

By proceeding in this way, we shall be better able to measure the gap that still separates promise from performance. Only when that has been done can we seriously turn our attention to new proposals. We see such proposals as designed not to rewrite the Final Act, which is not within our mandate, but to deepen our collective commitment to its purposes and to improve the quality of our performance.

The Final Act is a balanced document. If it were not balanced, it would not have commanded the assent of the thirty-five countries assembled here. The Canadian Government, therefore, regards itself as being committed to all parts of the Final Act and it intends to see all parts implemented in equal measure.

But public opinion in Canada focusses unequally on the Final Act. It does so because the different parts of the Final Act are different in their relevance to the concerns and priorities of Canadians. And it does so because Canadians have their own perception of what a policy of détente, practiced conscientiously, should imply. In essence, Canadians will assess such a policy by one simple test and that is whether, as a consequence of supporting their government's policy of détente, they are living in a safer and more humane world. How does the course we charted at Helsinki stand up to such a test?

We are bound to admit that, in the matter of improving security, the provisions of the Final Act are modest. The modesty of our achievement was recognized at the time because there is no other chapter in the Final Act in which our heads of government gave us greater latitude for future progress. But modest or not, we should not under-rate the contribution that these confidence building measures can make to a more stable and predictable environment in an area which remains the greatest area of armed confrontation, that is, Central Europe. We have gained experience in the operation of these measures over the past two years. We are hopeful that, without going beyond the intent of the Final Act, we may be able to refine their application and broaden their practice.

The mandate which has been given to us is limited. But the fact that it is limited does not absolve us from looking beyond it. The Final Act, in the end, finds its place in the wider conspectus of détente. And if détente is a matter of increasing confidence, it is ultimately inconceivable that we can manage to increase confidence in the political realm while the arms race continues unabated. Political détente and a deceleration in the arms race must go hand in hand. The confidence created by each has a mutually reinforcing impact on the other. Insecurity like security is indivisible.