

to speak. Perhaps I waited a little too long, but I do intend to speak.

Thus, with leave of the Senate, I move the adjournment of the debate on the report of the National Finance Committee.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Agreed.

On motion of Senator Tremblay, debate adjourned.

[English]

THE ECONOMY

ECONOMIC, FISCAL AND ENERGY POLICIES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ORDER DISCHARGED AND MOTION WITHDRAWN

On the Order:

Resuming the debate on the motion of the Honourable Senator Phillips, seconded by the Honourable Senator Yuzyk:

That the Senate of Canada do urge the Federal Government to re-direct its economic, fiscal and energy policies, and bring forward as soon as possible a new budget; such budget to provide proper economic direction, improved employment opportunities and measures to restore national confidence in the economy.—(*Honourable Senator Flynn, P.C.*)

Hon. Jacques Flynn (Leader of the Opposition): Honourable senators, I think this motion has become obsolete, and I ask leave to withdraw it, purely and simply.

Hon. Royce Frith (Deputy Leader of the Government): Could we have it stand until the next budget?

Hon. Duff Roblin (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): You have had two already.

Senator Flynn: I would like to clean up the order paper as much as possible as far as I am concerned.

Senator Frith: We will try to do the same.

The Hon. the Speaker: Is it agreed, honourable senators?

Hon. Senators: Agreed.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONSIDERATION OF FIRST REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF STANDING SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—DEBATE CONTINUED

The Senate resumed from Monday, June 28, the debate on the consideration of the Report of the Standing Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs entitled: "Manpower in Canada's Armed Forces", tabled in the Senate on February 10, 1982.

Hon. Gildas L. Molgat: Honourable senators, back in June the then Leader of the Government in the Senate gave us what I took to be the official response of the government to this report. He began his reply on June 23 and concluded it on June 28. In so doing he went through all of the proposals that had been made by the committee. It is not my intention today

to go step by step through all the recommendations. I think there has been a good deal of discussion on the subject already. However, I should like to focus on one recommendation in particular, and that is the first—the whole question of a white paper on national defence.

Before doing that, I want to say how pleased I was that the Minister of National Defence received our report as openly as he did, and I thank him for the very generous but accurate comments he made regarding the work of the committee. His comments were not, of course, made in this chamber because he does not come here to speak, but I was privileged to hear him in Toronto when Senator Hicks and I represented the committee at a meeting of the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies. The minister was present at that meeting, and spoke in the evening. Perhaps I might put on the record some statements he made at that time with regard to the committee's work, because I believe it is important that we have a rapport with the minister, that he understands what we are trying to do, and that we work together. That evening, when speaking at the dinner, he said:

• (1500)

I must highly commend the late Senator McDonald's initiative to establish a Senate Subcommittee on National Defence. Under the leadership of Senator Lafond, the subcommittee has proven highly successful, and provides a valuable service to Canada. In fact, I believe it has become, after the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, the most active committee of the Senate. Certainly, in its deliberations and output, the Subcommittee on Defence gives the nation clear evidence of both the intent and the qualities of the Senate. They are deliberations which illustrate the benefits of their experience, their wisdom, and, most of all, their overarching commitment to the present and future interests of Canada. I look forward with anticipation to the next installment of the subcommittee's report on the Armed Forces—that on the Maritime Command.

It is pleasant to hear those nice things said about the work of the committee, but the question, of course, is: Where do we go from here and what, in fact, is going to happen?

Perhaps I might digress briefly, before moving to the specifics of what I wish to say regarding the white paper, to express my personal opinion—an opinion which has already been expressed by some of my colleagues—with regard to a commitment which Canada has accepted under our European alliance, namely, to provide a special force, called the CAST force, for Norway. Meanwhile we have a partial brigade in continental Europe.

I personally disagree with that particular commitment and believe that as Canadians we should look at it carefully, because we are in a position where we have a brigade on the ground in Germany that is not a full brigade. It is not a fighting brigade in the normal sense. It is incapable of performing the task allocated to a brigade. Meanwhile we are dividing our efforts by accepting another commitment in Norway, which I believe we cannot realistically fulfill, and, if