

---

We must select those areas where first of all it is important to us that we make our presence known and express our views, but also in those places where we have some (a phrase used in the language of diplomacy) leverage. In the case of the Middle East, that leverage comes from two sources; actually, in the last analysis, they reduce themselves to one. We are generally accepted as being balanced observers. We have not committed ourselves so strongly to one side or the other as to have lost our effectiveness in terms of talking to them as friends. That stems from the fact that we have, of course, been the Number One peacekeeping country in the world. I make reference to that because it is again a rather central point of Canada's foreign policy. On many occasions over the years the question has been asked: Is this an appropriate role for Canada? It has been re-examined on a number of occasions, and each time the conclusion has been that it is something that not only fits our capabilities as Canadians but it is something that also fits our character as Canadians. I think it is the sort of thing that gives satisfaction to the people of this country to know that we can reinforce our commitments to peace and security in the world by making our troops, our servicemen, available — not for aggressive purposes but to preserve stability in troubled regions. The "comeback" has been that we are highly respected — in the Middle East for example and in other areas where our reputation as peacekeepers is very well known. It is my view that we should continue with this emphasis.

Many have asked me in recent weeks what we would do in peacekeeping terms in Rhodesia or some of the other Southern Africa situations. My response to them would be that, as a general principle, Canada should be prepared to participate in any peacekeeping activity that may be called for. What we must also discern before committing ourselves to that kind of activity is whether it is going to be effective, so that we won't find ourselves in Rhodesia, for example, in a situation where we should be the buffer between whites and blacks. That is not a situation that I contemplate with any enthusiasm and I have made that view known to the Secretary-General of the United Nations — also to the Foreign Minister of Britain, Mr Owen, and to others who have asked me about Canada's intentions. But, if the structure of a peacekeeping organization either for Rhodesia or for Namibia is one that we believe that Canada can participate in effectively, I am prepared to say that we should certainly look at it in a reasonable light.

Having said that, I believe it is also important, harking back to my earlier comments about the UN, to have a clearer and more precise mandate for peacekeeping from the organization as a whole. As things stand at the moment, it is always difficult, and one could even say "messy", when one looks at history, to get a commitment for a force to go into a particular area, or even to get a commitment that something should be done in a particular area. We have been urging for some time not only that the United Nations look at certain ground-rules that would govern the provision of peacekeeping forces but also that we have a formula that would permit the proper assessment of all the members of the United Nations to finance peacekeeping. The fact is that we have been in Cyprus for a great many years now. The problem is that there are still countries in the United Nations — and not merely underdeveloped countries — with a very real interest in keeping peace in Cyprus that have not, in fact, contributed to the financing for support of those forces. I must, in the presentation of our attitude on peacekeeping, ensure that, to put it crudely, we don't wind up being the "patsy" in

---