

prosperity of the people of Cyprus -- the young and old, the farmers, the shepherds and the townsmen, who now go about in fear of their lives or, too often, cannot go about at all. At stake, too, are the peaceful relations of two great and historic countries -- Greece and Turkey -- and with them peace in the Eastern Mediterranean and the dread possibilities of war in that highly sensitive area. And in the ultimate analysis, at stake is the ability of the world community to organize itself so that we can put war behind us once and for all, and can put peace, order and justice in its place.

These are the real issues which we face in Cyprus. We face them together with an agreed objective, and that in itself is a great source of hope. But, for all its moral authority and good intentions, the United Nations, like any peaceful agent of order and justice, cannot be effective without some co-operation, some give and take, some effort to move forward, on the part of the peoples primarily concerned. We cannot and will not force them to a solution of their problems, but we appeal to them to help us to help them before it is too late.

Before concluding, I should like to turn to some more general aspects of the problem of peace keeping. The basic dilemma which we have to face is a large but simple one. On the one hand, governments and peoples generally accept the need for the United Nations and its central role as the keeper of the peace. Thus the organization is entrusted, especially in times of crisis, with great problems of incalculable importance and danger. On the other hand, we have not yet come to a stage where the necessary political or material support is regularly forthcoming which would enable the United Nations to meet these problems with the authority and the efficiency with which, for example, an effective national government meets its responsibilities on the national level. This fundamental dilemma not only puts a considerable strain upon the United Nations itself, but, on occasion, involves it in serious and understandable criticism or even hostility. It can also put a severe strain upon governments such as your own, which are determined to live up to their undertakings under the Charter and to support, by deeds as well as words, the United Nations in its endeavours to keep the peace.

It is obviously most desirable that this dilemma should be faced with a view to making the United Nations more effective and more able to serve its members and the peace of the world at large. At the same time, it would be naive to suppose that the obstacles to such progress can be easily or quickly surmounted. There is no short cut. Political, economic, constitutional and even psychological conditions and concepts of long standing are not changed overnight, nor is it desirable that they should be. There must be, therefore, a sound and gradual development of thought and action at the national and the international level, if, on this matter of peace keeping, we are to profit from the lessons of the past and plan and act for a more stable and happier future.

Your Prime Minister recently delivered a very thoughtful and constructive lecture in the Dag Hammarskjold Memorial Series, on the subject of increasing the strength and capacity of the United Nations to respond to the demands made of it. In that lecture he emphasized the necessity for preparation and planning in advance of United Nations peace-keeping operations, since the ideal solution of a permanent United Nations force is clearly not politically feasible at the present time. Canada was one of the first countries to earmark troops for United Nations service, and Mr. Pearson has made some most constructive suggestions for the further development and co-ordination of such stand-by forces, including consultations among the governments who have already earmarked such forces. I believe that consultation and co-operation among interested governments can be of much value in contributing to the improvement of the peace-keeping effectiveness of the United Nations.