

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 would like to draw from Canadian experience with peacekeeping is that there is a very delicate balance between the requirements for efficiency and neutrality. In general, I would say, the more candidates for peacekeeping the better, even though this may mean some loss of efficiency. Over forty U.N. members have participated in one or more peacekeeping operations. I would hope that this number can be substantially increased. It is disappointing that only a few have informed the U.N. of the kinds of forces or services they might be able to provide if requested to do so. Peacekeeping ought not to be the business of any one group or of those who can best contribute the facilities and services required. Only when U.N. forces represent a wide spectrum of the U.N. 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. Peacekeeping, after all, is not only a method of preventing or stopping conflict; it is an international experiment from which the peacekeepers 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 U.N.'s capacity to keep the peace. At the last session of the General Assembly