

from Spain into Canada. Though I tried to explain to them the convolutions of our federal system whereby the provinces have certain rights in this regard, and needed to be convinced to follow the GATT decisions, they seemed to feel that we were a little remiss in not proceeding with these in a more prompt way. I think, however, one can assure them that this difficulty is well on the way to solution.

However, it was the fish conservation policy which, of course, aroused a great deal of concern. Our fishing conservation policy received very unfavourable comment. I had the opportunity, of course, to give them the rationale of our situation in these matters to show them that our scientific studies indicated there was a declining fish stock and something had to be done about it. I must report, however, that my efforts to explain the situation failed to give instant satisfaction to my interlocutors. But they did serve to remove some of the obvious misconceptions that were raised in the course of the discussion.

All that is really missing with respect to the fish situation is an agreement on what the facts are; that is clear. They do not believe the scientific evidence that we have presented. They think they have better evidence of their own. It seems to me that if you want to solve that problem in an amicable way, the first thing to do is to arrange for an agreement on what the facts are. If they are as we say they are, then I feel sure our position will be accepted, perhaps not willingly but it certainly will be accepted.

These developments and others that the committee have considered have usually, I am glad to say, been resolved either by the effluxion of time or changing circumstances. I think this particular committee dealing with transatlantic problems will probably self destruct quite soon and they may be looking for another mandate.

What I really want to tell the Senate about concerns a much wider consideration of economic questions. There is no question in my mind that NATO and its whole application to the situation in western Europe is being influenced, if not shaken, by the drive towards the Economic Community 1992 goal and by the events that are taking place in eastern Europe. The economic considerations arising from these two developments seem to me to have become vital to NATO and that economic problems from now on are likely to be far more central to NATO's activity than ever before.

NATO's policy, which is manned by what I think can only be described as an elephantine consultative machinery, is striving, doing its best to keep up. It certainly has its problems.

I mentioned the European Community and its drive to 1992. Oddly enough, the discussions in the NAA committee, which were supposed to be about NATO problems, were all concerned with the European Community 1992, to the extent of—and perhaps I am using too strong a word—"marginalizing" NATO problems. This concern was not only evident on the part of the Spanish and Portuguese parliamentarians; it was also evident among the twelve national representatives who were on the committee from ten nations. The same subject was

foremost in their minds. There is no doubt that, in spite of the events in eastern Europe and perhaps also because of them, Europe 1992 is as good as a done deal. It is an accepted reality.

The Spanish and the Portuguese were mainly concerned about the problems of the less-developed nations within the European Community in terms of getting the help they need to be fully effective as benefiting members of that organization. Their fears, of course, were that if help were given to eastern Europe there would be less for them. Nevertheless, they favoured something being done for eastern Europe. In the minds of all the committee representatives, Europe 1992 was the main issue of the day, and success seems to be taken for granted.

This is an extraordinary new political configuration in western Europe. If you add to that the headlong rush of affairs in eastern Europe, one can safely predict that the old NATO verities will certainly be reexamined. An economic and political revolution is unfolding. The old military certainties will be quite overwhelmed, and NATO cannot avoid responding to these mighty events.

As the run up to Europe 1992 gathers momentum, I would like to suggest that Canada must focus its attention on this development more closely than it has done heretofore. There is being created in Europe certainly the most populous, potentially the wealthiest, and possibly the most innovative trading block in the world. That takes in a lot of territory, but I do not believe that I exaggerate the possibility.

Canadian attention has been directed, quite naturally I suppose, to the Free Trade Agreement with the United States, and, as far as I am concerned and I think many others in Parliament, it has been exclusively directed to the United States. That attention is fully justified, because they are indeed our largest trading partner. It is true that our trade with Europe has been lacking in lustre in the past, although one sees signs of light at the present time.

● (1550)

However, I suggest it would be wrong to overlook the potential in Europe and foolish to neglect to keep the door open to Canada's interests. We hope that the community in 1992 will not be a fortress Europe. We believe it will prove to be outward looking. That point has certainly been drawn to their attention quite forcibly in recent times. But we need to find some way to ensure that our own Canadian views and interests are heard and represented somehow in the planning process that is leading to 1992.

It is quite possible that in the new arrangements Europe will want to have new controls against some outside traders. One can only refer to the attitude that is being taken today toward Japan to illustrate the kind of trading barriers that might be considered by the EC as they get down to brass tacks. Certainly agricultural protection, as we know well enough here, is another such issue. Our experience in these matters, particularly, for example, with respect to what they do in the United States, indicates that Canada is sometimes blindsided by what