

*Private Members' Business*

may have diminished, but there is still instability. The threat today is not so much the cold war as the instability that exists in that region where the threat from the cold war originally came from, and that is the Soviet Union.

There is still in that area in a time of instability a great deal of armament that is threatening to us. Through no motivation, because the motivation for the cold war and the motivation for attack is gone obviously, but inadvertently, in a time of instability and in an area of instability, there could be a releasing of weaponry that is potentially dangerous to us and that is what the Arms Control Centre pointed out.

It says that it agrees that Canada, in light of that, should renew the NORAD Agreement for two years. It also says that Canada should complement its role in NORAD with a more activist approach to strategic arms control as it relates to air breathing weapons and air defence and to confidence-building measures for the north.

I liked what my friend said and I think he and I were in agreement about the kind of thing that must happen in the Arctic, and the weakness.

Let me deal with one point before that and that is the role of parliamentarians. It is all very well for the parliamentary secretary to say that Parliament must initiate this review. If Parliament is to initiate the review, why is the government having its review on constitutional matters? There is no call for Parliament to initiate a review of the Constitution. The government has a paper, the government gives that paper to a parliamentary committee, it travels across the country, it hears Canadians, it reports, it advises and it recommends. Why cannot the same thing happen in defence?

We have been asking, I have been asking and my friend has been asking, the government for the last two years to initiate, to put down its policy similarly in defence as it has on the Constitution so that we can examine it and so that Canadians can examine it. Unlike constitutional matters, the government has refused to do the same thing in defence matters.

I think it is facile to say that you can do it with the Constitution, but you must not do it in defence.

The government is the government. It is responsible for initiating policy. Our role is to review policy and I think that is what must happen.

In that review, I agree with my friend that we have got to go beyond the present NORAD. There is instability and we have to come to grips with that instability and the need for security in the polar area. We are a polar country and it is time we stopped looking to the south of us so much and started looking to the north. There is an opportunity now for us to do that, for us to change our vision and to go far beyond the present NORAD.

Why can we not have a NORAD of the sea for example? Why can we not have NORAD of the sea? The government policy did not address that at all, did not show any initiatives for getting together. It talked about the Murmansk speech but where is the Canadian initiative for getting the super powers together in naval arms control? Where is the initiative for bringing together the United States and the Soviet Union.

The United States travelling through Juan de Fuca, travelling through the Northwest Passage, still thinks that its role, its right, is to travel anywhere it wants in the world. I think we have to talk about that with the Americans to say there is such a thing as Canadian space and there is such a thing as Canadian sovereignty. Maybe it is time for the United States, in view of the fact that the cold war is over, to look at the policy of the American navy and to see whether in fact it should be defending the United States and maybe the polar region too, but that it is not the naval policemen of the whole world.

Why can we not have in the polar area a security force? There is an Arctic Council that exists now. Canada is part of an Arctic Council and that Arctic Council has taken a very interesting initiative in the environment.

I ask the question: How can you take initiatives in the environment, multinational agreements in the environment, and have them become effective unless you have security? There is no security in the polar area at the present time. Why can we not have a multinational force? Why can we not have, first of all, confidence building measures and then going beyond confidence building measures, a security system like the Arctic