

simultaneously. Peacekeeping forces contribute to the restoration or creation of conditions within which political settlements may become possible and meanwhile help prevent a deterioration in the situation. Our objective in supporting United Nations peacekeeping activities has been to buttress the ability of the organization to hold the ring while the parties to a dispute attempt to settle their differences. We have, however, always taken the position that the parties should meanwhile make every effort to reach a settlement. Instead of belittling peace-keeping because of the problems which United Nations forces have encountered (for example, in the Middle East), critics should devote their energies to suggesting ways to strengthen the UN's ability to discharge its primary responsibility for peace and security and to ensure that future UN forces will have better terms of reference for carrying out their mandate.

Canada has not simply been playing a passive role in the peacekeeping field. From the creation of the first force, Canada has made a concrete contribution by participating in most peacekeeping operations. We have also sought whenever possible to promote movement by the parties towards a settlement.

I am convinced that Canadians want us to go on making a contribution to UN peace-keeping in spite of the undoubted difficulties - and certainly in spite of the claim of one observer recently that peace-keeping is a "vestigial" Canadian interest. To my mind, far from being "vestigial", peace-keeping is a forward-looking idea, which has proved its usefulness. This is certainly not the time to turn away from the United Nations and back to international conditions as they existed earlier in this century.

When new peacekeeping forces are required (and one does not have to be a prophet to predict that crises will arise in future), I am sure that Canadians will wish the Government to be ready to respond, if we are requested to participate and if the decision of the Security Council makes it feasible and appropriate for us to do so.

Recently, one observer of our external relations thought that Canada should, as a new direction, assign a high priority to disarmament and non-proliferation. I was amazed not at the goals themselves but at the idea that anyone could suggest that Canada has not attached fundamental importance to these goals. Canada is dedicated to the goal of general and complete disarmament and we have participated actively in every international disarmament forum and in every disarmament effort since the Second World War in attempting to achieve that end. Despite political impediments, some progress has been made in the initial steps of limiting armaments - for example, through the Partial Test Ban Treaty and the Outer Space Treaty. Canada played an active part in the achievement of both these international accords and was among the first signatories. On the proliferation of nuclear weapons, we have not only refused to develop these weapons ourselves but have contributed to the discussions that have, just two days ago, resulted in the tabling of a non-proliferation treaty in the Geneva disarmament talks. In the future, as in the past, we shall pursue every possible avenue to reach agreement on the reduction and eventual abolition of armaments.

In China today, we see anarchy and xenophobia, the source of which seems to be more the product of purely Chinese facts than of pressures or attitudes outside China's borders. Whatever the cause of current conditions, however, the task of learning to live with the Chinese has become more difficult. It is