

President-elect Clinton has already given positive indications in this regard. However, the U.S. offer of facilities for training peacekeepers falls far short of meeting the UN's most pressing needs. The most important thing now is for the United States to pay its contribution. This is one of my priorities for discussion with the new Administration.

What makes the issue of resources more urgent than ever is the changing nature of peacekeeping missions. It is no longer simply a matter of intervening between two war-worn opponents. As we see in the case of Yugoslavia and Somalia, peacekeeping operations have become multidimensional. They may involve restoration of peace, humanitarian assistance, refugee relief, reconstruction of infrastructures, electoral logistics and the participation of electoral observers, and even the establishment of legal and political systems or institutions that make it possible to avoid the emergence of conditions that lead to conflicts.

In light of this new reality, it is perhaps more important than ever to review our traditional criteria for taking part in peacekeeping missions.

When I say that we must review our traditional criteria, I am not questioning the decisions that we have already made. Some people, including Mr. Axworthy, the Spokesperson for the Liberal Party, seem to suggest that our decisions regarding Yugoslavia and Somalia were made rashly and irresponsibly.

Nothing is more false or misleading. On the contrary, these decisions were made as a result of a detailed and systematic assessment.

We are not in Yugoslavia by accident. We are there because peace and security in Europe are essential to peace and security in Canada. We cannot overestimate what Europe means to Canada in terms of our political, economic and even environmental interests.

We are in Yugoslavia because our armed forces have assured us that they have the means to participate and the necessary expertise to make an important and constructive contribution. We are there because thousands of Canadians have urged us to help the UN in its efforts to provide humanitarian assistance to the victims of this terrible conflict. After all, the continued promotion of international peace and security is at the heart of our foreign policy.

Of what value are our declarations or positions taken in the UN and other international organizations such as the CSCE if we are not prepared to back up our words with concrete actions for the sake of peace and security?