

Private Members' Business

reflect it. Instead, we are going to give them notice today that by 1994 this whole agreement ends, it is over, it is done with.

When the New Democrat spokesman for defence was giving the reasons for his motion this morning, I jotted down his fundamental premise so as not to misquote him. He turns a phrase well and argues with logic. He said: "The fundamental premise has changed". The fundamental premise for the NORAD agreement was put in the context of the end of the cold war.

If it is viewed, as apparently the New Democratic Party views NORAD, as existing entirely in the context of the cold war, yes he is right. The fundamental premise has changed. If it is viewed, as I do and as I think other party spokesmen and other parliamentarians do, that the fundamental premise of Canadian foreign policy and the fundamental premise of Canadian defence policy is co-operative action, a shared responsibility, a sharing of the burdens, a sharing of the costs, a collective approach to security, then most assuredly the fundamental principle has not changed.

The fundamental premise of our policy is that Canada does best as a relatively small power in a complicated and aggressive world to share with others through treaties and other arrangements on a shared basis. That is why we are active in the United Nations, why we are in NATO, why we are in the Conference on Co-operation and Security in Europe, the Commonwealth *la Francophonie*, the Organization of American States and yes, even NORAD. This is all part of a piece.

I want to make it very clear that the Government of Canada, now, today, no longer views NORAD from a cold war perspective. That is very clear. We do not view NORAD from a cold war perspective any more. We view this international treaty as we view all of our others, as part and parcel of the well developed Canadian tradition, developed by governments led by Prime Ministers who were Liberal and Prime Ministers who were Progressive Conservative, who felt that co-operative security and playing an internationalist role was the greatest basis for Canadian long-term success and dedication to the fundamental interests and the fundamental values of Canada as a strong and sovereign country.

Hon. William Rompkey (Labrador): Mr. Speaker, as befits a middle of the road party, I am torn on this issue. I see a lot of merit in the motion. However, I cannot support the unilateral termination of the agreement in 1994. I want to say, parenthetically, that if the Liberal amendment before the House of Commons committee that was reviewing NORAD had been accepted, we would only have a two year agreement. I find it very unfortunate that that amendment was not accepted so that we could have realized the changing world and the changing circumstances and been able to review our policy accordingly.

• (1140)

I agree that there is need for review. I accept what the parliamentary secretary has said about sharing. We are a mouse living next to an elephant. It is tough for a mouse to share with an elephant. The elephant has to be a bit more sharing, a bit more caring and a bit more co-operative.

Nobody has mentioned the Straits of Juan de Fuca and nuclear submarines transferring through Canadian space. The Straits of Juan de Fuca are not an isolated incident. We have had similar incidents in the Arctic with American ships going through Canadian sea space, not to mention submarines, but we do not know where they are and we seem to be powerless to do anything about it. Although, high on the Canadian agenda, it seems to me, is Canadian sovereignty. Canadians want us to get control over our own territory and that includes the north.

Co-operation and sharing is all very well and essential. It makes no sense at all for a power like us to be living on the North American continent with the United States and not have a joint defence policy. It is meaningless. It does not make any sense at all. Sure, we have got to have a joint defence policy, but it has got to be a two-way street. We cannot always be saying yes to the Americans and we cannot always be letting the Americans do exactly what they want because that is not co-operation, that is simply subservience. I do not think Canadians want subservience.

There has got to be a fundamental review. I agree that the cold war is over, but let us remember that the threat still remains. I want to quote from the submission of the Arms Control Centre before the standing committee. They say that they support the renewal of NORAD, but they say: "You simply cannot say yea or nay". The threat