

voting) was defeated by a vote of two in favour (Albania, Mauritania), 97 against (including Canada, the United States, Britain and the Soviet Union), with 14 abstentions.

It was not the least of the ironies of the nineteenth session that the only formal vote taken in two-and-a-half months was used to uphold the decision not to vote. The vast majority of the membership, divided on many points of substance about the financing of past, present and future peace-keeping operations, were nonetheless agreed that there was more to be lost than gained by pushing these issues to a decisive confrontation while the possibility of a negotiated settlement still existed.

### *Canadian Position*

Canada had played a leading role not only in establishing UNEF but in securing a basis for its financing which reflected the belief that the peace-keeping endeavours of the United Nations were in every sense the collective responsibility of its members. From that date onward, Canada had been heavily involved in efforts to place peace-keeping financing on an equitable collective basis, and to prepare the ground for agreed long-term arrangements to replace the less-than-satisfactory *ad hoc* methods which were annually resorted to in order to keep first UNEF, then ONUC and finally UNFICYP in being. At Canadian urging, the right of the General Assembly to levy assessments for UNEF and ONUC had been referred to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion and that right upheld. In the fourth special session of the Assembly (1963), Canada had been active in drafting the guidelines for future financial arrangements and in working out new formulae for financing UNEF and ONUC on a collective basis.

In all these negotiations, the constant Canadian objective was to ensure that the United Nations would be equipped with sufficient funds to enable it to fulfil effectively its Charter responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. To secure this, Canada pressed for the development and general acceptance of long-term financing arrangements, including a special scale of assessments for peace keeping that would be based on the principles of collective responsibility and relative capacity to pay. Collective responsibility was not, to Canada, an end in itself; rather, it seemed the most effective way of ensuring that the funds would be made available when the membership agreed that United Nations action had to be taken. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs was to point out at the nineteenth session: