

for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

In addition, the EC had floated the idea of changing the CSCE process to incorporate voting and decision-making by qualified majority. Although Canada had supported steps to move away from consensus in certain defined cases (e.g. CSO emergency meetings, "consensus-minus-one" in the human dimension), it was reluctant to support radical modifications to the CSCE's consensus rule. Canada believed that the process of trying to reach consensus was a useful exercise in itself, especially for the new democracies of East and Central Europe and Central Asia, which were unaccustomed to compromise and multilateral diplomacy. Moving to a voting mechanism would make it too easy to override those countries, thus alienating them from the CSCE process. In Canada's view, consensus led to stronger decisions and brought countries up to higher common standards, rather than leading to the lowest common denominator. Until there was a greater degree of commonality in participating states' respect for human rights and degree of democratic development, Canada thought it best to leave the consensus rule unmodified, other than when clearly necessary to improve the CSCE's conflict management ability.

The Stockholm Council

At the Council meeting held in Stockholm on December 14-15, 1992, Ministers dealt both with conflict management and with restructuring issues. In the area of conflict management, they adopted the recommendations of the Geneva meeting on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. They tasked the CPC with taking rapid steps to strengthen its support for CSCE preventive diplomacy missions and peacekeeping activities. They also appointed the ex-Foreign Minister of the Netherlands, Max Van Der Stoel, to the post of High Commissioner on National Minorities. In addition, they expressed their intention to strengthen cooperation with other organizations, in particular to increase coordination with the UN.

On restructuring, Ministers established the post of Secretary General to act as the representative of the Chairman-In-Office as well as the CSCE's chief administrative officer. They also instructed representatives of the participating states to meet regularly in Vienna between sessions of the CSO. In addition, they tasked the CSO with conducting a wide-ranging review of CSCE structures and operations.

The Stockholm Document also incorporated a Canadian proposal for the Chairman-in-Office and a team of CSCE experts to undertake a tour of newly-admitted participating states. Of the then 52 CSCE countries, a relevant number was still not represented in Vienna and only at times at CSO meetings in Prague. Canada was concerned that this absenteeism hampered further discussion of topics that were important to the states in question (e.g. Nagorno-Karabakh); it also cast doubt on the validity of the CSCE decision-making process. In making the tour, which began in April 1993, the Chairman-in-Office could engage these states, explain the CSCE to them, hear their concerns and answer their questions. Also with the aim of encouraging full participation, Canada contributed funds for newly admitted states to attend various experts meetings and conferences.

The Rome Council

The Rome Council meeting, held November 30-December 1, 1993, dealt with three