

could take new steps forward in this regard. I should hope that our exchange of views and our decisions in these fields will be included as part of a balanced result of this meeting in our concluding document.

Experts
meeting
proposed

One kind of result which I would propose would be a CSCE experts meeting or even a high-level meeting to discuss the protection of the principles of human rights and fundamental freedoms, which are reaffirmed in Principle VII of the Final Act, and the application of these rights in Basket III dealing particularly with the question of freer movement of people among the participating states. During the course of our discussions here, my delegation will further elaborate on this idea and will propose a mandate and the modalities for holding such a meeting.

It should be recognized, Mr. Chairman, 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*.

In our view, all participating states could contribute to ideological *détente* by refraining from acts which arouse distrust and concentrate instead on increasing confidence. The participating states could further contribute to ideological *détente* by removing the barriers to the freer flow of information. This would permit people to have unimpeded access to the experience and ideas of others. Surely each government represented here has sufficient confidence in its own system to permit its citizens to give their support to that system on the basis of free choice rather than coercion.

The task
ahead

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I again refer to the Final Act. We have now had five years to assess its impact and to identify the impediments to its full implementation. The task ahead of us at this meeting is clear. We should first conduct a careful and objective review of current respect for the principles and the implementation of the provisions of the Final Act. Our objectives should be to determine how close we have come to meeting the goals we set out in that document. At the conclusion of this review, we shall be able to determine what further needs to be done. Only with this information in hand, can we turn our attention to new proposals aimed at deepening our collective commitment to the purposes of the Final Act and to improving its implementation in a balanced way.

In anticipation of a fruitful outcome of the Madrid meeting, we must also bear in mind the need to continue the CSCE process on which so many hopes rest. This could be done by an unequivocal pledge to meet again in a third follow-up meeting to continue to assure ourselves that the principles and provisions of the Final Act are properly observed and, where they are not, that we take steps to rectify our shortcomings.