

The principal panellists for the discussion were Paavo Vayrynen, Foreign Minister of Finland; Helmut Schafer, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs, Germany; and Brian Atwood, President of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs in Washington.

I recognized that the request for me to serve as chairman of the debate was to many of the Europeans present only an instinctive gesture toward a citizen from a country with a well known tradition of peacekeeping. For me, personally, it was not only a honour but a deeply felt challenge.

As I prepared my notes for the occasion, it became a cause for deep reflection on the kind of country I know Canada to be. Those reflections were especially relevant as I consider the historic events of today.

Among other things, I asked myself why it was that Canada had developed a national facility for international peacekeeping — in fact, a pathfinder role. I did so with the very conscious memory of a remarkable Canadian who was the first mentor to some honourable senators still in this chamber, a man I had the honour to know personally, the Right Honourable Lester B. Pearson.

Mr. Pearson carved out a multilateralist identity for Canada. As President of the United Nations, he made that body a principal pillar upon which Canada's foreign and defence policies were conceived. It was Mike Pearson who was the architect of the first United Nations peacekeeping mission to Suez in 1956 and who later was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts.

Mr. Pearson, better than anyone I know, understood the accidents of geography and of history. Canada was thrust between the superpowers at the northern end of the world. This meant an important lesson, one common to all glacial states—that security had a broad and multi-faceted meaning. It meant that Canada was, as John Holmes once said, a country without a region. In fact, our region was the world. As a middle power, we would concentrate our effectiveness at the margins, as Mr. Pearson was fond of saying, for it was at the margins of the world where peace would be conceived.

If there are many roads to peace, our polar preoccupation ensured that we explore as many as our national capabilities would allow. Our polar preoccupation ensured that we would, indeed, be pathfinders in this area.

Many a fine Canadian soldier-diplomat explored those roads. Major-General Lewis Mackenzie returned recently from one of them, a horrifying road into a place called Sarajevo, a road that many of my congress colleagues in Germany last week had travelled themselves.

Lewis Mackenzie is a Nova Scotian by birth. To me, it is worth noting that part of his education was attained in my home area at Xavier College, now the University College of Cape Breton.

In a meeting I had with General Mackenzie shortly after his return, the world's best known peacekeeper noted that every country in trouble has taken down the Canadian telephone

number and is saying, "Hey, we would like you to come and help out here, too."

And I remembered thinking at the time, well, when we pick up the phone, we had better have a good understanding of the implications.

I do not think I have to tell honourable senators about the broad meaning and the nature of threats to security in our decade. Third World poverty is a threat to security. We cannot hide, as global citizens, from the disease, misery and environmental refugees of the other side of the world.

Our traditional notions of the military threat are now surrounded by the new marauding forces of our time—the forces of hypernationalism, of hatred, of the proliferation of weapons. They are the apocalyptic destroyers of whole societies. They feed upon each other with a frightening congeniality.

We presently watch the destruction of Somalia. We watch as former Yugoslavia collapses with a terrible ferocity. We want to pretend that this is our brother's problem. But the phone is ringing. Canada has been her brother's peacekeeper many times in the past. Our telephone number is well known. Many will say to us, as General Mackenzie pointed out, "Hey, we would like you to come here and help out". And there will be desperation in the tone of that call.

And when we answer the phone, we had better understand the implications. The international community now hovers on the realization that circumstances may entail the use of force to save lives. Canadians may be asked to assist in the rebuilding of whole societies where even essential civil infrastructures have ceased to exist.

While in Germany I had a strong sense of what that kind of building would entail. Perhaps the fact that the congress was held in Mainz—a city nearly entirely rebuilt after allied bombings in World War II—contributed to my appreciation of the enormity of the task.

I do not presume to tell honourable senators what they already know—that devastation on the other side of the world means that we can expect many more of our brothers to ask us to be their peacemakers.

When, therefore, as Canadians, we pick up the phone, we must be prepared to anticipate the full significance of the request, because peacemaking may be an even more formidable task in the future. It may include the rebuilding of stable communities. It may include the negotiation of assurances that minority groups will not be destroyed. It may, among many other tasks, include assistance for refugee protection and famine relief.

Evidently, we need to think about the implications before we even answer the phone. We have to, as Canadians, ask ourselves a lot of important questions.

We know the burdens on our soldier-diplomats will be even more formidable in the future. Are we ready to commit the resources to sustain new roles of peacemaking? Are we prepared to train them to cope with the prerequisite demands that a broad-based definition of security entails? Do we, as