

asked the Minister of Defence about comments he had made to the press concerning US involvement in the preparation of the Paper. Mr. Blackburn asked, "Why has the American Defence Secretary been kept 'fully involved and informed' about the White Paper when this Parliament has seen nothing concrete....?"<sup>11</sup> Mr. Beatty responded that as a partner in NATO and NORAD Canada had a responsibility to consult its allies.<sup>12</sup>

In response to the Minister's speech on the White Paper, Liberal member Doug Frith emphasized the need for Canadian defence policy to be coordinated with foreign policy. By eliminating the CAST commitment to Norway and imposing a military solution to a legal problem in the Arctic the White Paper has failed to complement foreign policy. Although Mr. Frith said that he was in favour of improving the navy, he took particular issue with the decision to purchase nuclear-powered submarines. He stated:

I reject the assertion that the only method of addressing the security issue in the Arctic is the acquisition of nuclear-powered submarines....It is our view that a combination of detection devices with increased air patrols and surface ships,...can provide a visible security presence in Canada's Arctic. I believe that in the long run a combination of conventionally powered submarines, frigates and air patrols will be a much more cost-effective way of dealing with the security problem....<sup>13</sup>

Mr. Frith stated that the real threat in the Arctic was not Soviet submarines but US submarines. In hearings before the Standing Committee on National Defence he had learned that, "There is no proof yet that the Soviets have used their nuclear-powered submarines under the Canadian ice cap."<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Commons Debates, 5 May 1987, p. 5761.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Commons Debates, 5 June 1987, p. 6780.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid.