

But, I cannot give any commitment. The mandate of the United Nations force has been renewed to June. There will likely be a further request for the renewal of that mandate until December. It could be there for a long time.

The United Nations Force in the Gaza Strip has been there for over eleven years. It costs us about \$ $\frac{3}{4}$  million a year to maintain that force. But, I firmly believe that difficult as that burden is for certain countries that are willing—countries like Canada—I would sooner see that kind of expenditure through the United Nations than the kind of expenditure that would be occasioned if instead of a controlled peace we had war with all of its consequences.

Senator O'LEARY (*Carleton*): You are telling us, as I understand it, that the largest part of this United Nations force in Cyprus—that is, the Canadian force—is paid for entirely by Canada?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: Except for Britain that is substantially right.

Senator O'LEARY (*Carleton*): And that in respect of the Irish contribution, or the Scandinavian contribution, only 40 nations out of more than 100 in the United Nations pay a share?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: That is right, I regret to say.

Senator O'LEARY (*Carleton*): Well, it is called a United Nations force, and apparently the request for the continuation of Canadian forces on that island will come from the United Nations which is paying nothing at all towards it?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: That is the regrettable situation. We have now before the United Nations a resolution that calls for a rectification of that problem. But, I regret to say that at this stage of international development not enough nations in the United Nations have taken the view of collective responsibility as has Canada, as has Britain, and as have all the Scandinavian countries, or most of the smaller countries. That is the situation.

We have the alternative of saying: "Well, if you will not play ball, we are not going to play ball." I do not believe that is the way to build up an international organization. I do not believe that is the way to make a contribution. We firmly believe in the peace-keeping concept. We have participated in every peace-keeping project of the United Nations. I think that our contribution has been a notable one, and one of which we should be proud. I regret, however, that the process of internationalization has not reached our judgment of what the situation should be, but I have no doubt that it will.

Senator O'LEARY (*Carleton*): Well, sir, do we try to impress on U Thant for example, and on the United Nations that this situation is almost intolerable?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: We certainly do. Everything I have already said—

Senator O'LEARY (*Carleton*): What is his response in a case like that?

Hon. Mr. MARTIN: We have a resolution now before the United Nations calling for a program of collective financial responsibility. There is a dispute between two of the great powers and the smaller powers—the General Assembly—the Soviet Union and France take the position that only the Security Council can establish a peace force; only the Security Council can establish the financial arrangements to be borne by the members of the United Nations. This is part of the stumbling block. Canada, the United States, Britain, Ireland, and a number of other countries, take the view that while under the charter of the United Nations the primary responsibility for establishing a peace force rests with the Security Council this does not mean that in situations where the Security Council will not act that the General Assembly should not have the right to initiate a peace-keeping project.

It is this difference between these two powers and ourselves and other countries that is part of the problem. It is not the whole problem. Last year a committee of 33 nations was set up. They are now trying to reconcile these