

of the industrial community within the larger world system. We regard this as a direction in which our relationships must evolve if the assumptions that lie at the basis of the Final Act are to have real substance.

From the beginning Canada has placed particular emphasis on the humanitarian dimension of our work. We see this as a fundamental, unique and indispensable contribution of the CSCE process to the development of détente. We were heartened that the review of implementation confirmed that these humanitarian questions are a legitimate subject of multilateral discussion. Most of us do not regard such issues as family reunification as being of secondary importance, waiting in the wings while political and military considerations occupy centre stage. If anything, our deliberations here in Belgrade have confirmed us in our view that human rights will remain a central preoccupation of our government and most other governments represented here as we move forward in meeting our mutual commitments.

In approaching this question, Canada proceeded on the basis that relations between States cannot remain unaffected where respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms is seen to be deficient. Our discussions have shown that we have a long, long way to go and this will take time before we can feel confident that the inherent dignity of the human person and his prerogative to know and act upon his rights are being respected in all places and in all circumstances. There is evidence that individuals who have tried to exercise rights that are endorsed in the Final Act are still being harassed, exiled, arrested, tried and imprisoned. This has led the Parliament of Canada to adopt resolutions as a unanimous expression of its deep concern in respect of what we see as violations of fundamental human rights. We earnestly hope that the attention that we have focussed on these matters will encourage governments to reflect on the negative impact of their practices.

We had hoped that Belgrade would be the occasion for all signatory governments not only to reaffirm their pledges to respect human rights, but also to act on them. We have never claimed that human rights are all there is to détente. What we have claimed and what we do claim is that, to the extent that détente rests on confidence, we cannot muster that confidence among our citizens unless it is seen to have a human dimension. Respect for human rights is part of the structure and balance of the Final Act. If we want the Final Act to be more than the sum of its parts, we cannot with impunity act as if the societies to which it relates were islands cut off from one another. Our concerns on these humanitarian issues are not motivated by a desire to wage ideological warfare, or to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries.

In the specific area of human contacts, we tried to get acceptance for the idea that the provisions of the Final Act should be applied in such a way that family contacts - whether involving visits or reunification - would be facilitated as a normal routine so that such cases no longer would have to be the subject of individual negotiation between governments. We also tried to get agreement that governments would facilitate normal communication of