

Government Orders

there will be a reduction from nearly 58,000 to 20,000, a reduction of 38,000.

Those numbers go right over most people's heads. Those 38,000 armoured personnel carriers lined up would stretch from Montreal to Toronto along the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. That would demonstrate graphically the size of the armed camp that Europe has and the size of the reductions that are taking place because of the new atmosphere being engendered through the CSCE.

The meeting that will take place in Paris on the 19th of this month will be another significant step. Canadians can take a great deal of pride in the role which our country has played in seeing that our common security and our future in the global and regional relationship with European powers will be secure because of this new order. The House will hear in the coming hours from other MPs. This is a chance to really speak as Canadians, particularly on the eve of Remembrance Day. We are mindful of past sacrifices that men and women of the country have paid in made-in-Europe wars and that a new future is ahead of us. The direction of Canadian foreign policy in this area, developed over a number of years now with different governments all speaking for a common Canadian interest, can continue to be strong and supportive.

Mr. Jesse Flis (Parkdale—High Park): Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to debate Canada's foreign policy with my good neighbour from Etobicoke—Lakeshore. I say good neighbour because our ridings are neighbouring ridings and our constituents come from similar roots. We both have Canadians who come from all countries that belong to the CSCE, including a non-European country such as the United States.

I was pleased that the parliamentary secretary placed such importance on this aspect of foreign policy, but I was very disappointed that there was not even a minister on the government side to move the motion. Does the government really take foreign policy seriously? I did not expect the Secretary of State to be here because I know he is in Toronto to make a major speech this afternoon which I hope to get to. Surely, the government would have had a couple of ministers in place to move and second the motion. That is no reflection on the part of

the parliamentary secretary. I know he does his work very conscientiously.

My first encounter with the CSCE process was in the Madrid conference of 1980 to 1983. I was there with a group of parliamentarians from the House and we witnessed the corridor negotiations that were going on in resolving human rights issues. We witnessed the violent public demonstrations with representatives from Canada, the U.S., Ukraine, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, all asking the CSCE delegates to address the human rights issue. This is where Canada always took a lead. While the Soviet Union and other countries wanted to address disarmament, and rightly so, Canada made sure that the issue of human rights violations was always addressed at these conferences since it is one of the items in basket one.

In January of 1989, at the conclusion of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in the Europe follow-up meeting, I remember the somewhat cautious, but at the same time elated, atmosphere that resulted from the series of successful meetings. Even the harshest critics could not deny that the CSCE was indeed alive and well and becoming a very real expansion of east-west relations.

When the Helsinki Accords were negotiated in the early days of *détente*, some called it a new era of pan-European co-operation. Others called it a Soviet victory in ensuring post World War II borders. Even this year we saw how German unification made the Poles and Lithuanians very nervous. Was this a threat to their present borders? Whatever the interpretation was, however, the Helsinki final act provided specific principles to guide the behaviour and relationship of countries with economic, political, and social discussions.

The Helsinki process was not easy. It could not be. There was a need to believe in the process, to persevere, to cross cultural and ideological lines, and to arrive at some common ground. Even then, people called for an abandoning of the process because of the violations by the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. At the end of day, at the end of the Vienna follow-up conference that took place from November 1986 to January 1989, there was a blueprint for the future, signed by all 35 participants. Vienna began, as Gorbachev introduced his *glasnost* and *perestroika* reforms. Although the United States and the Soviet Union have no more voting power than any other