

third parties to overcome. The only way to avoid this would involve a very substantial extension of qualified majority voting in the determination of the CFSP together with more strictly defined common positions. This will not happen in any current policy relevant time frame.

Whatever the form of the legal documents that eventually emerge from the IGC, it is likely that in future the CFSP will have a more public profile that has been the case in the past and that it will have stronger institutional support in the Council and in the Commission. Whether this will result in more effective policies is uncertain. In particular, the interface between security and defence policy will be particularly problematic for many member governments. Nonetheless, and bearing in mind that the ultimate fate of the IGC's deliberations will be hostage to political decisions and issues beyond the scope of its mandate, it is likely that the CFSP will have an increasing, even if only incremental, impact on third parties.

Issues and Options for Canada:

The issues that a CFSP supported by a stronger institutional base and with more comprehensive policy scope raise for Canada can be categorized under two broad headings. The first covers the substantive policy content of the CFSP, and the second covers what may be termed structural and strategic issues. In practice, this is a somewhat artificial distinction because issues of structure and substance constantly impinge on one another, but it is nonetheless helpful in sorting out the implications of the CFSP for Canada.

Substantively, the policy positions taken formally under the rubric of the CFSP have caused few if any problems for Canada. The range of issues that have been covered so far by decisions resulting from the EPC/CFSP process has been a relatively narrow one in which common positions, mostly of a declaratory kind, have been more frequent than joint actions. More often than not, joint actions have simply taken the form of diplomatic demarches. In general, the common positions and joint actions taken by the Union have been ones with which Canada has had little difficulty associating itself. Whether the issues have concerned the CSCE/OSCE, the Middle East, Cyprus, or Central America, when the member states within EPC/CFSP have been able to reach a consensus it has not been one requiring Canada to publicly disassociate itself. Rather, as discussed below, the problems for Canada have been structural and strategic.

It is worth underscoring the fact that the Union's policies having negative impact on Canada have lain largely outside the formal scope of the CFSP. It has been the impact on Canada of many of the external policies that fall within the Community's responsibilities that have created problems. The so-called "Turbot War" illustrates some of the difficulties. The position adopted by the Commission on the basis of the Common Fisheries Policy was eventually undermined by