

offers Canada many direct benefits: a 12-mile territorial sea; a 200-mile exclusive economic zone; exclusive jurisdiction over the continental shelf, even when it extends beyond 200 miles; and environmental protection provisions particularly in ice-covered waters. Clearly this UN convention has been a central element in the promotion of Canada's national interests.

As a second example I take the International Atomic Energy Agency. The IAEA acts as the inspection agency in applying internationally-accepted safeguards on the sale of nuclear material and technology. For Canada to provide equivalent bilateral coverage for its nuclear exports would not only be prohibitively complicated from a technical and political point of view but also enormously expensive.

A third example is food aid. The Canadian development assistance program includes the provision of food aid which is valued at about \$325 million in 1983-84. Roughly 40 per cent of this is channelled through the World Food Program. This UN program not only produces developmental returns to the recipient country it generates valuable income for Canadian farmers and fishermen.

Moving to the broader questions about the role and functioning of the UN — what is wrong and what can be done to correct it — we must first recognize the sources of disillusionment. Many of these are all too familiar: the intrusion of political controversy into the work of the Specialized Agencies; the effect of attempts to isolate Israel in the UN system; and the general malaise that has afflicted UN bodies as a result of increasingly complex and conflicting interests associated partly with a greatly expanded membership. If these frustrations continue to mount they could lead to the unravelling of the system we have so painstakingly constructed.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) provides a striking example. While we take for granted the coldly calculated approach of the USSR toward the UN system, we become very concerned when the United States displays an ambivalent attitude. We would not like to contemplate any important UN agency without the USA as an active member providing positive leadership. This is why, despite sharing much of its exasperation, that we would prefer the USA to stay within UNESCO and continue working vigorously with countries such as Canada, radically to improve UNESCO's performance. Canada is determined, in working from within, to get UNESCO back to the priorities of its mandate: education, culture and science, that are of value to Canadians.

Our response is not simply an act of faith, an ingrained reflex from an earlier more positive era in UN diplomacy. It is based on a realistic analysis of what the UN is doing. Broadly speaking the main areas are peace and security and functional co-operation.

How well is the UN doing in the key area of peace and security? Not very, must be the answer. Wars rage in the Middle East. The occupation of Afghanistan and Kampuchea continues. A Caribbean island is invaded, and conflicts fester in Central America. Moreover, in recent years the Security Council has become increasingly paralyzed due to the unsatisfactory relationship between the two superpowers. This has resulted in some cases in the UN being deliberately bypassed on security issues. Clearly the UN has to do better on high profile peace and security issues if it is to gain maximum support in the international community and with our publics.