

that collective security as envisaged in the United Nations Charter is illusory. I see in such crises evidence to support the opposite conclusion, that, if the full weight of United Nations action as envisaged or implied by the Charter — conciliation, impartial study, co-operation in economic and social projects, all the resources of the quiet diplomacy of an international agency — had been applied at an earlier period, the crisis might never have occurred.

A MAJOR ELEMENT OF FOREIGN POLICY

It is for this reason that we in Canada consider loyalty to the purposes of the United Nations to be one of the chief elements in our foreign policy. We do not say this only at a time of crisis or only with respect to the more dramatic political problems with which the organization deals. We are able to assist in the economic development of newly-independent countries through bilateral and multilateral aid programmes. We have thrown our full weight behind efforts to develop multilateral trade in directions beneficial to all nations. Last year we convened a conference of nations best able to assist in United Nations peace keeping to help co-ordinate the technical planning of those nations for such tasks. We have ourselves taken part in every major United Nations peace-keeping project since 1948.

These Canadian policies are based on the conviction that, if United Nations membership means anything, it means that middle and smaller powers have rights and obligations with respect to the search for security. If the leading powers are unable to find solutions to some problems, other nations must take whatever action is open to them in furtherance of the aims of the Charter. The participation of many middle and smaller powers in peace-keeping operations has given those nations the right to contribute to the formulation of policy on matters of major concern. The increasing involvement of all members of the organization in the rights and obligations of membership has opened up new and valuable opportunities for dealing with the most pressing of world problems....

VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS

We welcome the agreement reached on September 1 that the twentieth session of the General Assembly should proceed with its normal work and that the question of the applicability of Article 19 should not be raised with respect to the costs of the peace-keeping operations in the Congo and in Gaza. The financial difficulties of the organization must now be settled through voluntary contributions. Canada is one of a number of governments that have already made such contributions, and it is our hope that other member governments will now contribute their appropriate shares. The amounts are small. Surely the price is not too high to pay in order to put our collective house in order.

There remain to be settled the long-range questions of responsibility for initiating and financing

future peace-keeping operations and of sharing equitably the costs of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East. Let me outline a few principles I believe should explain our approach to these questions:

First, the maximum possible sharing of the cost, preferably by collective assessment, is the fairest, and politically the most effective, method of financing peace keeping. It should be the first method to be considered by the Security Council when the Council decides to authorize a new operation. Other financial arrangements may have to be worked out to fit different circumstances, but it is essential to the proper functioning of the organization and to the maintenance and support for it in member countries that financial responsibility for projects of wide international benefit should be shared by the international community as a whole.

Second, if the Security Council is unable to act because of disagreement amongst the great powers, then the General Assembly must be allowed to recommend appropriate measures that governments can act upon if they so desire. I should be the first to agree that power and responsibility are linked under the Charter. But to go on from there to maintain that a single great power should be able to frustrate the will of the majority is surely a distortion of the Charter's spirit.

Third, the United Nations must have the technical and military capacity to act when required. I have noted that, at your conference in 1964, you passed a resolution that refers to the necessity to organize eventually "world forces as part of an agreement for the general and complete disarmament of sovereign states". After that, the resolution goes on to make certain proposals for the advance planning of peace-keeping operations. Canada welcomes this approach. Last year...we organized a meeting of representatives of a number of countries with experience in peace-keeping operations in order to exchange information and to prepare our Government better for future operations....

In this present difficult period in the United Nations we are faced with some basic questions. Are we to go forward in the paths indicated by the Charter or not? The Charter is not a constitution for world government nor can it provide all the answers to questions that must be debated and negotiated between sovereign governments. The assumptions on which it is based and to which all member governments have formally subscribed seem abundantly clear, however. A commentator has referred to what he calls "an unexpressed belief that for every crisis of world politics there are certain adequate principles of just action not yet formulated but discoverable, and that the United Nations is the agent which, by its nature and constitution, seeks to discover and to act upon these principles". Member governments cannot, if they are to be honest in maintaining their commitment, give only what this commentator describes as "calculated and ephemeral support". Their support must be consistent, whole-hearted and imaginative if real progress is to be made towards the objectives set forth in the Charter....