

each member government will decide in its own interest that the importance of maintaining the United Nations as an effective organization for peace and security outweighs other considerations which may previously have seemed to be of overriding importance.

In this connection, it is perhaps useful to recall the deliberations in the Working Group a year ago which resulted in the adoption of Resolution 1874 at the fourth special session of the United Nations General Assembly. This resolution contains certain features which my Delegation, for one, considered to be unwise but which we accepted because we believed that, even with these features, it represented an important and constructive forward step in our search for a new modus vivendi. Conversely, the Canadian Government concluded that the consequences of failure to reach agreement were far more objectionable than any of the paragraphs in the resolution which it didn't like.

Basic to the search for a new modus vivendi, in the view of my Delegation, is recognition of the fact that we are in what Ambassador Stevenson recently referred to as the period of "limited peace, cease-fire and peaceful change". The Charter has the capacity and flexibility to cope with these changing circumstances if we will only allow it to do so. In particular, we must recognize that the United Nations' use of the military forces of its member states has not been as an ultimate sanction against an aggressor but rather as an extension of the United Nations presence interposed with the agreement, and often at the request, of the parties to a dispute in order to further the peaceful resolution of their differences.

In making the case for a viable and constantly-evolving United Nations, adapting itself to the needs of the times, we do not intend to ignore or detract from the provisions of the Charter. In particular, we believe that all member states subscribe without reservation to the statement of the functions and powers of the Security Council contained in Articles 24 to 26 of the Charter and to the conference on the Security Council of primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In our view, however, the corollary of these provisions is that the Council has a responsibility to address itself effectively to the tasks assigned to it and the requirement for great-power agreement must not result in impotence when constructive action is imperative. If this responsibility is met, there will be no occasion for the Assembly to concern itself with specific disputes or situations unless requested by the Security Council to do so in accordance with Article 12 of the Charter.

The fact that the United Nations General Assembly has conferred on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security does not absolve the whole membership of the organization of its collective responsibility to support the actions of the Council. This obligation applies particularly to the financing of duly authorized peace-keeping operations. The provision of peace forces, just like the services of a fire brigade, should be available without limitation by reason of the lack of ability of the disputants to pay. The maintenance of peace is in the interests of the international community and that community must, therefore, be prepared to supplement to the extent required the resources of those directly concerned.

My Delegation cannot subscribe to the view expressed by a speaker at our last meeting that our Working Group faced no problems. My Government has just recently decided to continue to contribute to UNFICYP, following the very recent unanimous decision of the Security Council to continue the force in being. This was not a decision which was easy for the Canadian Government to take. As members of the Working Group will be aware, the Canadian Government has undertaken to cover the full cost of the Canadian contribution to UNFICYP. Canada's contribution in monetary terms alone will therefore amount to several million dollars. While a country which has not contributed financially to any major peace-keeping operations and has recently ceased covering its share of the cost of observation missions may perhaps take the view that present