

*Supply—External Affairs*

with greater care by the allies of the United States than yesterday's speech to congress by President Johnson. That speech contained the general affirmation of the United States to "keep its commitments". Naturally the new president concerned himself immediately with domestic affairs. He dislikes NATO, but this omission cannot be given undue significance. There are voices in the United States, notably that of Senator Goldwater, that argue for building American strength at home rather than abroad. The members of NATO must think constantly about the provision and deployment of the armed forces at the service of the alliance. Canada has honoured her NATO commitments in the past and we hope Canada will continue to honour them in the future.

As I have already mentioned, the scrapping of the frigate program and certain other information we read in the press, which one cannot help but feel may have come from authoritative sources, leads one to wonder whether our commitments in this regard are going to be carried out. The planning of military requirements must be a task undertaken jointly by all members of the alliance. This is not something imposed upon the alliance by one or two members. Last May when NATO met in Ottawa the task assigned to the permanent organization in Paris was to study NATO's requirements and the sources available. This task has not, as yet, been completed.

I see the Minister of National Defence has now returned to the house. He addressed the Empire club in Toronto today and spoke on the subject of military strategy. This statement, I understand, was part of his speech, referring to the NATO ministerial meeting which we had here last May, in which he said that they would recall the decision taken, that the council undertake a comprehensive review of the interrelated questions of strategy, forces requirements and the resources available to meet them, in order to achieve a satisfactory balance between nuclear and conventional arms.

This is a very far reaching, sweeping program. Its implications, indeed ramifications, affect the whole scope and structure of western military capacity. Yet I recall, Mr. Chairman, that this happened at the NATO meeting at which, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, nothing was to be decided. This review to which I referred a moment ago was one for which we should have waited before bringing nuclear weapons on to Canadian soil. The result now seems to be that military policy is in some sort of nuclear strait-jacket, with all the eggs in one basket, so to speak. I suppose this may be why the frigates were cancelled. We could not afford both.

The next cornerstone of our foreign policy to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs referred is the United Nations. I should like to say immediately that I had the pleasure of visiting the United Nations recently as an observer for a while and having conversations with a number of the delegates there. What I heard there certainly indicated to me that the acquiring by Canada of nuclear warheads for the Bomarc's did not do this country a great deal of good, so far as the United Nations is concerned.

Nothing has been said publicly about this matter, at least not when I was there, but one certainly heard about it privately. It is the old story, that fitting nuclear warheads on the Bomarc's, considering what use they may be and their purpose, something like bows and arrows in the military context, was of very dubious value and was far outweighed by the loss of our influence at the United Nations in certain circumstances. It was said to me, "I see your government has now joined the nuclear club", and regardless of how one might argue that we really had not joined the nuclear club, that is what people elsewhere believe.

Another point about the United Nations to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has referred has to do with peace-keeping machinery. The Prime Minister also dealt with this in his address to the United Nations. This is a very excellent thing and something that I think we are all in favour of. As was suggested by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in his remarks this afternoon, plans are at present in the state of formulation as to what type of peace-keeping machinery we might have.

There are some suggestions I should like to make on the basis of my experience at the United Nations and I hope that the Secretary of State for External Affairs will take them into consideration. Apart from the military commitments and the types of military forces that might be required, there are certain civilian facilities—I will not use the word "forces"—that might be planned now and kept on file with the secretary general. For instance, every emergency situation that arises in the world is different from the previous one. Just as the Congo was different from the Middle East, so may the next situation be entirely different. The political situation may be different. The geographical situation may be totally different. The type of United Nations personnel that may be required in such a situation can only be determined by the circumstances as the situation arises. However, a certain amount of planning can still be done in advance in order to have on hand certain types of civilian personnel that may