

into land and air divisions

2. Pre-positioning equipment and supplies for the Canada-based brigade group (5 GBC) which in time of crisis would join the brigade group permanently stationed in southern Germany (4 CMBG)
3. Pre-positioning equipment and supplies for the AMF(L) Battalion Group assigned in time of crisis to Northern European Command
4. Re-equipping our armored regiments with new main battle tanks
5. Assuring sustainment of the army division by 1 Canadian Brigade Group and the new Militia brigades
6. Increasing the personnel strength in Europe to provide land and air Divisional elements and larger logistics and medical support cadres
7. Providing additional airlift capability.

To revitalize the reserves by

1. Introducing a Total Force Concept, reducing the distinction between the Regular and Reserve forces
2. Assigning the Reserves specific wartime tasks
3. Improving the quality and quantity of training and equipment
4. Increasing the Reserves to 90,000 personnel over time
5. Investigating reactivation of university Reserve officer training programs
6. Improving Reserve pay and benefits.

To build a firmer foundation for future defence by

1. Providing equitable opportunities in both official languages in the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence
2. Expanding the role of women in the Canadian Forces
3. Ensuring that the composition of the Regular and Reserve Forces more adequately reflects the ethnic diversity of Canadian society
4. Strengthening defence industrial preparedness
5. Enhancing the contribution of the Canadian Forces to foreign disaster and humanitarian relief
6. Broadening and extending the Military and Strategic Studies program
7. Replacing the War Measures Act with new emergencies legislation
8. Introducing legislation to establish Emergency Preparedness Canada, the agency responsible for coordinating the civil aspects of government-wide mobilization planning.

The Department of National Defence document added that major military equipment programs took a long time to complete and the government would not be able to implement all the initiatives at once. The goal, however, was to have them all substantially in place by the end of the 15-year planning period covered by the White Paper. The Paper committed the government to annual real growth in defence spending which would not fall below 2 percent over the 15-year period. Increased resources above that planned funding floor would be provided as major projects forecast in the White Paper were introduced.

The *Globe and Mail* reported on June 5 that Captain John Moore, editor of the authoritative annual London

review *Jane's Fighting Ships*, had greeted with astonishment and skepticism the plan to buy nuclear-powered submarines (SSNs). "If the aim is to go rumbling around under the ice looking for 'boomers,' [ballistic missile-carrying submarines] then it seems to be rather pointless just to satisfy Ottawa's sensitivity about American deployments," Capt. Moore said. "You can't show the flag with an SSN . . . The whole point of a hunter-killer is that nobody knows you are there, so you don't go waving your periscope around with a flag on it and playing The Maple Leaf Forever." The plan was the most widely criticized of all the White Paper initiatives, with Liberal defence critic Doug Frith (Sudbury) saying it "is going to send the wrong signal to the Russians, and NDP defence critic Derek Blackburn (Brant) calling it "a very, very dangerous proposal." In addition, a spokesman for the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament said, "There is a very real danger . . . that, in times of crisis, Canadian submarines operating in the high Arctic will become an adjunct to the United States Navy's new forward maritime strategy, which, by threatening to attack Soviet submarine deterrent forces in their home waters, seriously undermines the stability of deterrence." A spokesman for Greenpeace said, "Canada's reckless decision to buy nuclear-powered submarines will threaten the security of Canadians, and could lead to a catastrophic environmental disaster, while doing nothing to enhance Canada's claim to Arctic sovereignty" (*Toronto Star*, June 6).

Canada's ambassador for disarmament, Douglas Roche, said, "Had I been writing that part of the Paper [regarding the Soviet Union] I would have recognized in a deeper way this transformation moment that is going on in the world in general terms in which we are trying to learn how to live together in the global community, in which we all have common ground and common vulnerability." But, Mr. Roche added, "our reputation, our experience and our commitment will overcome the poor rhetoric in the White Paper . . . The work of the Canadian government in disarmament is not going to be diminished by a White Paper. Our work of trying to build the fusion between East and West is going to go on" (*Kingston Whig-Standard*, June 13).

Prime Minister Brian Mulroney told the Commons on June 15 that criticism of the White Paper was little more than talk, a June 16 report in the *Globe and Mail* said. "We are not concerned about the opinions of any expert about the White Paper," the Prime Minister said. "This is a national document which . . . will strengthen Canada even more as a military power." Mr. Mulroney further defended the new policy in July when he told protesters in Nanaimo, B.C., "We're going to have a prouder country that will be properly defended . . . We're going to defend the interests of Canada" (*Ottawa Citizen*, July 13).

Finally, the Canadian military broke with tradition to begin speaking out on the White Paper. General Terry Liston, head of public relations for the Department of National Defence, confirmed on June 19 that senior military personnel had been speaking on the White Paper in churches, schools and service clubs since its release. Brigadier General Kent Foster of CFB Petawawa, told a Rotary Club meeting in Pembroke that he was pleased with the White Paper and spoke favorably of the government's