

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
MINISTRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES  
REFERENCE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

# STATEMENT DISCOURS

SECRETARY  
OF STATE  
FOR EXTERNAL  
AFFAIRS.

SECRÉTAIRE  
D'ÉTAT AUX  
AFFAIRES  
EXTÉRIEURES.



STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF  
STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS, THE  
HONOURABLE MITCHELL SHARP,  
TO THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY  
AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE,  
HELSINKI, JULY 4, 1973

---

Mr. Chairman,

I should like first to echo the words of gratitude expressed by previous speakers for the meticulous arrangements which have been made for us here by our Finnish hosts. The warm reception we have all received is in the best traditions of Northern hospitality. We are also in debt to Finland for their patient efforts and material support which were instrumental in helping to organize and carry through the preparatory consultations to a successful conclusion over many months of meetings.

Our Ambassadors at those consultations did their job well: their careful labours have produced mandates which carry the consensus of all the participants. Given the kind of goodwill now being expressed, there are reasonable prospects this conference can produce results of enduring value.

Not only have the preparatory consultations produced a useful document; they have also taught us certain lessons about this new form of negotiation by consensus -- lessons that will be of value in the later stages of the conference. The first lesson is that the road to success is to be found through serious and detailed negotiations accompanied by a willingness on all sides to approach difficulties in a spirit of accommodation rather than confrontation.

The second is that there can be no artificial time limits or other constraints; if representatives of sovereign states seeking greater security and co-operation are forced to rush to their conclusions the inevitable result will be agreement at the minimum level. With such a result everyone would lose. Our objective should be not quick results but the greatest positive content in the documents that will emerge from this conference.

The third lesson is that negotiations of the kind in which we are engaged cannot be isolated. They form part of a general process of improving relations; a process which includes other multilateral negotiations and also bilateral contacts. Notable in this respect are the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks and the agreements reached recently by Mr. Nixon and Mr. Brezhnev. We also welcome, in particular, the recent decision to open negotiations in Vienna on October 30 on mutual reduction of forces and armaments and associated measures in Central Europe. Progress in one set of negotiations ought to, and no doubt will, have a favourable effect on the others as they move ahead together in the same general period of time.

We are laying the groundwork for a new kind of world -- a world which should be better than the one we have known. This is cause for encouragement, even though the challenge is daunting. But ours is only a beginning. The document before us has in all conscience been difficult enough to prepare but it provides only a framework for the second stage of this conference and is not by itself any guarantee of a successful outcome. It has already been pointed out that the mandates are not final formulations. But they embody agreed concepts and express a basic balance among the interests of the states participating in this conference. As such, they form an acceptable basis for the elaboration of more detailed and substantive documents. The course which has been set is a good one; we should keep to it.

As I see it, we are assigning two principal tasks to the second stage of the conference: First, to establish guiding principles for future co-operation and negotiation -- both multilateral and bilateral -- in each area of the agenda; and second, to work out ways and means of putting these principles into practical application. Both these elements must be present if the work this conference will do is to be meaningful for the peoples for whom we speak.

Let me now indicate briefly how Canada views the mandates and the tasks that are to be assigned to the second stage. Under the first item of the agenda the main task will be to enunciate principles which should guide relations among states. Such principles can provide an important basis for future security and co-operation, not only in Europe but more widely in the world. Canada has a direct interest in this item because it regards Canadian security and European security as interdependent. I heartily agree with previous speakers that fundamental to all such principles is the proposition that the use or threat of force must be ruled out completely in relations among all states regardless of their political, economic or social systems. A corollary is that national boundaries and territories should be inviolable and that disputes should be settled by peaceful means. At the same time, nothing we propose should deny or exclude the possibility of peaceful change. Evolution is in the nature of things. The history of the world provides plentiful evidence that man-made efforts to prevent it may well be not only futile, but, indeed, dangerous to future peace and stability.

Canada has been encouraged that one of the mandates calls for the preparation of proposals for confidence-building measures. The least the world can expect of us is that, in our search for greater security, we define measures to enhance confidence and to lessen the risk of military surprise or miscalculation.

In its discussion of economic co-operation, the conference should have regard to the wider context of multilateral trade negotiations and discussions on monetary reform taking place elsewhere. This conference should not, in our view, engage in negotiations on these matters. It will, however, be a place where we can give support to the idea of removing barriers to trade which can in turn facilitate other forms of co-operation and exchange. Canada has always encouraged trading nations to be outward-looking and to avoid discrimination in trading matters. It will continue to urge all countries, and particularly the states participating in this conference, to approach trading relations not only among themselves but with the rest of the world in this spirit.

As we seek to improve our relations in the economic, technological and environmental fields, we should not forget our responsibility to the developing countries. As we advocate action and co-operation which would result in increases in the wealth and welfare of our peoples, we should bear in mind the need to extend these economic benefits to those countries in the world less well endowed. Fortunately there is no inherent contradiction between these two objectives. They are complementary, not competitive.

For the future, it is our view that it would be inadvisable, especially in the field of economics, were the conference to try to duplicate the work of existing bodies. There are already organizations competent to deal with matters falling within this field and they should be used to the

maximum. Certain aspects of our economic relationship may not fall neatly within the ambit of one or other of these institutions and it may prove necessary to revitalize other organizations already in possession of a great deal of relevant experience to fill the gaps. I have in mind in particular the Economic Commission for Europe. Canada is seeking full membership so that we may play our full part in any tasks the conference may consider appropriate for that body.

I now turn to an area in which Canada expressed particular interest at the preparatory talks -- that of co-operation in expanding contacts between people and in solving humanitarian problems. Without improvement in human contacts, and relations of all kinds, the work that we shall do here and in Geneva will have limited practical effect and little meaning for our peoples. More normal relations and expanded co-operation should involve not only governments and official bodies but should also extend to the level of person-to-person contacts.

We in Canada believe, and we think it reflects the views of humanity as a whole, that members of families should not remain unwillingly separated because they reside in different states and that citizens of different countries should be able freely to marry and join their spouses. While we recognize that specific cases must of necessity be dealt with on a bilateral basis, the enunciation of principles and the adoption of concrete measures on divided families and like problems would, we believe, substantially improve inter-state relations.

Canada attaches the highest importance to this question of freer movement, not only because of the composition of the Canadian population but also because we believe that progress depends more on putting these principles into effect than on repeating accepted norms. This question is, in many ways, the touch-stone of the success of the conference. If we can achieve gradual but meaningful progress in removing barriers to the movement of persons and information, we will be well on the way to achieving our goals -- creating the mutual understanding and confidence necessary for any enduring security and co-operation. For these reasons, I shall be asking the executive secretary to circulate a written submission on this question for consideration at the second stage of the conference.

All of us, I am sure, are already thinking of what may follow a successful conference. On this subject, we in Canada have an open mind. As the negotiations proceed over the next months, we will be able more easily to reach a judgment on whether any follow-up machinery will be justified, and if so, what. If it is eventually decided that such machinery should be created, Canada's chief reoccupation will be to ensure that it will have clear and precise terms of reference, will not duplicate existing institutions and will provide for full participation by Canada and the United States of America as well as by all European states. The security of North America and Europe are interdependent: so are their economic and cultural future, and our common participation in this conference and in any follow-up to it will be essential.

Mr. Chairman, this is an historic moment because it is the first time the foreign ministers of all (or practically all) the states of Europe have assembled in company with Canada and the United States of America to work out ways of furthering their common interests in greater security and wider co-operation. This occasion reflects in a tangible way that interdependence of Europe and North America of which I have spoken and which is such an important fact of international life for Canada in particular.

We are in the course of initiating a new kind of negotiating process in which decisions are taken by consensus of all the participants, large and small, aligned and non-aligned: a process by which each shares responsibility for their implementation; where no state or states, because of size or power, can dictate the outcome.

In this new approach in which we are all engaged, we will be creating new kinds of relationships in Europe that will influence significantly the shape of developments on this continent and in our countries over the coming years. In so doing we have before us a basic question: will the principles that we will be drawing up be based on the mutual hostility and distrust of the past or on a growing degree of mutual tolerance and confidence? Co-existence may be peaceful in purely physical terms but can be warlike in psychological terms. Devotion to one's own system or ideology need not and should not imply a commitment to convert others or to force them unwillingly to follow ideas in which they do not believe. Detente implies not the removal of differences in systems and ideologies but their mutual acceptance and accommodation in the interests of greater co-operation, freer movement and more open communications among people as well as states. Competition, yes, but antagonism, no. Only in this way can the division of Europe be overcome.

There must be a broader and more dynamic concept of co-existence of people as well as states, of ideas and ways of life as well as of regimes and systems. How otherwise can they enrich one another and promote the ideals of mankind? Otherwise we will have only uneasy existence in which real detente -- lasting and rewarding for all -- will be impossible.

It is in this new and deeper spirit of live-and-let-live that we hope the second stage of the conference, which we see opening in mid-September, will embark on its important task. It is also in this spirit that Canada, for its part, will participate fully in all aspects of the conference, convinced that in doing so it will be contributing to the security and well-being both of Canada itself and of the international community.