

Now we are left with the question of where next in Europe, and particularly what will Canada's relationship be with Europe? There are perhaps four options. The options can be considered under four headings, to be slightly more precise. One option is the CSCE. There is a very real prospect, as has been noted already in this debate and has been referred to in the resolution.

The CSCE itself will become the framework for organizing security in Europe, for dealing in a military way with whatever remaining threats are perceived to the security of Europe.

The great advantage of the CSCE, as has already been stated, is that it includes countries on both sides of the now defunct Iron Curtain. It also includes the neutral countries such as Sweden and Switzerland, and includes Canada and the United States. So it has a trans-Atlantic component as well as strictly a European component.

That means that all of the countries on both sides of the Atlantic that conceivably have a particular interest in issues of regional security in Europe would have a place at the table. It may well be that the CSCE then becomes the forum for sorting out what will be the future arrangements, and arguably may establish within its own system a sum system of collective security in Europe.

Another option is the Council of Europe. Another option is NATO. Another option may be something that nobody has yet put on the table. We have at least four headings under which we can look at the issues of the future security arrangements in Europe. The CSCE, of course, deals with many other issues in Europe, and that is referred to in the resolution.

Let me focus my remarks in my capacity as defence critic for our party on the issues of military security, and how they may be organized and dealt with. One question we have to ask is what is Canada's interest in these arrangements? A subsidiary question to that is what will be the role of the United States in a future Europe?

I think Canada's interests are clearly, certainly in the minds of government supporters and of the Liberals, entirely linked with that of the United States. There seems to be a strong position still emanating from government circles and from the Liberal Party that NATO is to be taken for granted as continuing to have a role and that every effort must be made to maintain NATO's continued existence even if it means finding roles for NATO which it does not presently have.

Government Orders

Furthermore, it is in our interest to encourage the Americans to maintain troops in Europe and concomitantly that we also therefore must maintain troops in Europe, must maintain an air force that can support those troops, must maintain a navy that also is in support of the troops that we have in Europe.

Yet, the military role for American and Canadian troops is now no longer there. It has disappeared. The front lines cannot even be found. One of the officers in the CF-18 squadron there said to the defence committee that what was the town in Czechoslovakia that was his target for exercise purposes and in the event of war, is a town that he now drives his family to on a Sunday afternoon outing.

The target has gone. There is no military requirement for Canadian and American troops in Europe. The only remaining argument is a political one, that is that somehow American and Canadian troops are needed to counter balance some development in Germany. There is an argument sometimes raised that it is essential as part of the nuclear deterrent strategy that if the Americans leave and whoever is left in the Soviet Union threatens a nuclear assault on western Europe, western Europe could no longer in those circumstances count on the American use of deterrent.

• (1310)

Let me deal with these arguments one by one. The real truth of the matter is that there are those in the United States, and reflected and echoed to some extent in Europe, who want the Americans to stay in Europe to exercise American influence in Europe. That is a view which we must dissociate ourselves with. It is not in Canada's interest that the Americans still remain in Europe. It is in Canada's interest that the Americans withdraw their troops from Europe in part so that there is no longer any argument that we should be maintaining troops in Europe.

We spend \$1.2 billion a year on maintaining a contingent in Europe. Everyone in this House can consider other more valuable and useful expenditures. Some would argue simply reducing the deficit. Others would call for a child care program, for restoring the cuts in social programs in this country, for finally dealing with the crisis on native reserves and among native people in Canada, for dealing with poverty in the Third World. We are spending \$1.2 billion directly to maintain this contingent in Europe which no longer has any military significance.