

arrangements to meet each situation as it arises. Some countries, it is true, have set aside standby units within their regular forces, or separately recruited, to be available for service with the United Nations if required. This, has, I am sure, been helpful to the United Nations and will do something to mitigate the need for improvisation which has tended to characterize past peace-keeping operations and for which the United Nations has -- quite unjustly -- been criticized in some quarters. The fact is, nevertheless, that forces still have to be assembled at short notice, that these forces reflect differences not only in language and tradition but also in training, equipment and staff procedures, and that they have to be welded into an effective peace-keeping force under difficult and often delicate conditions in the field.

This is a problem which is not capable of any simple or immediate solution. As I have tried to suggest, no two peace-keeping operations have been exactly alike. By the same token, it may well be difficult to devise a method of planning that would take account of all situations calling for the employment of a United Nations force. Nevertheless, it seemed to us that there had been a good deal of experience accumulated in past peace-keeping operations and that there might be some value in correlating that experience and turning it to good account.

It was with that object in mind that the Canadian Government took the initiative in convening the conference which met in Ottawa from November 2 to 6. It was attended by representatives from 22 out of the 28 countries invited, most of them military officers. Major General Rikhye, the Secretary-General's military adviser, attended as an observer. May I say that I was much impressed by the high quality of those who were delegated to represent their governments at the conference. I took this as evidence of the importance which was attached to the conference by all participants.

The purposes of the conference have been much misrepresented in certain quarters. It was convened essentially to enable countries with experience in United Nations peace-keeping operations to compare notes, to identify and survey the technical problems that have been encountered, to pool our experience in meeting those problems and to see how, individually, we might improve our response to the United Nations in future situations requiring the services of an international force. There was no attempt made by the conference to reach formal conclusions or to chart any forward course of collective action. There was, likewise, no attempt by the conference to consider questions relating to the authorization, control or financing of peace-keeping forces. The conference recognized that these were questions belonging properly within the jurisdiction of the United Nations itself. And, finally, I want to make it quite clear that the conference did not discuss the earmarking of standby forces for United Nations service, though I have no doubt that the experience of those who have done so should be helpful to others who may decide to adopt such a course at some future time.

In making these observations I am concerned to put the conference in proper perspective. I am also concerned to deny allegations made in a Soviet memorandum which was conveyed to me on the eve of the conference. That memorandum alleged that the conference was designed to consider the earmarking of special military contingents for participation in United Nations peace-keeping