



Statements and Speeches

SS 83/15

KOREAN AIRLINE INCIDENT ISSUE AT CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

Speech by the Honourable Jean-Luc Pepin, Minister of State (External Relations) at the Ministerial Session on the Madrid Follow-up Meeting of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, Madrid, September 7, 1983.

...The presence in Madrid this week of ministers of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) is a testament to the importance this conference holds for our respective governments and peoples, and to our deep concern that the CSCE process should not founder. This forum, and those ministers present, must unfortunately now bear witness to a tragedy which evokes indignation.

I am referring of course to the destruction of a Korean Airlines *Boeing 747* on August 31. The conscious in-flight destruction of this civilian, unarmed passenger aircraft by sophisticated fighter aircraft of the Soviet Union, no matter where or how it occurred, has outraged public opinion throughout the world.

This action has uselessly eradicated the lives — 269 of them — citizens of many of the states represented here today. In the case of my own country, at least ten Canadians have perished. There can be no justification, whatever might have been the circumstances, for this callous demonstration of the eagerness of a state to exercise its territorial jurisdiction against the unintentional presence in its air space of a civilian airliner and to destroy in this instance the lives of innocent citizens.

What worries me most is what would happen to international commercial transportation if each time an aircraft goes astray — and we know it does happen often enough — it is shot down.

It is with this in mind that my government has proposed in the United Nations Security Council that there be: first, a full and impartial enquiry carried out urgently by the Secretary-General; second, that the International Civil Aviation Organization be requested to make an urgent and thorough investigation with a view to making recommendations for improvements of international civil aviation regulations and practices which will preclude ever again the repetition of such an incident; and, third, that compensation be paid.

We urge the Soviet Union to participate willingly and fully in these efforts to find out how this tragedy happened and by so doing to ensure that it is never repeated. We urge the Soviet Union to meet the demands of an outraged public opinion around the world by acknowledging responsibility, by expressing regret, and by offering compensation. In putting these proposals forward we are giving the Soviet Union an opportunity to contribute to international law in this area.

The Soviet action has served to underline the fragility of the confidence and stability that now exists among sovereign states throughout Europe and the world. This wanton and seemingly uncontrolled

resort to the use of force raises further doubt in the minds of all those who had hoped for an improved level of trust in East-West relations.

We were to gather here, Mr. Chairman, to reaffirm our commitment to security and co-operation in Europe, and by extension, throughout the world. After three long years of negotiations we thought we had arrived at an agreement which would help to bring a greater degree of peace, confidence and security to a troubled world. We had planned to come to take note of what we have been able to achieve and to express our expectations for the future.

We arrive today with those expectations gravely diminished. What are we to make of this sad demonstration on the part of the Soviet Union of their inability to meet international obligations of the most fundamental and humanitarian kind? The challenge of co-operation which we all face here at the CSCE has been made all the more difficult as a result of this latest affront.

The destruction by the Soviet Union of the Korean Airlines jet is the most recent violation by the Soviet Union of its Final Act commitments. Other violations of similar and even greater magnitude, have been primarily responsible for the halting progress here at Madrid.

The Madrid meeting began in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, a blatant violation of the principles of sovereignty, self-determination, and the inviolability of frontiers. It was further set back by the imposition of martial law in Poland and subsequent developments in that country. These events were strongly protested here in Madrid by the foreign ministers of many of the participating states in February 1982, and led directly to an eight-month adjournment of our meeting.

Despite commitments to the freer movement of people, emigration has been drastically reduced by the Soviet Union even as our delegations have been meeting here in Madrid. Members of Helsinki monitoring groups have been harassed in the Soviet Union. These actions contravene both the spirit and the letter of the Final Act. They created the need for a lengthy review of the record of implementation of the Final Act, greatly prolonging the Madrid meeting. These actions are a regrettable step backwards, away from our goals of increased security and co-operation in Europe. To have passed them over in silence would have cast a shadow on the credibility of this conference. We will no more pass these violations over in silence than we will remain silent over the unprovoked attack on an unarmed civilian aircraft by the Soviet air force.

Despite the failures brought out so clearly here, and raised once again today, we must not, however, in the interests of peace in Europe and in the world, forget the potential for future progress that is inherent in the achievements of the Madrid meeting. This potential lies embedded in the draft concluding document. Throughout the course of this meeting, the Canadian delegation has worked diligently to ensure a balance in this document between the security aspects of our conference on the one hand and the human dimension of the CSCE on the other. I believe the document we have now before us strikes the needed balance.

We can point with very considerable satisfaction to the prospects for the Conference on Disarmament in Europe and the major contribution it could make to enhancing our security.

The confidence-building measures provided for in the Helsinki Final Act were a novel and ambitious start, but as they were voluntary and not verifiable, they were of limited value. It is clear that if such measures are truly to create confidence among states, they must be militarily significant, verifiable, and must include provision for challenging any state participating in the system for not carrying them out. The precise mandate for the Conference on Disarmament in Europe is intended to overcome the present deficiencies. Under the criteria specified in this mandate, confidence and security-building measures could be adopted which would cover the whole of Europe, without exception. A further advantage is that naval and air activities in the adjoining sea area and air space, which are directly linked to activities on the continent of Europe, would also be taken into consideration.

If such a regime were adopted, it could lay the basis for genuine measures of arms control and future disarmament in Europe. We must be clear about this: the transition to the disarmament stages of the Conference on Disarmament in Europe is not automatic and it is subject to scrutiny by the CSCE. The ambitious goals we have set and the inherent difficulties in achieving them means that we must progress step by step. Confidence that they are being carried out properly will be an important factor in deciding to move to a second stage.

I have also emphasized the human dimension of our endeavours here, an almost unique enterprise in an international political forum. In the area of principles, the Madrid document includes enhanced provisions on religious freedoms and breaks new ground in providing for consultations between state and religious authorities.

It also assures the right of workers freely to establish and join trade unions.

It contains an unqualified condemnation of terrorism.

There are improvements too in the area of freer contacts between our people, of wider dissemination of information and co-operation in culture and education. In particular, there is progress in defining time limits for the processing of applications for exit visas, assuring freer access to foreign publications, and improving co-operation in culture and education. In particular, there is progress in defining time limits for the processing of applications for exit visas, assuring free access to foreign publications, and improving the working conditions for journalists. These are modest steps, but they are practical achievements which would take us further along the path to better understanding.

The document also contains provisions to convene, prior to the next follow-up meeting, two experts meetings, one on human rights and the other on human contacts. These meetings will open further the dialogue on issues of fundamental concern.

Canada is particularly pleased at the prospect of acting as host to the Meeting of Experts on Human Rights which will take place in 1985. This subject has taken on special importance in Canada following the entrenchment of human rights in our constitutional documents with consequential effect on our legal system. This meeting will review the implementation of the human rights records of the participating states and, while recognizing the different approaches to human rights, will try to reduce the

wide differences and the misunderstandings which trouble relations between East and West. The terms of reference for the meeting are not so clear nor detailed as we would have liked; nevertheless, we have concluded that the participants will want to discuss fully and with sincerity the human rights practices in other participating states as well as in their own. It is necessary to further the dialogue and commentary on human rights in other participating states if we hope to induce them to conform to international law and their commitments under the Final Act. We look forward to welcoming to Ottawa, the participants in this meeting.

Mr. Chairman, I have outlined briefly the most positive elements in the draft concluding document. They hold out the hope of decreasing mutual suspicion and increasing security by fostering the transparency of military operations on the part of both East and West. They hold out the hope of enhanced co-operation through the expansion of economic, scientific and cultural contacts between East and West. They hold out the hope to individuals that they may once again be reunited with their families. They hold out the hope to individuals that their rights and liberties, their fundamental dignity as individuals, will be respected by their own governments. They hold out the hope of a renewed vigour and progress in human relations as an increasingly important aspect of the dialogue between and among our governments.

My government will commit itself to abide by the obligations set out in the Madrid Document, just as it has abided by the undertaking it agreed to in Helsinki. We will do everything in our power to turn these new hopes into concrete realities. We expect all other participating states to do the same. I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that Canada will not remain silent in the face of violations of these commitments, violations which serve only to undermine the credibility of the entire CSCE process. But I want to reiterate that to turn the hopes embodied in the Final Act and now the Madrid Document into realities requires the concerted effort of all the participating states.

We must recognize that relations between East and West have deteriorated since those bright days of hope in Helsinki in 1975. It now becomes of even more importance that we reverse this trend. The participating states have not taken full advantage, it seems to us, of the opportunities for expanded contacts, dialogue, and co-operation, which were opened up by the Helsinki Final Act. It is in the clear self-interest of each and every participating state here to seize the opportunities for co-operation which are presented by an agreement now in Madrid, and to take up the challenges which will be presented by the Conference on Disarmament in Europe and other meetings over the next several years.

It has often been said that the course of this Madrid review meeting has been heavily influenced by the events occurring outside it. This is true. How could it be different? Any political forum which is to have any relevance whatsoever in contributing to the resolution of political conflict must always reflect its surrounding political reality, good or bad. But it is also true that to be effective, to be credible, a political forum such as the CSCE must be able to influence those same external events. International events are not predetermined by some capricious Fortuna; they are man-made. We can make a new forward step here in Madrid by expressing our firm resolution to improve upon the record of the past and to adopt a document with engagements which, if treated in good faith, would hold out for the people of all our countries the prospects of enhanced security and understanding. There is still much

left to do before we meet in Vienna. Let us hope that when we meet again there will be more of a *positive and hopeful nature to discuss.*

The Helsinki Final Act of 1975 reaffirmed the objectives of all participating states: to promote better relations among themselves and to ensure conditions in which their people could live in true and lasting peace, free from any threat to or attempt against their security.

Is this undertaking merely a hollow slogan, to be ignored at will by governments in their day to day decisions? I think not. The stakes today are simply too high for our governments to ignore this undertaking. We face in our time the constant threat that small-scale, regional or local conflicts could escalate to the horrific spectre of nuclear confrontation unless all available, however small, steps are being taken to reduce mistrust and promote co-operation among states.

But if individuals faced with the threat of state-to-state confrontation cannot live in security, neither can they live in real peace if their fundamental human rights are denied them by their governmental authorities or other citizens by their own governments.

In this context I am convinced that the CSCE process can play a role in improving relations among our states in both respects: to ensure that our people can live free from the threat of war, and free from arbitrary authority.

What has Canada done, what does it intend to do in this respect? The achievement of greater stability and greater security in Europe has been Canada's prime objective at the Madrid meeting for these past three years. At times this objective appeared more distant hope than realistic possibility. Yet, the opportunity for dialogue over critical East-West issues which the unique CSCE process offers is one which must be taken most seriously.

It is only through reasoned dialogue and debate that the participating states can arrive at acceptable solutions to the problems and tensions which beset Europe. The CSCE process provides a basis — the Final Act — to set out the common values and interests which are aimed at increasing security and co-operation in Europe. It provides a forum — the review meetings — to evaluate the degree to which participating states live up to their obligations under the Final Act. It provides a method — the concluding documents of these review meetings — for enhancing the collective undertakings of the participating states beyond those of the Final Act. Taken together, these instruments constitute the solid framework of a new European political process aimed at the future — one which is inherently dynamic and outward-looking, molding itself to changes in international relationships and indeed contributing to a shaping of these relationships. It is process which encourages co-operation over confrontation, debate over diktat, negotiation and compromise over isolation and absolutes.

How profound is the sense of suspicion and how brutal its consequences can be have been tragically demonstrated in another part of the world. The corrosive effects of that distrust know no barriers. In the 1930s, a distinguished Soviet Foreign Minister, Maxim Litvinov, reminded the world that peace is indivisible. So too, I submit, is the sense of trust and confidence on which peace rests.

My government hopes, indeed pleads, that this forum we have made for ourselves in the CSCE may dedicate itself in the years ahead to the patient building of confidence and trust without which no true security can exist.

S/C