

relations. In CSCE terminology, you are engaged in the improvement of human contacts, of information and of access to culture -- the essence of the so-called "Basket Three".

Progress in Basket Three is not something that can be achieved by the stroke of a pen at a single spectacular meeting of high state dignitaries, or by putting basic issues off indefinitely into the future. It can be accomplished only by small steps -- by the progressive reduction of the barriers to the movement of people, ideas and culture. At Geneva we must start not by abandoning the discussion of key problems (as some have suggested) but by opening doors and indicating the directions in which we should go after we pass through them. The general principles of freer movement of persons, ideas, culture and trade, which were accepted at Helsinki, should now be firmly established, and some means chosen -- the more obviously needed ones -- to begin the process of practical implementation. The Canadian delegation at Geneva, in company with our friends, has emphasized some aspects of human contacts that will have the most obvious effect -- both psychologically and in a humanitarian sense. The first steps in human contacts can be accomplished by removing the irritants of divided families, spouses and engaged couples, and by improving and increasing the possibility of visits by individuals and groups between East and West.

Greater access to the publications of both Eastern and Western Europe, coupled with a freer access to each other's culture, are also obvious first steps in creating the basis for the degree of confidence that must permeate all levels of relations if we are to achieve stability in the future. Confidence and stability must indeed be the watchwords in an increasingly interdependent world.

One of the major problems that we have encountered at the CSCE is the insistence of certain participants on the sanctity of "laws, customs and regulations". This is another way of saying that national laws and systems should prevail whenever they come into conflict with international laws and obligations. I suggest there is another, more enlightened, approach. Each state has, of course, the sovereign right to decide what it will accept by way of international obligations, but once it has done so I believe it is under a moral compunction to see that these obligations are fulfilled. This is surely the only realistic basis for international co-operation. In other words, if a national law or practice conflicts with an undertaking given at the CSCE, there will have to be an understanding among participants that something