

oars; it is not so difficult, however, to conceive of a continuing creative effort aimed at a broad range of goals which we have set for ourselves. Accordingly, at this first review of the implementation of the objectives and provisions of the Final Act, we should direct our attention to those measures which call upon governments to take unilateral actions and we should encourage a wider development, in practice, of this commitment. We should aim at strengthening the application of procedures which would be automatically put into effect in a humanitarian spirit without lengthy bilateral negotiations or interventions at the official level. This is particularly important now, because our willingness to establish common practices to help our people meet and reunite with their families, and to marry across national frontiers and to receive the information and cultural material of their choice, will unquestionably influence the scope — and, indeed, the ultimate success — of actions we may subsequently undertake on the bilateral and multilateral levels in the furtherance of *détente*.

It would be difficult to overemphasize the importance that we attach to the proposition that *détente* must have practical and concrete meaning in order to be permanent. It is only to the extent that *détente* is seen to facilitate procedures and improve conditions for individuals that it will be supported by public opinion. And, finally, only if it is supported by public opinion will it be possible for governments to pursue and develop *détente* as a major goal of their activities in the international community.

When reviewing what has happened in the human contacts field since the Final Act was signed, my Government has formulated a number of general impressions, if not conclusions.

Clearly all problems have not been resolved and much remains to be done. But is it our impression that from some countries more people than before are travelling abroad for meetings based on family ties, or to reunite family members more permanently, or to contract marriage with citizens of other countries. It must be noted that in many instances these cases have been the subject of discussions between the governments involved and these are often very time-consuming. We welcome this increased movement of people, of course. But are the controls applied to it still excessive? And why, in many instances, need it be preceded by bilateral negotiations or official interventions? We still note that many applicants for visas are repeatedly refused, often those identified with various "categories" grouped together in terms of age, profession, ethnic affiliation and those who wish to meet members of their families abroad who are judged as "illegal emigrants" by the authorities responsible for issuing visas. It does not always seem to us that applications for visas to meet and reunite with families are being dealt with