

What further practical steps can be taken by this body and by its individual members to reinforce the capacity of the organization to keep the peace? Last year the Secretary-General, in the introduction to his annual report proposed a study of advanced planning of peace-keeping operations. No action has been possible on this proposal, but I would hope that the organization will be able to come to grips with this problem in the months ahead.

As we all know, a small number of countries have earmarked military units for United Nations service, but without central planning and without additional offers, the effectiveness of such measures is necessarily limited. Canada continues to believe that the earmarking of units with appropriate central co-ordination is a technique of value to our organization in its task of keeping the peace.

But peace keeping by itself is not enough. Peace building is even more important. The Charter outlines a whole range of procedures for use in achieving the pacific settlement of disputes. The British Government has inscribed an item on this subject and I wish to record the readiness of my Government to collaborate in studies to develop this important aspect of the activities of this organization.

But machinery for peaceful settlement will be of no avail unless governments are determined to make use of it when disputes arise. The time has come to ensure that peace keeping is intimately linked with peaceful settlement. The former, essential as it is, should not be permitted to obscure or divert the purposes of the latter. The precedent of providing for mediation at the same time as for the dispatch of a force, on the model of the first Security Council resolution on Cyprus, is a good one. But it is important that the related measures aimed at achieving a political settlement be vigorously pursued. The parties to a dispute should not expect to enjoy the benefits of United Nations intervention without accepting responsibility to settle their differences and thus facilitate the earliest possible termination of peace-keeping measures.

Mr. Gromyko spoke of disarmament. I should like to say something about this matter likewise. Turning from peace keeping, I think it is to be recognized that this is another field of the greatest importance. We are all agreed in this room that general and complete disarmament is the goal we must reach in order to have a secure and peaceful world. This goal was spelled out in a resolution adopted by the United Nations in 1959. It remains our goal, notwithstanding the measure of the limited achievements of our discussion. We have tried over the years to make progress. When agreement on general disarmament eluded us, we turned our attention to collateral measures. We have come to recognize that, while we have been exploring this path, the underlying peril has been growing. Nuclear weapons are now in the possession not of one power or two, but five, and many other governments are acknowledged to have the capacity to make them.

The Secretary-General, in his report of September 20, has described the spread of nuclear weapons as the most urgent question of the present time. He has urged that it should remain at the very top of the disarmament agenda. My Government fully supports this judgement. Although it has the capacity, it has not engaged in the building of nuclear weapons.