

---

Canada will persist in underlining the importance of the humanitarian objectives for CSCE and *détente* which we, together with like-minded delegations, tried to advance here at Belgrade. We stand by the approach to *détente* that we took at the outset of the meeting. In our view, it is fundamental that the individual have a central role in the furtherance of *détente*. Its benefits must be passed along to the individual, so as to give him the widest possible opportunity for living in a safe and humane world, and for enjoying economic security, cultural enrichment and normal human relations.

We were charged by the Final Act to give consideration to the development of the process of *détente* in the future. Since the results of the Belgrade meeting are less than we thought possible or desirable, it is almost inevitable that there will be scepticism about the value of the CSCE process, or even conceivably about *détente* itself. In the view of Canadians (and this probably is true of citizens of many of the other participating states), *détente* does not have an independent existence. The public will weigh the reality of *détente* on the basis of results. We suspect, in view of the high expectations of our public, that it will be a source of disappointment in Canada that the ideas we hold to be so fundamental and have advanced so persistently and strongly have not been reflected in the document because of this meeting's inability to achieve consensus. However, we reaffirm our continuing commitment to these ideas and values.

I should, therefore, urge all delegations to give serious thought to what the meeting that has just taken place may mean for the broader process of *détente* and the CSCE. Some may argue that *détente* will not be much affected by this meeting or by public opinion. To some this may be a comforting thought, but they should not take it to be a foregone conclusion. The CSCE is not incidental to *détente*. On the contrary, it is a major international effort focusing on the two vital and complementary aspects of *détente* — the pressing issues of security and the effort to map out a broad range of co-operative relations. To have been unable to record common views on these matters here in Belgrade is in itself a commentary on how little any of us can take *détente* for granted.

The Canadian Government, for its part, remains firmly attached to the policy of *détente*. But *détente*, by definition, is a two-way street. It will not exist simply because we say to ourselves that it must. If we want it to be a reality, we must make it a reality. The lesson of Belgrade must not go unlearned. But we must be sure that we understand what it is. That we have not succeeded in putting words on paper is unfortunate; but it is not the heart of the matter. The heart of the matter is that commitments freely undertaken at Helsinki are carried out in practice. For that we should not need verbal reminders; the language of the Final Act is clear. We did not come here to alter it, and its provisions remain an indispensable yardstick against which performance will be measured. At Madrid we shall have a clearer picture of where we stand. It will then be five years from the signature of the Final Act. Public opinion in our countries is not likely to grant us much of a further reprieve if we are not seen by then to have pursued the course we charted together at Helsinki with a greater sense of commitment and with greater imagination. Belgrade and Madrid may be important milestones on that course, but the real test of the CSCE lies in the com-

---