

something to improve the capacity of the participating countries to respond more effectively and more rationally to future appeals by the United Nations.

Since the conclusion of the Conference, I have been encouraged to note the proposal of the Secretary-General that the whole question of advance planning for peace-keeping operations be studied by the United Nations. In putting this proposal forward in the introduction to his annual report, the Secretary-General expressed the hope that such a study might "yield recommendations for consideration by the competent organs", which may then authorize him "to proceed along such lines as may be generally approved". Canada strongly supports this proposal, and we will naturally be prepared to play our full part in carrying it forward at the appropriate time.

The availability of properly trained and equipped forces is one element of an effective United Nations capacity to keep the peace. The availability of the necessary financial resources on an assured basis is another. 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.

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. According to that opinion, the expenses incurred by the United Nations in the Middle East and in the Congo are expenses of the organization and the assessments for them approved by the General Assembly are binding assessments.

I am bound to acknowledge that some important member states do not share our view either of the principle or of the law involved. In circumstances where the five Permanent Members of the Security Council between them are responsible for meeting two-thirds of the costs of our organization, the dissenting views of two of these Permanent Members are clearly of critical importance. The divergence between their views and those of the majority of members have set us on a collision course which, if not diverted, can only have the gravest consequences for the United Nations, whatever the outcome. In this situation, 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.

The vital importance of this problem has, of course, been recognized for some considerable time. As far back as 1961, the Canadian Delegation, in an effort to find a solution to this problem, sponsored the proposal which led to the establishment of the Working Group of 15. In this Group -- and subsequently in the Working Group of 21 --, we sought actively to reconcile the fundamental divergences of view which have threatened the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace. We deeply regret that it has not proved possible so far to arrive at any accommodation.