

ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

CONSIDERATION OF FIRST REPORT OF COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONCLUDED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the consideration of the First Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, tabled in the Senate on 20th June, 1984.—(*Honourable Senator Macdonald.*)

Hon. John M. Macdonald: Honourable senators, I must confess I did not follow closely the proceedings of the Standing Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources which reviewed the recommendations contained in the Fifth Report of the Special Committee of the Senate on the Northern Pipeline, which report was entitled "Marching to the Beat of the Same Drum". However, I must also confess that I was impressed by the speech delivered in the Senate on June 20 last by Senator Hastings, who is chairman of the committee.

That report was a review of the public and governmental responses to the 21 recommendations contained in the report of the Special Committee on the Northern Pipeline, which was tabled in the Senate on March 30, 1983. It must be most gratifying to the members of the special committee that 17 of the recommendations were accepted and the remaining four were not rejected out of hand but, rather, required further study.

I found one part of Senator Hastings' speech especially informative. He mentioned that the committee provided a clear momentum and initiative for three important federal government programs in the north. The first is known as Northern Regulatory Review; the second is the Northern Oil and Gas Action Program; and the third is the Northern Land Use Planning Program. If honourable senators wish details of these programs I refer them to the two reports.

It should be noted these programs have been initiated at the prompting and with the concurrence of the special committee. I feel Senator Hastings and his committee deserve the thanks and commendation of the Senate for their valuable report and for the follow-up they made to determine what had been the response of the government.

The Hon. the Acting Speaker: Honourable senators, as no other senator wishes to speak, the debate on this order is considered to be concluded.

MARITIME DEFENCE

CONSIDERATION OF REPORT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE—DEBATE CONCLUDED

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the inquiry of the Honourable Senator Frith calling the attention of the Senate to the Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled: "Canada's Maritime Defence", tabled in the Senate on 15th June, 1983.—(*Honourable Senator Macdonald.*)

Hon. John M. Macdonald: Honourable senators, the report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs dealing with maritime defence is the second report of its Subcommittee on National Defence. The first report dealt with manpower in Canada's armed forces, and there is to be a third report dealing with air power. These reports are very interesting and they are valuable documents. They represent a detached, factual, non-emotional, in-depth study of our national defence. The conclusions reached and the recommendations made are worthy of, and entitled to, favourable consideration.

The present report deals with Canada's maritime defence. To see the quality of the study, as it were, one only has to look at Appendix E. This is a list of the people who appeared as witnesses before the subcommittee. It shows 100 persons gave evidence, 18 of whom appeared more than once. The list of witnesses is an impressive one. It is composed of service and non-service people who are experts in their fields and whose knowledge and ability, I am sure, greatly impressed the members of the subcommittee.

● (1450)

Honourable senators, I expect this report on our maritime defence is of special interest to those of us who come from the eastern and western coasts of Canada. I know it is of special interest to those from the east coast who remember the state of our navy when Canada went to war in 1939. You will remember, too, the frantic efforts which were made to increase our naval strength, and to build and strengthen our coastal defences. The report mentions that in 1939 our regular navy consisted of six destroyers and 2,100 uniformed personnel, and these were divided between the east and the west coast. It is of interest to know that during the war the navy expanded rapidly and in 1945 consisted of 211 ships of various types and 94,000 uniformed personnel.

During that war our navy did many heroic deeds and not only made a substantial contribution to our final victory, but also proved that the Canadian navy and its sailors were at least as good as those of any other country in the world.

Honourable senators, if I might digress for a moment, I would like to say that I have a special interest in the navy, coming, as I do, from the east coast. As you get older, you remember things that happened long ago. I remember the time when the unit I was with went into France. We were what was called army troops; we moved when army headquarters moved and we did not go to France until practically the end of July. However, we wandered around the Channel for a while and spent the night waiting to disembark. There was some bombing during that time and, in the morning when we went up on deck of the ship we were on, I saw alongside the port side of that ship, approximately 600 yards away, a big, powerful low-slung cruiser and I tell you, it was a very reassuring sight.

Conditions have changed since 1949 and such a rapid expansion of our naval forces is no longer possible. The modern navy ship is a very sophisticated piece of equipment whose design and construction requires a long period of time. It requires highly trained personnel to operate it, experts in electronics, mathematics and physics, computer sciences and engineering.