

formalism, bureaucracy and inflexibility that bedeviled some other international bodies. Now that the European security agenda was more tractable, an institutionalized CSCE could be useful, even necessary. Moreover, it would give Canada a permanent seat at the European table. The challenge was to define "institutionalization" in a way that steered clear of cumbersome bureaucratic machinery, avoided redundancy with existing bodies, and ensured the CSCE had ongoing relevance and vitality. As Clark said at Humber College: "The goal is concrete progress, not talkathons."

- In Canada's view, the basic elements of an institutionalized CSCE would be:
- annual meetings of CSCE foreign ministers and biennial meetings of heads of government, to provide continuing high-level political involvement and direction;
 - a CSCE Assembly, where parliamentary delegations from member states could meet on a regular basis to discuss issues of common concern;
 - an ongoing agenda of meetings in all three baskets; and
 - a small, permanent secretariat.

In the interests of effectiveness, Canada also raised the possibility that the CSCE might have to modify, "on a selective basis," its consensus decision-making rule.

Mechanisms for Crisis Prevention and Conflict Resolution

Even while celebrating the changes in Europe and hoping for prosperity and peace, Canada anticipated that the transition from despotism and centrally-planned economies to democracy and market-based economies would be difficult and likely to generate tensions and instability. It thus decided to make its priority within the CSCE the establishment of mechanisms to prevent and resolve conflict in the CSCE region.

The high-level political body -- meetings of foreign ministers or their designated representatives (called, in early Canadian documents, a "European Security Commission") -- would have the supervisory role in conflict prevention and a key role in conflict resolution. Canada proposed that the ministers should be supported by a small, permanent "Institute for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes," which would provide expertise in dispute settlement, facilitate communication between participating states, refine crisis prevention methods, and offer administrative support. In addition, Canada suggested the establishment of a separate CSCE "Verification Agency" to facilitate and coordinate verification and confidence-building activities mandated by the CFE and CSBM negotiations.

Canada also proposed the creation of a crisis prevention "mechanism," which could be invoked by any participating state or the Institute director and would take the form of a "crisis panel" composed of a representative from each state directly involved, a representative from a participating state jointly agreed by the states directly involved and a chairperson taken from a pre-established roster. The panel would facilitate dialogue among concerned parties, conduct fact-finding investigations and recommend a strategy to resolve the crisis -- be it mediation, arbitration or even (suggested Clark) peacekeeping.

If these failed to resolve the crisis and hostilities broke out, the "mechanism" would move into the conflict resolution phase. This would involve the immediate convening of a meeting of foreign ministers or their representatives to review the situation and recommend a course of action. Early Canadian proposals suggested amending the consensus principle such that states directly involved in the conflict would not participate in meetings where the course