

launched cruise missiles from Soviet submarines under Canada's Arctic ice cap. I said at the beginning of my remarks that it is important that our defence policy go hand in glove with our foreign policy. Our foreign policy is to have an effective Canadian role and voice in arms control. Yet, if the Secretary of State for External Affairs is convinced that the sea-launched cruise missile threat exists under the ice cap, why has he not asked that the super powers put on the agenda at Geneva sea-launched cruise missiles as part of the arsenal facing the western world?

It seems to me that there is a gap between the defence policy which the Minister is advocating and the one taken by his own foreign minister. I submit to the House that it is very important that the Conservatives understand that defence policy, foreign policy and domestic policy must always go in the same direction. I submit that that is not now the case.

Some people put the cost of these nuclear-powered submarines at \$5 billion but it is well known that \$5 billion does not include the costs of refitting, refueling, or the training of the crews. The purchase, which will be the largest single expenditure in Canada's defence history, will be at least 50 per cent higher after the infrastructure has been built for it.

I have nothing against the enhancement of the Navy's capabilities. The Navy will have acquired 12 nuclear powered submarines for deterrence of threats to our Arctic security. That begs the question of what the nuclear powered submarines will do when they meet an American or Russian submarine under our Arctic ice cap. Would it not be simpler to use our conventional weaponry systems, including the frigates, anti-submarine air patrols and conventionally powered submarines, to deal with the submarines when they exit from the choke points in Canada's Arctic?

I suggest that this is a very expensive, unilateral, military response. There are other methods of addressing the same problem which have far less implications for Canada's defence and foreign policy. I do agree that as Canada is a maritime nation we will have to enhance Canada's Navy to ensure that we can control the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and ensure that Canada's security and sovereign interests are looked after.

The Liberal Party has a major disagreement with the White Paper with regard to the Conservative Government's decision to withdraw its CAST commitment to Norway. I believe that is a mistake in the premise of Liberal defence policy. Defence policy must dovetail with foreign policy. The Conservative Government itself developed the northern foreign policy approach. I agree that in terms of long-term geopolitical interests Canada will be best served by having alliances and associations with other Nordic countries such as Norway, Finland and Denmark which share Canada's geopolitical concerns. As a result of the withdrawal of our CAST commitment to Norway we will lose one of the major political IOUs which we have in the NATO Alliance since the Norwegians will view this withdrawal as a determination by Canada to withdraw its interest from other Nordic countries.

### *Statements by Ministers*

A good example of this was the Government's reversal of its decision to close the embassy in Helsinki. That was a clear signal to the Nordic countries that we were beginning to place less emphasis on our natural economic, cultural and political alliances with our Nordic neighbours. The Government quickly realized its mistake and announced that it would maintain the embassy in Helsinki. I believe that the decision to withdraw our CAST commitment to NATO will be viewed in a similar manner by our Norwegian friends. Canada will lose influence which it has had until now with our Nordic neighbours who share similar geopolitical interests.

I am going to ask the Standing Committee on National Defence to try to determine to what extent Canada's resources can be redeployed in Europe. Particularly in the light of recent arms control talks it is important that Canada maintain a physical presence of troops on European soil in Germany. We should pursue an option which would allow us to maintain our CAST commitment for the various reasons I have indicated, of a geopolitical nature, including redeploying our forces in Europe.

I agree with the Minister's statement that at the present time our CAST commitment militarily is not viable. However, I do not accept that because it is not viable in today's methodology we should scrap our commitment to Norway in the event of the outbreak of hostilities.

Aside from the geopolitical reasons, it is important that Canada maintain its commitment to Norway because, first, Canadian troops are among the few troop allotments in the western alliance which have been specifically trained for winter war conditions. Second, if we end up with a nuclear-free Europe, Norway will strategically and militarily take on a more important role. I believe that if there is a reduction in nuclear forces in Europe, Norway's role as a defence partner in the NATO Alliance will become more important *vis-a-vis* the Russian submarine fleet that is presently off the Kola Peninsula. Norway would be first under seige with the outbreak of war and it is important that the NATO Alliance recognize the strategic importance of Norway and that Canada recognize the role it can play because we have been trained for winter war conditions.

• (1250)

In conclusion, I believe the primary debate will be about nuclear powered submarines. The Liberal Party is opposed to the acquisition of nuclear powered submarines for all of the reasons I have outlined in my speech.

The Government has yet to answer whether the acquisition of nuclear powered submarines will ultimately mean that at some point in the future Canada will be drawn into the U.S. maritime strategy which many military analysts believe will lead to a destabilization of the existing superpower standoff. The Soviet Union is afraid that an aggressive attack on their submarine fleet off the Kola Peninsula will mean that the Russians will be forced into first use of their nuclear weaponry.