

(C.W.B. March 1, 1967)

obvious example, the situation in Vietnam remains on the Security Council's agenda although it has not been discussed for over a year because there is no basis for agreement within the Council as to what the United Nations can or should do to bring peace to that unhappy country.

IMPROPER USES OF UN FORUM

While it is true, therefore, that the Council usually reacts to rather than shapes events, it is equally true that constructive use of the Council depends on the seriousness with which governments regard their obligations under the Charter. It is no service to international peace to treat the United Nations as a substitute for the task of direct negotiation, or to use its machinery for the purpose of publicizing charges which it is impossible to verify. Indeed, I should urge that, before a subject is given consideration by the Security Council, the Council should satisfy itself that the question is one which does, in fact, endanger international peace, and that the parties concerned have themselves examined all peaceful means for the settlement of the dispute before placing it on the agenda.

Whatever the subject under discussion, however, Canada will take a position which is consistent with our record of strong support for the principles of the United Nations Charter and for the strengthening of the organization.

CANADA'S UN POLICY

We shall act independently and according to our best judgement — keeping in mind, of course, our special relations with our allies on the Council, our Commonwealth ties and our interest as a nation which looks both across the Atlantic and across the Pacific Oceans. We shall have in mind our responsibilities as members of the International Control Commissions in the states of Indochina and as participants in the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East and in the United Nations Force in Cyprus. These responsibilities will shape our attitudes, but certainly not limit our determination to participate actively in the search for solutions to the disputes concerned.

We shall be conscious also of the importance of finding common ground between the permanent members of the Council without sacrifice of principle. It is true now — as it was in 1945 — that the ability of the permanent members of the Council to work together is an important condition for the maintenance of peace. In the intervening years, the smaller powers have performed many of the arbitration, conciliation and peace-keeping functions which it was thought in the beginning would be the primary responsibility of the permanent members. Yet they have only been able to do this in so far as some consensus, tacit or otherwise, has been in existence between the permanent members. The main exception to this rule was the United Nations intervention in Korea, but I do not think we should look upon that episode as a significant precedent for the future.

Of course, we must expect there will continue to be situations which involve fundamental dif-

ferences of opinion, or of interest, between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., and in these situations there cannot be any doubt as to where Canada will stand. Nevertheless, it will be our purpose to work with the other non-permanent members of the Council to find ways and means of permitting the United Nations to function effectively, and therefore to emphasize its capacity to act as a third party and impartial presence.

SUPPORT FOR UN MEDIATION

In addition, it will be our aim to try to take advantage of situations in which the United Nations is involved to strengthen its claim to mediate or arbitrate disputes. Too often, the United Nations has been able to stop the fighting but not to persuade the parties to settle their disputes. If the peace-keeping services of the United Nations are an essential ingredient of the whole process of developing a system of peaceful change in the world, as I believe they are, then the Security Council must be prepared to insist on some *quid pro quo* for such services. In particular, it should be ready to make full use of the resources of the Charter, including, for example, the recommendation of appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment for the settlement of disputes, the prompt investigation of disputes where necessary and, finally, the recommendation of such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

The appointment of a mediator or a rapporteur, or of a commission of investigation, or of a conciliation commission — all these are methods which are open to the Council but which have not been used to the extent that they might have been. The reason again is that co-operation between the permanent members of the Council has been inadequate. Only such co-operation will permit the United Nations to act with the authority, prestige and power which are necessary to gain acceptance for its decisions and respect for its recommendations.

ORGANIZING PEACE-KEEPING EFFORTS

We shall also be concerned during our term on the Council to see if we can improve the procedures for organizing peace-keeping operations. Since we last served on the Council in 1959, Canada has participated in United Nations forces in the Congo and in Cyprus, helped to provide air support for observers on the borders of the Yemen and for a Pakistan contingent in West New Guinea, and provided the commander for the observation mission sent to the border between India and Pakistan in the fall of 1956. Yet, during all this time, the United Nations has had to act on the basis of inadequate planning machinery and unreliable financing arrangements.

Some say that it would be unwise to press for better arrangements because these would imply making concessions to the point of view of the Soviet Union that only the Security Council can decide what measures are to be taken for the maintenance of peace. This would ensure a voice and a veto for the Soviet Union in all such cases.

We recognize, of course, that there may be occasions when action by the Council is impossible and when the Assembly may have to recommend