

many UN votes in the years to come. The Canadian delegations to future sessions will have a prominent part to play in reforming and strengthening the UN and the multilateral system in general as a major and continuing foreign-policy objective. We must use the opportunity that presents itself, since there is a real possibility that, with all the strains to which it has been exposed, the UN system may now be at the point where improvements can be introduced.

No review of the thirtieth session would be complete without reference to the role played by U.S. Permanent Representative Daniel Patrick Moynihan. American political caricaturists have portrayed Mr. Moynihan in roles ranging from King Lear and Savonarola to Wyatt Earp. The success of Mr. Moynihan's tactics in the UN forum may long be questioned, but there is no doubt of their approval by the American public. "Fan mail" to the U.S. Ambassador reached 4,400 letters during one week of the session, reportedly a record for holders of his position. These letters suggest that his methods, however controversial, have in some measure restored the American public's confidence in the value of active U.S. participation in the UN. From this perspective at least, such a development will be viewed as welcome.

For the United Nations, 1975 was fairly typical of the 30 years of its existence as

an organization — another kaleidoscope of conflict and peacemaking, of advance and setback, agreement and disagreement, of serious concern with unresolved problems and satisfaction with the solution of others. Nevertheless, while the organization has enjoyed better years, it has also suffered far worse.

It is not expiring, and is, indeed, showing a resiliency for which few have given it credit. The signs of confrontation are worrisome, but the mere fact that the developing world is exercising its numerical strength in various UN bodies is indicative of a fundamental belief in the system provided for resolving disputes. It also suggests an implicit faith in its future. There are grounds, therefore, for some confidence that, with the experience of recent history in mind, the United Nations will again prove equal to present challenges and once again demonstrate that it is often most creative when it is in the most serious trouble. We sometimes forget how far the United Nations has already gone towards giving substance to its Charter, how it managed to survive the period of the Cold War and decolonization, and how it has succeeded, on the whole, in preventing the recurrence or spread of hostilities in many parts of the world, though long-term solutions for the underlying causes of these disputes have eluded it.

*United Nations
most creative
in times
of trouble*

Canadian aid policy

"What's in it for us?"

By Sheldon Gordon

For the past 25 years, the Canadian business community invariably has asked that question of Ottawa's foreign-aid program. And for the past 25 years it has generally been satisfied with the answer. Canadian business may not, however, be satisfied much longer.

The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is juggling its assistance priorities for the next five years, and the shift is likely to prove painful for a number of domestic suppliers and consultants who have been traditional beneficiaries. Moreover, CIDA will be an "in-house" proponent of Canadian Government concessions to the Third World on a wide range of trade, investment and monetary relations.

The Canadian response to demands for a "New International Economic Order" may far surpass in value the traditional forms of aid to developing countries. But it will also exact a measure of sacrifice to which both Canadian businesses and consumers have been unaccustomed, and for which they are as yet unprepared. Some segments of Canadian business may be

Mr. Gordon is a member of the Ottawa bureau of The Financial Post, and writes frequently about Canadian development assistance. He has an M.A. in international affairs from Carleton University, and was previously diplomatic correspondent in Ottawa for The Toronto Star. The views expressed are those of the author.