

The financing of peace-keeping operations has been a continuing problem, climaxed by the deadlock which prevented the nineteenth session of the Assembly from functioning normally. We have concluded from that experience that collective responsibility for financing, even on the basis of a special assessment-scale which would take into account the economic capacities of member states and other relevant considerations, is not a principle which, in present circumstances, will be enforced by the Assembly. It is naturally in the interests of the countries which contribute contingents to UN forces that the costs of these contingents should be equitably shared by all, and there is no doubt in our minds that collective assessment based on a special scale is the most equitable method of meeting peace-keeping costs. It is now apparent, however, that such a method of financing will not be enforceable unless the Security Council so decides. What we should hope is that the Council would, in fact, decide on this method in most cases. If no agreement can be reached in the Council on that basis, then the next most satisfactory method of financing, if conditions permit, is for the parties to the dispute to pay the costs. Voluntary contributions may always be solicited as an extra source of funds, where the expenses are heavy and the parties are unable to meet them. But, in that case, the members of the Council, and particularly the permanent members, should be the first, in my view, to contribute their share. The permanent members cannot reasonably claim a preponderant voice in decisions to keep the peace if they will not help finance operations which they have authorized.

The final conclusion I should like to draw from Canadian experience with peace keeping is that there is a very delicate balance between the requirements for efficiency and neutrality. In general, I should say, the more candidates for peace keeping the better, even though this may mean some loss of efficiency. Over 40 UN members have participated in one or more peace-keeping operations. I should hope that this number could be substantially increased. It is disappointing that only a few have informed the UN of the kinds of force or service they might be able to provide if requested to do so. Peace keeping ought not to be the business of any one group or of those who can best contribute the facilities and services required. Only when UN forces represent a wide spectrum of the UN membership can we be hopeful that the necessary political support will be forthcoming. All member states should be equally eligible, with two qualifications: the great powers should not usually be asked to participate nor should states with a direct or particular interest in the dispute or situation. Peace keeping, after all, is not only a method of preventing or stopping conflict; it is an international experiment from which the peace-keepers themselves have much to learn and which could be a forcing-house for international military co-operation with immense long-term benefits for world security.

I have spoken of the past and drawn some conclusions which point to the future. Let me now be more specific about how we might improve the UN's capacity to keep the peace. At the last session of the General Assembly Canada co-sponsored a resolution which called for the adoption of a special scale for the financing of peace-keeping operations involving heavy expenditures, and recommended to the Security Council that it authorize a study of the methods of improving preparations for peace keeping. The resolution also invited member states to communicate information to the UN about their own plans and capabilities.