

other autonomous or semi-autonomous bodies, each with an internationally-recruited supporting staff. The total of the expenditures for the United Nations family met by assessments of the membership in 1948 was \$63.5 million. By 1965 it stood at nearly \$246 million. At present rates of increase, it will exceed \$500 million a year by 1972. In addition, these organizations are responsible for the direction and conduct of voluntary programmes, which in 1969 exceeded \$250 million and which are growing at about the same rate as the regular budgets. This means that it must be assumed that by 1972 the UN will be a billion-dollar-a-year business, with Canada contributing about \$40 million of this amount.

Both the budgetary levels and rates of growth of the UN organizations are highly controversial. The 26 so-called "developed" members, which collectively are called upon to provide between 85 and 90 per cent of the UN's resources, see the cost-spiral as symptomatic of unwelcome developments. These include resolutions drafted and approved by the majority without regard for the views of the small minority of members upon whom falls the main burden of the implementation; technical conferences and operational activities turned into political confrontations; an enormous increase in the number and length of conferences, all too many of which are concerned with repetitive and largely unproductive debates and uncritical approval or active encouragement of expanded activities by international secretariats without due regard to planning priorities or operational efficiency. Perhaps the most resented feature of rapid budget growth is that it includes an increasingly large "aid-component". Most developed countries support the thesis that the assessed budgets of the UN and its agencies should be limited to administrative costs and that aid programmes should be voluntarily financed. The erosion of this convention presents one of the most immediate and dangerous threats of destructive confrontation facing the UN today, because of the possibility that the great powers, which collectively are responsible for two-thirds of the assessed budgets, will arbitrarily impose limits on the size of their contributions or the purposes for which they may be used.

Canadians, as citizens of a developed country, instinctively share the desire to see a UN which can effectively conciliate disputes and bring peace by equitable compromise, which will have the capacity to set economic and social targets that impose tolerable burdens on contributors, which generates programmes that expand at a "reasonable" rate of growth, and which carries out its mandate by means of an efficient and impartial secretariat.

It is important, however, not to lose sight of the fact that there is another side to the controversy. As the 100 developing nations see it, the