

be some agreement on the blueprints or master texts of peacekeeping procedures, these to be moulded to fit the individual circumstances of each operation. Even this measure of agreement has proved to be more difficult to accomplish than we expected 10 years ago.

I want to emphasize as well the importance of establishing clearly the terms of reference or mandate of a peacekeeping force or observer mission before it is authorized to begin its work. The degree of clarity of such terms of reference will depend to a large extent upon the degree of political consensus which prevails amongst the parties to the dispute and the other governments concerned. This will usually depend in turn on the nature of the dispute or situation. If the situation involves internal disorder it will be very difficult to lay down a clear-cut mandate. There will be other kinds of situations where the degree of consensus existing in the Council is so fragile that nothing can be agreed other than a general instruction to prevent conflict or to supervise a truce.

It may be that it will be clearly preferable for the U.N. to intervene in these circumstances than for some other organization or government to do so without reference to the U.N. We may have to accept that the Force Commander and the Secretary-General will have little guidance. However, we should only come to this conclusion, I believe, after having accepted the risk that inadequate terms of reference might do serious harm to the prestige of the U.N. and to its future effectiveness. There will be no easy answers. But the Canadian Government will be bound to give more searching examination to requests for assistance if it is not satisfied that the mandate provides sufficient guidance for the conduct of the troops on the ground.