

Council in the same way as we have in the environment. Why can Canada not take that kind of initiative, and why can Canada not say to the United States and to the Soviet Union that they, the United States and Russia, Canada, the Danes, the Norwegians, should have a multinational sea security system, a surface and air security system in the polar region. That is absolutely necessary and its time has come.

After all, if we can do that in the Persian Gulf, why can we not do it in the polar area? What we had in the Persian Gulf was in fact a security system, a 16-nation or more security system. It was not attacking anybody, at least in the beginning it was not. It was simply establishing security. By the way, a lot of that was due to the experience of NATO, of which we and the United States are both partners, and part of the success of the gulf was the fact that we had worked together over the years. We knew our communications systems and we knew our strategies and we were operating jointly. If it can be done in the gulf why can it not be done in the polar areas?

That is the kind of initiative I would like to see. That is the kind of review of NORAD that we need. That is why I am in a dilemma. I like the motion but I cannot unilaterally say just to terminate it and let us see where we go from there.

I have to say in conclusion that if our amendment before the external affairs committee had been accepted, we would have only a two-year agreement and possibly we could have supported the motion.

**Hon. John Bosley (Don Valley West):** Mr. Speaker, I had not realized the matter that was before us until about half an hour ago. I came over because the mover of the motion, the member of the New Democratic Party, knows that I have some interest in the issue of NORAD renewal, NORAD treaty matters, given in fact what did happen in the external affairs committee. I will come back to that in a minute.

• (1150)

Before I get to that, the hon. member for Labrador has made a statement that I hope he did not mean because it flies in the face of some of the things we have been trying to develop around here for some time. I made the note and wrote it down that the government's

### *Private Members' Business*

role is to initiate policy, our role in the House of Commons is to review policy. I know the hon. gentleman has been here for a long time and has been an esteemed member of the defence committee for a long time. I am sure he does not mean what that says, that it is not the role of members of Parliament in the new capacity of committees to initiate policy reviews on their own and to make policy proposals on their own.

I hope that that is what he meant to say, because that is certainly what the committee on which he serves and the committee that I chair regards as our proper role. I think he may have meant that he wishes the government had come forward more quickly with a defence policy paper, and I accept that that is his concern. I am sure he does not want to leave on the record the idea that the only role of members of Parliament is to review government policy initiatives. If that is in fact what he meant to leave on the record, I would be surprised.

He may want to respond to that. I will leave him a minute at the end to respond to that on a point of order, Sir, because that is precisely what he said.

Let me, however, come back to the subject matter that is here. It is true that the standing committee of this House deliberated on the matter of the NORAD renewals here for quite a long time. If I remember correctly, the composition of the joint committee was members of both the defence committee and of the external affairs committee. Certainly the hon. member who proposes the motion today was a member of a distinguished group of members of Parliament who spent some time reviewing this matter. If I remember, they also commissioned a fairly substantial and lengthy piece of research, and on at least one panel I know four experts met. I should say that while I chair the parent committee, I did not participate in the deliberations of the subcommittee but I value the work they did.

That subcommittee commissioned a panel of four experts to prepare a series of papers examining in great detail five aspects of the renewal issue. Those were, specifically, *Soviet Strategic Developments and their Implications*, *United States Strategic Developments and their Implications*, *Strategic Arms Control*, *Aerospace Surveillance* and *U.S.-Canadian Interests in Consultation*.

That panel of experts wrote a long report which they asked our consent later to publish, which we happily gave