

Statement

Secretary of
State for
External Affairs



Déclaration

Secrétaire d'État
aux Affaires
extérieures

92/12

**NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY
THE HONOURABLE BARBARA McDOUGALL,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
TO THE
HELSINKI FOLLOW-UP MEETING
OF THE
CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE**

**HELSINKI, Finland
March 24, 1992**

Affaires extérieures et
Commerce extérieur Canada

External Affairs and
International Trade Canada

Canada

Mr. Chairman:

This is a new Europe. Ideological confrontation has been replaced by co-operation. This is a time of unparalleled opportunity. But, as control systems are dismantled, impulses of nationalism, conflict and hatred rise to the surface. Turmoil and suffering are threatening progress and prosperity, and even the short-lived gains of democracy.

Canada's Commitment to European Security

This concerns my country very deeply and practically. Canada's security begins in Europe. We believe the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) has the right formula: enduring security can be built only on principles of democratic development, economic stability, environmental respect and, above all, the ascendancy of human values -- all interacting.

Moreover, European security requires the co-operation of all countries of Europe and North America. Our commitment to this has been underwritten in human lives.

Canada's commitment encompasses hundreds of millions of dollars in economic and technical assistance to the region. It's our emergency humanitarian relief to places like Nagorno-Karabakh and food shipments to Ukraine. It is 1 200 Canadian peacekeepers and monitors in Yugoslavia. It is our commitment to transatlantic security institutions, including not just the CSCE but the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

The CSCE and European Security

We are entering a new phase in the evolution of our common security in which the CSCE is central.

What are the new factors?

- o First, the CSCE must become an action-oriented forum for managing conflict. This means, first and foremost, having tools for the prevention of conflict and, if all else fails, having the tools -- political and otherwise -- to resolve conflict.
- o Second, we must consolidate and reinforce the elements painstakingly put in place since we signed the Paris Charter in November 1990 -- including renewed emphasis on implementation.
- o Third, we must take account of our expanded and diverse membership, which challenges us to acknowledge a new CSCE dynamic at the same time as reaffirming and recommitting ourselves to the basic principles that are the foundation of the CSCE.

The CSCE and Conflict Management

The gains of the last three or four years are historic. But it does not take profound analysis to recognize the difficult

transition many CSCE countries are going through. There are few havens from unrest and tension. These manifest themselves in different ways. At one end, we have economic dislocation. At the other end, in an extreme form, we have bloody conflict. Yugoslavia and Nagorno-Karabakh are the obvious examples. We know there are others.

There are also more insidious sources of conflict -- the rise of racism, prejudice and xenophobia. No CSCE state is immune -- certainly not Canada. Nor is there any easy cure. But the CSCE does provide a political framework, complete with detailed commitments and institutional infrastructure, to help us deal with these issues.

We are entering an epochal phase wherein democracy, individual liberties and pluralism are the basic contract of our societies. The transition is not easy. The practices have to be learned. The old command mechanisms are gone. This organization's principal task is to provide the framework for tolerance, accommodation, peaceful settlement and development itself.

Our meeting must position the CSCE to deal effectively with these challenges to our security.

The CSCE must play its full role in conflict management. What does this mean?

Consolidating CSCE Institutions

First, we must fine tune our institutions. They have potential not yet realized. We do not need to create new institutions. We do need to make existing ones work better -- in terms of both their relationship to each other within the CSCE process and their relationship to other regional and international organizations.

The CSCE will co-operate with other European institutions, such as NATO, the European Community (EC) and the Council of Europe, in a complementary way drawing from the abilities of each. Because of its mandate and membership, the CSCE has the potential to be the principal agency of co-operative security in this framework of interlocking European institutions. But its practices need serious work.

The CSCE Council has to become a more active body for political consultation. I know I am not alone when I say that we must use our meetings more effectively. We need to focus our discussions.

We don't need to read these speeches to each other. We need to act to deal with the problems facing Europe. Our emergency meeting this morning on Nagorno-Karabakh was important. It underscored the position of the Council as the CSCE body for political action.

When we take decisions in the Council, we need to be able to implement them.

We have already used some tools on an ad hoc basis: fact finding, rapporteur missions, good offices. We need to integrate them formally into the CSCE process. There are other instruments we should look at: a conflict management mechanism that could include the monitoring or peacekeeping operations.

In order to do this, we need to bring clarity to the relationship of the CSCE with other regional and global organizations, particularly when we start thinking about complex operational issues like peacekeeping or monitoring. For example, while the CSCE has the political mandate and moral authority to establish a monitoring mission, it does not have the practical capability -- the hard assets -- to deploy such a mission.

I don't believe we need to give the CSCE itself these assets. First, because we don't need to burden this process with more institutions and bureaucracy. Second, because they already exist elsewhere. What we need to do is find a way of engaging them to support CSCE decisions. How do we do this? We interact through common membership in other organizations that can act. In dealing with a crisis, the CSCE Council of Ministers can authorize intervention requiring military transport and other facilities. Those CSCE countries that are members of NATO can draw from NATO's unique capabilities to do this, though their actions would be as members of the CSCE.

Our delegations need to look carefully at these interlocking relationships. I believe they hold the key to making the CSCE more action-oriented.

Flexibility must be our touchstone. Countries do not like being boxed in; they like options and alternatives. Conflicts are fluid and unpredictable. CSCE instruments must reflect this. The CSCE's flexibility helped it endure and maintain its relevance. We must avoid rigidity, legal or bureaucratic.

We should also be more flexible about the consensus rule. CSCE commitments must continue to be adopted by consensus. But, where there is a clear violation of such commitments -- particularly in the area of the human dimension -- we must be able to take action, with or without the consent of the offending state or states.

Securing Human Rights

My government continues to believe that the consolidation of pluralistic democracy is the best hope we have for building security in Europe, as elsewhere.

Human values are supreme. No political system can replace the unique power and richness of a society in which individuals are free to make choices.

Each person within society has the same rights -- it does not matter whether they are the minority or majority, male or female. The treatment of minorities is the ultimate proof of how just and decent a society is.

CSCE governments have made a solemn commitment to ensure that all rights are respected. If this requires changes to domestic law, it must be done. If it requires better enforcement of those laws, it must also be done. If it requires action by other CSCE states to ensure compliance, we must use the mechanisms we've established precisely for that purpose.

The guarantee of human rights and fundamental freedoms is the direct and legitimate concern of all participating states. Promoting tolerance is the first, fundamental step.

It is not an easy task. People find too many reasons to be intolerant: ancient hatreds, misconceptions, ignorance, resentment or fear simply because some people are "different." Economic insecurity also breeds resentment and intolerance.

Governments alone cannot build tolerance -- it must be the work of the whole of society. They can, however, declare that intolerance is unacceptable and take specific measures to ensure the rights of minorities.

The persecution or differentiation in treatment of individuals based on race, religion, ethnic or linguistic background can be made illegal. Once made illegal, governments can use the full force of domestic law to prosecute offenders. My delegation will propose some specific ideas in this regard.

We also have to focus on areas that have been neglected -- like the rights of indigenous peoples. We were prevented from making progress on this issue at Moscow. My delegation will work with Denmark and others during this meeting to secure language in our final offer document on this important question.

Migration

We must also ensure that we focus on issues that are potential sources of conflict. One such area is the question of migration. In Prague, we agreed that we would have an expert's meeting on migration. Helsinki must set a date for this meeting, sooner rather than later. We cannot afford to put off any longer a serious discussion among CSCE countries on this question.

Economic Prosperity and Environmental Protection

Economic prosperity is crucial to security. There is no security where there is poverty and deprivation. The Bonn Document, with its landmark commitments to developing market-based economies, recognized this.

The European Community (EC), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the G-24 countries (G-24) and the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) have done much good work in pursuing the programs of co-operation outlined in Bonn. There is, however, still much to do. We can give political impulse to this process through the meeting of our Economic Forum early next year.

We do not need new institutions in the CSCE or elsewhere to help countries deal with the challenge of making the transition to market-based economies. Rather, we need to identify the outstanding problems and key areas requiring attention and use the specialized expertise of existing organizations more effectively.

Caring for the environment is also part of our security. The scramble for the use of scarce natural resources or the threat of environmental devastation are real sources of potential conflict. We must deal with the pressing environmental problems that are all too evident throughout central and eastern Europe.

My government believes that a new type of CSCE experts' meeting -- highly focused, technical, designed to promote co-operation, not draft a document -- could be useful in this area. We would like this meeting to agree to hold an experts' seminar on the question of sustainable forest development that Canada would offer to host in Vancouver next year.

Arms Control and Non-Proliferation

One of the main tasks of this meeting is to set the direction for the new security negotiations.

Our negotiators in Vienna have presented us with a comprehensive set of Confidence- and Security-Building Measures (CSBMs). We will also have an Open Skies Treaty, which will contribute to confidence by ensuring unimpeded access to the territory of the 24 signatory states by each other. Open Skies will enhance verification of the Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty (CFE), which we are all aiming to have ratified and put into effect by the time our Heads of Government meet in July.

That will mark the end of an historic phase of our discussions in the CFE process. When we next meet to negotiate arms control and to discuss the broader security agenda, all CSCE countries will be at the table. This opens up possibilities for progress and new challenges.

Most important of all, the Gulf crisis showed us that concerns about nuclear proliferation were not unfounded. In my view, curtailing nuclear proliferation and the spread of nuclear weapons -- including capabilities and delivery systems -- is the number one security problem for the 1990s.

We must reinforce the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We must attract to it those countries that have refused to sign it. We must ensure that the Treaty is indefinitely extended in 1995. We urge the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) countries to sign the Treaty as non-nuclear weapons states.

Equally important, we must support and work with nuclear scientists and engineers in the CIS states to enable them to turn their full talents and energies to the pursuit of peaceful scientific endeavours. This is why Canada welcomed the establishment of the International Science and Technology Centre in Moscow and will support it financially and participate fully in its work.

At Prague we adopted a Declaration on Non-Proliferation and Arms Transfers. CSCE countries have a responsibility to deal with this issue. Indeed, it is only through global and regional co-operation that we can deal with it.

CSCE countries should reaffirm their leadership in support of the UN's Arms Transfer register, fully comply with its reporting provisions and encourage the widest possible adherence to this new transparency and confidence-building measure.

My delegation will follow up on the commitment we made in the Prague declaration to include non-proliferation and arms transfers in the CSCE's post-Helsinki agenda.

CSCE: The Next Phase

We have a challenging task ahead of us. As we move forward, we must not forget that the CSCE exists in a broader global context. Our work should, at all times, complement the work of others -- especially our other common institution, the United Nations -- and be more invigorated and more effective than ever before. If it is to be relevant, it must take account of the larger, non-CSCE world. We should focus on consolidation and implementation of what we have already achieved.

Our Heads of State and Government will meet in July to set out the CSCE's direction and agenda for the coming years. There are some who say the task is daunting because we don't know what Europe will look like in a few years.

Of course we don't, we are not fortunetellers. But I believe, if we do it right, if we are faithful to the commitments we have solemnly undertaken in the CSCE, we will succeed in building a transatlantic/pan-Eurasian community that, in practice and in spirit, reflects the principles first established here in Helsinki 17 years ago.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, now, as then, we are grateful to Finland for its hospitality and warm welcome.