

- (d) there is an increasing concern that peacekeeping operations, valuable as they are, should not become a justification for inaction by the parties to disputes but should be accompanied by progressive moves towards a peaceful and permanent settlement.

I could not hope, Mr. President, to mention all those delegations who spoke during our debate in a constructive way. But I may perhaps draw particular attention to the very pertinent remarks made by the representatives of Ireland, the United States and Pakistan - to mention only three - on the vital relationship between peacekeeping and peace-making. This relationship is a matter of continuing concern to my delegation. We are strongly convinced of the need to ensure that peacekeeping operations are undertaken as a useful, but temporary, method of leading towards the ultimate goal i.e. - the peaceful settlement of the disputes which made peacekeeping necessary in the first place.

I believe it is also worth noting the suggestions which have been made that the Military Staff Committee might again have a useful role to play. My delegation believes that the Military Staff Committee has been inactive long enough. The considerable expertise and knowledge of its members, and of those who might join them to carry out a specific task, should be made full use of to the advantage of the whole organization. Although provided for in Chapter VII of the Charter, the Military Staff Committee is not precluded by any specific provision of the Charter from doing work which could be of benefit both in the field of enforcement action, which falls clearly under Chapter VII, and in preparations for peacekeeping operations which are of a non-enforcement and voluntary nature.

Mr. President, I could not conclude this brief statement of our views and our intentions without mention of the continuing and indeed growing financial deficit afflicting this Organization. A deficit does exist, and voluntary contributions to eliminate it are very much needed. This is what concerns us, not the question of where the responsibility for this situation should lie.

We are, of course, aware of the understandings - and the misunderstandings - which preceded and apparently followed the consensus of September 1, 1965. We do not wish to dispute the understandings which may have been reached nor to suggest the existence of understandings where none existed. But we do say this: this Organization is in financial difficulties because of constitutional and political disagreements that we are now gradually trying to put aside. What Member States must ask themselves is not what other delegations have said and done - or will say and do. They must ask themselves if they are prepared to respond to the consensus of September 1, 1965; to heed the call for voluntary contributions; to act and be treated in this area as the separate, respected sovereign states which they are. Canada pays its assessments under the regular budget and makes voluntary contributions to a variety of international programmes