

ideas and information between individuals particularly through the freer flow of printed material. For a country like Canada with its close links with Europe, this is a matter of direct and practical relevance. As Canada's Minister of State for Multiculturalism, I am particularly conscious of the degree to which events in Europe have found their way into the consciences of our nation and especially of that large portion of our population who trace their origins to Europe. In a freedom-loving society such as ours, questions of culture, religion and tradition are of fundamental importance and are to be respected along with civil and political rights.

We regret that our efforts to achieve a document of substance on these issues have been unavailing. We had hoped that in this important area, it might be possible to distil some understandings about how the provisions of the Final Act could be carried out more effectively and in a more routine way. Some may be made uncomfortable by a discussion of these humanitarian concerns but distaste for them will not make them go away. Certainly Canadian interest in them will not cease just because this meeting has ended. Our commitment to these goals will be vigorously maintained.

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 which we took at the outset of the meeting. In our view it is fundamental that the individual has 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 relationships.

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 skepticism 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 in 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 that we hold to be so fundamental and which we 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 concepts and values.

I would 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 focussing on the two vital and complementary aspects of détente - the pressing issues of security