operations; that its objectives were "directly connected with the general course of certain powers aimed at using the United Nations in their special interests"; and that it envisaged the "creation of a military apparatus on a collective basis by a number of states members of military blocs with the aim of conducting military operations in the interests of this group of states under the cover of the United Nations flag". I have had occasion to deny those allegations before and I do so again this evening. They completely distort the intentions of the Canadian Government as sponsor of the conference and they impugn the good faith of those who accepted our invitation.

Although this was an informal, working-level conference, involving neither collective action nor collective commitments, I think the discussions fully justified our decision to convene it. If I were asked to summarize the results of the conference, I would say that it has achieved three things:

First, it has helped to clarify and focus the appreciation of delegations of the practical problems involved in peace keeping;

second, it has done something to improve the capacity of the participating countries to respond more rationally and more effectively to future appeals by the United Nations; and

third, I am hopeful that the conference will have been instrumental in creating more understanding climate for the conduct of peace-keeping operations in the future.

There is no doubt in my mind that there will continue to be a need for peace-keeping operations. I say this in no spirit of pessimism or misanthropy but because our generation has witnessed great political and sociological changes which will take time to work themselves out and which cannot be counted upon to do so without some element of upheaval. I also regard peace keeping as part of the process by which the members of the international community have tended, over the past two decades, to organize their activities increasingly on a world basis. The focus of many of these activities has been the United Nations, and it is right and proper that the United Nations should also be the focus of our preoccupations with the problem of world peace. I am encouraged to think that the readiness with which countries have been prepared to call upon the United Nations to keep the peace is evidence of the extent to which that view is already shared. And finally there is the more distant prospect of a disarmed world. I need not remind you that both major parties to the disarmament negotiations have accepted the need for a United Nations peace force at that final stage of the disarmament process. As the joint statement of agreed principles to which they subscribed in 1961 puts it, such a force should be able to ensure that the United Nations "can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations". If that is a distant prospect, it does not diminish the current and crucial importance of strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to keep the peace. Only if this is done can we be sure that we are coming within reach of a more rationally ordered world society, which is itself a condition of a world without arms.

S/C