all nations have an interest in the delegation of some measure of responsibility to the international community acting in concert -- then we have no option but to persevere on the course we have charted. This means that we must strengthen the United Nations in all possible ways. We must make it responsible to the concerns of all its members. We must extend its relevance to new problems and new preoccupations. We must continue to keep before us the goal of universal membership. That is the message I would leave with you this evening. That is the message I would want you to carry to all those who have the future of the United Nations at heart.

---

s/c