

that now exist are detrimental to the progress of eastern countries, particularly in the field of agriculture that we have just been discussing, and there is the need to break down these barriers if these countries are to help themselves, not only agriculture and farm products, but textiles and steel as well. This is a real problem for the West to settle. Hopefully, it will be settled if GATT is successful; but, even if it is not, it is a problem that the European countries, in particular, must take under their immediate consideration if they are to do their part in the economic redevelopment of eastern Europe.

This meeting of the Economic Committee was followed by a general meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly to discuss the work of the Council of Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This body, which came into being about 10 years ago, became a platform, in the time of the Cold War, where talks could be conducted between rival parties. It proved to be a successful mechanism of establishing certain rules about human rights and crisis prevention. It has been a valuable development. It now consists of about 48 states; 10 from the old USSR less Georgia—I saw in the paper the other day that not all 10 turned up to take the oath, as they were expected to do. Maybe that 48 will have to be reconsidered, though the rest may join later on.

The functions of the CSCE can be divided into three categories. First of all, there is a secretariat, a document collection centre so that all policy considerations can be studied in one place.

The second category was designed to help these countries of eastern Europe develop sound election policies and programs. Members of the council go out into countries that are having elections and they lend assistance in setting up the elections and they supervise the elections. They send working parties out.

Then there is the question of human rights in the CSCE countries. In this respect, the organization has the power to send rapporteurs into Armenia, or wherever, to look at human rights violations in those particular areas and to report.

That is all to the good, but we must recognize that there are serious limitations. In the first place, the CSCE *modus operandi* has a problem. States can raise problems, and on the request of a state, you can get reports from the secretariat of the CSCE; but, when you come to decision making and deciding what to do, they have the problem of consensus.

Consensus means everybody must say yes. It is modified, because there can be one dissenter; it is consensus less one. All of these states but one must say yes in order to get a decision registered.

Then, of course, the question of enforcement arises. There is no mechanism at the present time where that can be done. There is a move to give the CSCE an enforcement arm. Our own Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has spoken to that effect in rather emphatic terms. From my point of view, however, I would proceed cautiously in that connection, because if you decide to enforce human rights and have the CSCE intervening directly into the domestic affairs of

Armenia or Azerbaijan, etcetera, you will have a big problem on your hands. It is doubtful whether there is any mechanism that could be devised in the CSCE to deal adequately with the question of enforcement. That represents a very difficult question.

NATO, of course, offers its cooperation. NATO, as we all know, has been going through a crisis of purpose these last few years. Its reaction has been to downsize the army. We had a taste of that the other day when our budget came down. NATO has been active in nuclear disarmament and military doctrine. It does not have an enemy any more. It is no longer facing the East the way it once did.

It is remarkable to me, in the short few years that have passed, to find that when you get to a NATO meeting, you must deal with a lot of Russians. Marshall Lubov, who is head of the Warsaw Pact, has been coming to NATO meetings to talk about mutual concerns. Representatives from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary all appear now at North Atlantic Assembly meetings and are accorded the same privileges as other parliamentarians. That is a good thing. One of the most remarkable things that they tell us is how much they like NATO. That seems absurd and odd when one considers the history of recent times. However, they make it clear to us that they want to see NATO continue, in general, the way it has been operating these last few years.

The Russians are saying that one day they might wish to be associated with NATO as well. So, we have a deep interest in the future of NATO in these countries.

The problem is that NATO has suffered a loss of its main target. It must re-orient itself. It is adjusting rapidly to the facts, but one of the problems in Europe is competition. Many people are competing for the same turf in Europe these days. There are overlapping activities going on between NATO and other organizations. For example, the Maastricht Summit promised a common defence policy for the Economic Community. If there is such a common policy, it must involve military. How is that to fit in with NATO?

There has been a large agitation, particularly in France, for the resuscitation of the Western European Union, an idea that I thought had been discarded long ago, where select European countries would unite for military purposes. We have the France-German army, a division of soldiers or some lesser unit of that kind. France and Germany are developing new cooperative methods of working together that have never been any place before. So, there is a lot of confusion in Europe. There is plenty of competition, and one of NATO's problems will be to sort out its role with respect to these various bodies that are now appearing on the scene.

We must remember that the Cold War does not mean we have a world at peace. I wish it did. It means that our collective security measures will still be required in one form or another, perhaps not the way they are now, but certainly in an effective form in the future.

NATO's asset is the experience of integrated national forces. That is an easy phrase to say, but it encompasses an