

Canada has consistently responded to U.N. requests to provide personnel as available for peacekeeping, because we believe this to be a significant way to contribute to world peace. But in Canada there is growing concern about peacekeeping for two reasons. Firstly, many of the disputes which led to the need for peacekeeping forces appear no nearer to solution than they were one, two or even three decades ago. We recognize that these basic and intractable problems cannot be settled overnight. What we wish, but do not always see, is evidence that the parties are intent on negotiating an end to their disputes.

Secondly, although the two most recent forces, the U.N. Emergency Force and the U.N. Disengagement Observer Force, are being properly paid for through collective assessment, we have failed to reach general agreement on how future peacekeeping operations should be financed, and the U.N. Force in Cyprus is over \$50 million in debt. If operations are not properly funded, many members of the U.N. will not be able to afford to provide forces - a situation which will not be healthy either for this organization or the concept of peacekeeping.

In considering future participation, Canada will weigh these two considerations: whether peacekeeping forces will contribute to a settlement rather than provide temporary relief or even contribute to a perpetuation of the problem, and whether arrangements to pay for them represent the common will of members to assume the financial burden and permit troop contributors to be selected from a broad cross-section of countries.

Human Rights

I have no doubt we will hear a great deal about human rights during the coming months. And not only here at the United Nations. Within a few days the review conference on the Helsinki Final Act opens in Belgrade. Canada, as one of the signers of that document, will make its views known at that time.

But we must also recognize that the United Nations has a major responsibility in the human rights field; one we have not always discharged fully or effectively.

Last year we welcomed the coming into force of the Covenants on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and on Civil and Political Rights. Paradoxically at a time when these new human rights instruments have defined more fully the rights of persons in states which have ratified these instruments and have created new machinery to monitor the compliance of Member States with their legal and moral obligations, the gap between the ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the practice of states has widened noticeably. It is regrettable that only one-third of the total membership of the United Nations has ratified the major human rights covenants, and that even fewer states have accepted the Optional Protocol. The various monitoring and reporting procedures are too slow and cumbersome to be truly effective, and offer little tangible assistance to victims of violations.