

Since we tend to think of a great many activities of the United Nations as being devoted to peace, it might avoid misunderstanding if I defined, as carefully as possible, what these activities are. The United Nations has a number of means available to it to maintain or achieve international peace and security. I am not here concerned with enforcement action against an aggressor -- the Korea type of operation. Only the Security Council is likely to be able to carry out such action. I am not concerned either with procedures for peaceful settlement of disputes before they reach the stage of conflict. These procedures of conciliation, arbitration, mediation -- what we now call peace building -- do overlap with peace-keeping operations but they do not by themselves lead at present to any serious disagreement within the United Nations.

Between conciliation and enforcement there is peace keeping. I am referring to the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and to the United Nations operations of varying kinds, with the most complicated titles, in the Congo, Cyprus, Kashmir, Lebanon and in other locations, which have either been terminated or are still under way. In such projects the essential aim of the United Nations is to interpose its presence in situations of conflict or potential conflict until longer-term solutions can be worked out at the political level. These operations have not been mandatory and were not meant to be coercive. The forces, groups or individuals manifesting the United Nations presence have entered the territory of the state concerned only with the consent of the authorities there. They have carried out diverse functions -- observation in areas of conflict, patrolling cease-fire lines and frontiers or assisting in the preservation of order.

It is with this peace-keeping sector of the United Nations' wide range of responsibilities that I am concerned. The dimensions of the problem we now face in this field are very great. Although there are developments from time to time which give hope of a solution, there is a continuing and fundamental disagreement about the role of the United Nations in the domain of international peace and security. The frustration and paralysis in General Assembly activities in the past couple of years and the possibility of a major confrontation over voting rights show how serious the problem has been.

At the present time the United Nations has an accumulated debt somewhat under \$100 million, resulting chiefly from the refusal of some members or the disinclination or avowed inability of others to pay their share of the costs of peace keeping. This debt presents serious problems for the United Nations but not because the amount is too great for the members as a whole to bear. So far as the money itself is concerned, we should remember that the Secretary-General calculated last year that the total expenses of the organization in 1964 -- including peace-keeping costs -- amounted to about a quarter of one per cent of the defence budgets of the leading military powers alone. The real problem is that two great powers, the Soviet Union and France, both permanent members of the Security Council, insist, from somewhat differing standpoints, that contributions requested from them for peace-keeping costs are either illegal or optional. There is disagreement about the principles which should determine an equitable sharing of the financial burden of peace keeping and, as a result, this burden is, in our opinion, unfairly distributed.