

The Vienna meeting obliged conference members to publish by law all laws and regulations dealing specifically with the movement of peoples within and between states. I think we need some laws and regulations to handle cases like the Biedrycki case that I mentioned earlier.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the list is exhaustive, the scope entirely flexible and unlimited. Now, even more than ever, the opportunity is here to expand the role and increase the effectiveness of the CSCE. I am very pleased—in fact, I am somewhat surprised by the seeming seriousness of this government to take that opportunity and to play a leading role in the future of the conference by way of this motion in front of the House today. My colleagues and I have no argument with the principle of this motion.

In fact, when Mr. Shevardnadze visited Canada in May of this year and spoke to the Standing Committee on External Affairs, he expressed hope that the CSCE would play a larger role and would, in fact, become the forum for expanded east-west relations.

My colleagues and I then endorsed the concept as an ideal balance for those countries affected by the changing global climate, to play a more significant role as will be expected, the closer together superpowers become ideologically.

For once, we will be able to turn our attention to other problems, other security threats, as was referred to by the Secretary of State in his speech in May that the parliamentary secretary alluded to when he launched the government's new policy in Europe.

I cannot help but wonder, however, how this new initiative will fit in with the Europe of 1992, as we have already heard the desire of some of the countries to take more charge of their affairs and not involve North America as much in the decision-making process.

How are we going to retain the trans-Atlantic nature of the CSCE? I must say here that when the Standing Committee on External Affairs visited the Soviet Union and then visited the two Germanys on May 1, we heard both from the East Germans and the West Germans that they want the participation and involvement of Canada and the United States as full members. This was very reassuring to hear.

### *Government Orders*

I would still like some clarification though on the nature of the role of the Parliamentary Assembly that is referred to in the motion, the Crisis Resolution Centre and the Permanent Secretariat. I would like to know how all this changes the role of NATO.

Does the minister see the conference replacing NATO, or working alongside to it? If this is the case, what does he envision as the future of the Warsaw Pact, which is now defunct? How can the evolving CSCE guarantee peace and security to the countries that once belonged to the Warsaw Pact? What will be the criteria for new members? How will the Baltic States that desire membership be treated?

Here I must say, Mr. Speaker, I know how you fought for protecting the non-recognition policy for the three Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

Because of the Persian Gulf crisis, because of our own Oka situation, somehow the world has forgotten these three countries when the west, Canada and the United States included, said all along: "We do not recognize the Soviet occupation of these countries."

If we did not for 50 years, why are we doing it now?

• (1210)

Should this issue not be addressed by the evolving CSCE? These people want an answer.

I do not think I am letting anything out of the bag here, but I understand that the leader of Lithuania and the leader of Latvia are negotiating to come and visit us in Canada. Rumour has it that the Prime Minister is prepared to meet with them officially.

And this, I want through you, Mr. Parliamentary Secretary, to pass on to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and to the Prime Minister, a sincere thank you on behalf of Canadians of Baltic origin. I think that is a very important and significant move. You have the full support from this side of the House.

Another question is, what will be the criteria for countries admitted as observers if some countries cannot belong as members, but would like to come as observers? How should we treat these countries? Who will make those decisions? Or, will these types of decisions require unanimity amongst all 35 participants?