

First, it indicates in a newspaper report in today's *New York Times* that Canada's withdrawal has stirred angry reactions from the Bush administration and from NATO headquarters.

Hon. Efstathios Barootes: Now you like the United States, do you? You did not like them one year ago.

Senator Grafstein: We will hear from eastern Europe in a moment. The report goes on to state.

... mirroring fears that it will increase Congressional pressures for faster American withdrawal and unravel the 43-year-old North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It goes on to quote the NATO Secretary General, Manfred Woerner, who noted that with considerable regret

... given the political and military importance of the presence of Canadian forces in Europe

Senator Roblin: Read the rest of it if you want to quote Mr. Woerner.

Senator Grafstein: We can go on and read the comments of one of our Canadian advisers. Alex Morrison, Executive Director of the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, stated that the token level was still "psychologically very important to Canada's presence." He criticized the move as:

... a withdrawal of Canada into itself. It would reduce the importance of Canada's voice not only in NATO but in general European security matters.

I ask the question through the leader in the Senate if the Canadian government did consult with its allies before taking this decision. For example, did they consult with NATO? Did they consult with the United States? Did the government consult with the U.K? Did the government consult with Germany?

Senator Murray: Yes, yes, yes and yes.

Senator Grafstein: If that was the case, what was the reaction from those countries?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, my friend should have added to the quotation from the Secretary General of NATO the following. He also said that "Canada has assured the allies it will meet its other commitments to the 16-country North Atlantic Treaty Organization and its joint military structure."

As I pointed out, we are keeping two CF-18 fighter squadrons here for contingency operations and the brigade group for war or contingency operations in Europe. Our continuing principal NATO commitments will, like those of our allies, be those related to the defense of our own territory, and to our air and maritime approaches.

● (1630)

Senator Grafstein: Is the government not concerned that Canada's influence in international bodies in Europe—CSCE, NATO itself and even GATT and the ECC—will be vastly diminished by this symbolic withdrawal?

Senator Murray: I do not agree with the honourable senator.

Senator Grafstein: Honourable senators, it appears that these experts and the European experts disagree here.

Senator Murray: The honourable senator has quoted an unnamed person in the Bush administration, the Secretary General of NATO and Alex Morrison, a Canadian.

Senator Grafstein: Honourable senators, perhaps I could add one other name, again from the same press report. This is Professor Serfaty who is a specialist in Atlantic relations in Washington. He states this:

... it will confirm the perception that all of the new world is going home, and it might increase European interests in developing an autonomous defence entity that would be distinct from NATO.

Does the government consider that to be a useful trend?

Senator Murray: Honourable senators, we are hardly going home. I just explained that we will be in NATO until 1995 or thereabouts; second, what we are doing in terms of the military structure and, third, the very considerable commitment that we have made to peacekeeping throughout the world, including in Europe. This is collective security in the 1990s. That is proper foreign defense policy in the 1990s.

FISHERIES AND OCEANS

DECLINE OF NORTHERN COD STOCKS—REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT REPORT

Hon John B. Stewart: Honourable senators, I would ask a question of the Leader of the Government in the Senate concerning the tragic situation that now prevails in the North Atlantic ground fishery. As a basis for my question let me read a sentence or two from the *Globe and Mail*, February 27, 1992:

For five years, a series of danger signals flashed that the northern cod stocks were in dangerous decline. Inshore fishermen sent that message when they returned from frustrating fishing trips. An independent review of the stocks underscored the problem, first in an interim report in 1989 then in an authoritative report in February, 1990.

That report, I interject, was made by Dr. Leslie Harris of Memorial University. Continuing the quotation:

The government dismissed Mr. Harris as a "purist" who did not understand the socio-economic problems of the fishery.

The author of this piece in the *Globe and Mail* proceeds to quote a letter written by the fisheries minister of the day, the Honourable Bernard Valcourt, to this newspaper; that is, the *Globe and Mail*. I quote from the quotation given by the *Globe and Mail* of Mr. Valcourt's letter:

These levels will allow the stocks to regenerate, not fast enough for the purists perhaps, but sufficient to ensure that massive social and economic dislocation and hardship is prevented.