

and should be made for addressing sources of conflict *within* participating states; conflict prevention had to include an effective political process, had to cover both broad political and military areas, and had to have a supporting secretariat for both substantive and administrative tasks.

In July, Canada submitted two papers to the Summit Preparatory Committee (Prepcom), which was meeting in Vienna. The first, tabled July 11, set forward Canada's objectives for the Summit.⁸ In Canada's view, the Summit's deliberations should be governed by three basic principles: 1) the comprehensive nature of the CSCE -- i.e. its three baskets -- should be preserved and reinforced; 2) while pursuing institutionalization, the flexible, political and pragmatic nature of the CSCE process should be preserved; and 3) the right of full participation by all participating states in CSCE activities should be maintained -- i.e. no shunting aside of North American members. This paper also proposed an outline for the summit declaration.

The second paper, tabled at the end of July after attempts to develop a joint paper with West Germany failed, laid out more broadly the Canadian proposal for the development of the CSCE's conflict prevention and resolution capacity.⁹ In this paper, Canada proposed that the CSCE should provide its members with mechanisms that would *automatically* be triggered to defuse tensions and resolve conflicts.

The institutional framework proposed was that described in the Humber College speech. Overall responsibility for conflict prevention and management would fall to a "Council" of foreign ministers or their designated representatives. The operative side of ministers' work would be delegated to a permanent body, now called a "Centre for the Prevention and Resolution of Conflict" rather than an Institute for Peaceful Settlement of Disputes. The Centre would consist of an executive director assisted by a small secretariat, including experts in dispute settlement, and would possess sophisticated communications capabilities.

In Canada's view, the Centre's functions would fall under two broad rubrics: 1) support for political efforts to prevent and resolve conflicts; and 2) support for the implementation and verification of CSBMs.¹⁰ The first would include such tasks as helping the conflict prevention "crisis panels" proposed by Clark -- described in detail in the July paper -- undertake fact-finding, dialogue and conciliation efforts; it would also involve assisting the Council's attempts at conflict resolution should tensions result in hostilities. The second would include technical and administrative tasks in the areas of information exchange and data management. This could involve establishing and managing a communications network capable of serving CSBM, CFE and Open Skies communication requirements; managing data compilation, storage and access in relation to agreed CSBMs; organizing annual implementation assessment meetings and other meetings agreed under the CSBM

⁸Included in Annex.

⁹Included in Annex.

¹⁰Though Canada had earlier proposed a separate verification centre, it had since determined that support for this idea was not high.