

in Helsinki can contribute to a more stable environment in Central Europe, the most acute area of potential armed confrontation.

The experience we have gained over the past five years with confidence-building measures has been positive. It encourages us to explore the suggestion in the Final Act that they could be developed and enlarged in order to strengthen confidence. The adoption of more developed and extended confidence-building measures could create an atmosphere of greater openness and stability in military affairs, which could be followed by the adoption of real disarmament measures and an agreement on the peaceful settlement of disputes and, ultimately, on a non-aggression pact. However, we maintain that, for confidence-building measures to play this role, they must be militarily significant, verifiable, reciprocally mandatory, and applicable throughout Europe from the Atlantic Ocean to the Ural Mountains. We believe that as long as these criteria prevail, a mandate could emerge from our meeting in Madrid for convening a subsequent meeting, perhaps at a high level, which would explore ways of developing and extending confidence-building measures and report back to the next CSCE follow-up meeting on the results of its work.

On questions of disarmament, I cannot over-emphasize the concrete aspect. We shall not make real progress through declarations of good faith or by trying to legislate intentions. We must come to grips with the real issue, that of military capabilities. In other words, we must limit the capacity to wage war.

Diverse  
opportunities  
for co-operation

Mr. Chairman, the Final Act offers many opportunities for greater co-operation in the field of economics, science and technology, and the environment. We acknowledged in the Final Act that co-operation in these fields can be developed on the basis of equality, mutual satisfaction and reciprocity. Over the coming weeks, reciprocity, a key element of *détente*, will be much in the minds of my delegation as we review implementation, particularly in commercial and scientific exchanges. We seek a solid basis on which to build and expand co-operation in the future.

The participating states, constituting as they do the largest part of the international industrial community, share grave responsibilities within the larger world system. We are faced with immense challenges. We must co-operate to meet them. We should seek a more rational allocation of resources, which would benefit not only the peoples of Europe and North America, but the developing world as well. We should work together in order to relieve the pressure that the rising aspirations of our peoples place on the limited capacity of our economies. We need to respond, within the limits of our abilities, to the legitimate demands of the countries of the Third World. We must solve the energy crisis and prevent the further depletion of other natural resources. We must protect and improve the environment. These problems require mutual collaboration in a spirit of confidence and reciprocal benefit because, in essence, they all deal with the well-being of people.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, I would submit that what the Final Act is all about, is people. Concern for disarmament, for peace, is really concern for our people. So are concerns which impinge more directly on individuals and communities. This assertion is not to arrogate any special priority. The emphasis that Canada places on the principle of

---