

Canada has always supported the view that the responsibility for maintaining peace and security is one which is shared by all member states of the United Nations. We regard it as a logical consequence of that view that the cost of peace keeping must also be shared equitably by all, with due regard to their relative capacity to contribute. We believe this principle of shared responsibility to be inherent in the Charter, and we find ourselves confirmed in that belief by the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

It is worth noting that, despite the formal adherence of the majority of member states to the principle of collective responsibility, that principle had never, in practice, been fully implemented or consistently adhered to in large-scale operations involving the use of military forces. Twenty-four states had never contributed to UNEF; 33 had defaulted on all ONUC payments. The abated assessments offered to developing countries for both operations in recognition of their limited capacity to pay had been compensated for by voluntary contributions from developed countries. Some peace-keeping operations (e.g. UNTEA in West Irian and UNYOM in the Yemen) had been financed by the parties directly concerned. The bulk of the costs in Korea had been born by the nations providing contingents.

In March 1964, the Security Council established the United Nations Force in Cyprus on the basis of voluntary contributions in troops, cash or both. This decision, which was questioned by Canada as a significant departure from the collective principle, lent new urgency to Canadian efforts to secure agreement on long-term future arrangements which would reflect both collective responsibility and the limited capacity of many to pay.

At the General Assembly, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, the Honourable Paul Martin, made clear Canada's concern at the deteriorating situation:

The crisis we face is not merely a financial crisis. Nor is it limited to constitutional issues. It is a crisis which touches upon our whole conception of the United Nations as the custodian of international peace and security. It is a crisis on the outcome of which hinge the hopes and aspirations of the vast majority of its members for a peaceful and securely-ordered world.

It would be tragic indeed if, in a future crisis, the United Nations were debarred for lack of funds from intervening in the cause of peace.

Mr. Martin went on to emphasize that any solution to the existing dilemma would require concessions on all sides:

It is incumbent on each and every one of us to reflect on the implications of our present course and to explore all avenues of reaching an accommodation to which we can all subscribe

Such an accommodation must be found The search for agreement must be initiated at once and pursued vigorously. The Canadian objective in these discussions will be to achieve an accommodation, not a capitulation It is not enough for the