

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