

there must be a clear, achievable mandate from a competent political authority like the Security Council; the parties to the conflict must undertake to respect a cease-fire and must accept the presence of the Canadian troops; the peacekeeping operation must undergird a process aimed at achieving a political settlement; the number of troops and the international composition of the operation must be suited to the mandate; the operation must be adequately funded and have a satisfactory logistical structure. In the past, the amount of risk incurred by our soldiers was rarely a problem. This is no longer the case; the risk factor has become an essential element in our decision-making.

Although these guidelines are still valid, the international setting in which peacekeeping operations occur has changed radically since 1989 and will, in my opinion, continue to change. I welcome the views of the House in this regard. In reviewing the course of history to date, it seems clear that peacekeeping operations have traditionally been launched when the parties to a conflict concluded that their purposes would no longer be served by the continuation of an armed conflict, but by a settlement negotiated with the aid of a third party. These operations were consequently deployed with the permission of the protagonists to monitor a cease-fire or the withdrawal of troops from disputed zones.

Then, in 1989-90, far more extensive operations were introduced, designed to assist the parties involved to put into effect a negotiated settlement to a conflict. In Cambodia, for example, the United Nations had the mandate of disarming the factions and establishing security throughout the country, repatriating refugees, ensuring respect for human rights, supervising the key ministries of the national government and organizing provisional elections. Thus, a very important civilian component was added to the traditional military presence.

A new concept, that of humanitarian intervention, was introduced in Bosnia and Somalia. Our soldiers were sent not to maintain a cease-fire or a peace that obviously did not exist; their mandate was to help get humanitarian convoys through. The example of Somalia shows that this type of intervention can have some very positive results. Despite the problems we hear about -- most of them centred on Mogadishu -- the humanitarian crisis has largely been surmounted in the rest of the country.

The United Nations Secretary-General has acknowledged this process of evolution in his *An Agenda for Peace*, which is based on the principle that conflict management requires a whole range of tools, one of which is peacekeeping. The international community's objectives have become more ambitious and include conflict prevention, consolidation or restoration of peace by