

reciprocal, global and indivisible. But if this is what *détente* means, we intend to ensure that it rests on a firm foundation of deterrence.

### **Disarmament**

...It is clear that we shall not be able to increase confidence in the political sphere as long as the build-up of arms continues unabated. Political *détente* and the deceleration of the arms race are inseparable. Confidence created by each has a mutually reinforcing impact on the other.

Looking at the Final Act, we find that its provisions regarding questions of improving military security are modest. Nonetheless, the confidence-building measures instituted 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....

### **Economic co-operation**

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.... 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.

...The emphasis that Canada places on the principle of human rights and its application in humanitarian co-operation between participating states is not a distortion of the balance of the Final Act. The mutual confidence that that document was intended to impart to our relations is basically to build confidence between people. I must note, with great sadness, however, that since the Final Act was signed, people have been harassed, arrested, tried, exiled and imprisoned, simply for trying to monitor and to exercise their rights, endorsed in the act. This persecution is inevitably a major cause of friction in East-West relations today.

Although human rights are open to varying interpretations, the Final Act requires agreement on certain concepts and on the "inherent dignity of the human person". We have subscribed to common standards of human rights behaviour in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant international covenants. I believe, then, that it is correct and important to urge all participating states to bring their human rights practices into line with the norms to which they have freely subscribed in these agreements....

### **Family reunification**

Since the Final Act was signed, the movement of people between East and West has become more open and, in our rela-

tions with some of the participating states, there have been gratifying advances in family reunification and visits. But, there remain outstanding cases and problems which basically are of two orders: on the one hand, there are administrative barriers, such as the multiplicity of authorities with which individuals and our embassies must deal regarding travel for family reasons. Such problems can be overcome by making practical changes.

On the other hand, there is the far more vexing problem of complications over the status of sponsors for family reunification and family visits. In rejecting pleas to co-operate in overcoming this problem, some of the participating states adduce Principle VI on non-intervention in internal affairs. But this principle pertains to illegal interventions, exercised by coercion. It is not intended to apply to obligations established by international agreements such as the human rights covenants.

While the participating states agreed in the Final Act not to intervene in matters falling within each other's jurisdiction, it is clear that human rights such as the right to leave one's country and return freely, take precedence over domestic jurisdiction. Moreover, while we agreed in the Final Act to respect each other's right to determine laws and regulations, we also agreed that in exercising this right we would conform with our legal obligations under international law. Therefore, I am clearly on firm ground in maintaining that the laws and regulations of the participating states on the application of human rights, such as the right to leave one's country, must conform with international obligations....

It should be recognized that there is an ideological dimension involved. The systems and institutions or, in other words, the ideology of many of the participating states is based, in great part, on the conviction of the rights of the individual and the rule of law, which is deeply rooted in the history of our societies. In the past we have argued in favour of ideological *détente*. The principles of the Final Act embody relevant and essential concepts: ideological pluralism; ideological non-intervention; freedom of ideological choice; and access to ideological information (that is, the freer flow of ideas). We believe that acceptance of these concepts, both in theory and in practice, is essential to the pursuit of *détente*....