
human rights and its application in humanitarian co-operation between participating states is not a distortion of the balance of the Final Act. The mutual confidence that that document was intended to impart to our relations is basically to build confidence between people. I must note, with great sadness, however, that since the Final Act was signed, people have been harassed, arrested, tried, exiled and imprisoned, simply for trying to monitor and to exercise their rights, endorsed in the Act. This persecution is inevitably a major cause of friction in East-West relations today.

**Human
rights**

Although human rights are open to varying interpretations, the Final Act requires agreement on certain concepts and on the "inherent dignity of the human person". We have subscribed to common standards of human rights behaviour in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the relevant international covenants. I believe, then, that it is correct and important to urge all participating states to bring their human rights practices into line with the norms to which they have freely subscribed in these agreements. Mr. Chairman, this follow-up meeting of the CSCE provides a legitimate and, indeed, a necessary forum in which to do so.

Since the Final Act was signed, the movement of people between East and West has become more open and, in our relations with some of the participating states, there have been gratifying advances in family reunification and visits. But, there remain outstanding cases and problems which basically are of two orders: on the one hand, there are administrative barriers, such as the multiplicity of authorities with which individuals and our embassies must deal regarding travel for family reasons. Such problems can be overcome by making practical changes. On the other hand, there is the far more vexing problem of complications over the status of sponsors for family reunification and family visits. In rejecting pleas to co-operate in overcoming this problem, some of the participating states adduce Principle VI on non-intervention in internal affairs. But this principle pertains to illegal interventions, exercised by coercion. It is not intended to apply to obligations established by international agreements such as the human rights covenants.

While the participating states agreed in the Final Act not to intervene in matters falling within each other's jurisdiction, it is clear that human rights such as the right to leave one's country and return freely, take precedence over domestic jurisdiction. Moreover, while we agreed in the Final Act to respect each other's right to determine laws and regulations, we also agreed that, in exercising this right, we would conform with our legal obligations under international law. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I am clearly on firm ground in maintaining that the laws and regulations of the participating states on the application of human rights, such as the right to leave one's country, must conform with international obligations.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I have been able to demonstrate that there is room for a useful exchange of views concerning the principle of human rights and its application in Basket III matters. I hope that the results of this debate will be to narrow the gaps between us on these issues. While we may not reach total agreement, we may well achieve a better understanding which could, I suggest, be reflected in expressions of determination to respect the relevant principles and to improve our implementation of those provisions of the Final Act pertaining to humanitarian issues. Moreover, we
