

Supply—External Affairs

Minister go about speaking about the necessity of this force under United Nations control, we have to go outside the House of Commons to find out what the situation is. Today the Minister of National Defence spoke in Toronto.

The Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are all for this force. There are tremendous difficulties in the way. If you set up a body under the United Nations, is it going to be recruited only from the small nations? Are you going to recruit Britishers or Americans or Russians? When you form this force, does it take its direction from the United Nations regardless of the feelings of the respective nations whose forces are used? How often in the last few years it has been found difficult, if not impossible, to use Canadians in certain areas because Canadians are white and the coloured races do not want white armed forces from the United Nations.

Suppose the kind of United Nations force contemplated by the minister and the Prime Minister is set up. What happens? Suppose Canada says: We do not want to be at war with nation A. Must the members of the force from Canada take the direction of the United Nations rather than that of their own nation? One has only to ask the question to realize, with conditions of nationalism being what they are today, the impossibility of setting up such a force. Again I say that does not deny peacekeeping machinery, but it does deny the setting up of such a force powerful enough to act under the direction of the United Nations.

I said a moment ago that we had to find out outside the house what the situation is. As found on page 12 of the speech delivered to the Empire club of Toronto today by the Minister of National Defence, the minister said:

Neither the secretary general nor any major power group within the United Nations has shown any enthusiasm for such a permanent force.

That may be the reason the minister did not press it today; but for the last two or three months the airwaves have been filled by the public statements of the minister and the Prime Minister on the dedication of this country to the setting up of such a force.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Would my right hon. friend permit me to say to him that I have listened with interest to what he has been saying. I do not take issue with what he has said. If there was evidence in the United Nations at the present time that a United Nations police force could be set up, this government would certainly give support to that idea but, as my right hon. friend knows, at the present time there is not the

disposition to give support to such an idea and we have been trying to achieve it within a more limited sphere.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is a very interesting observation because I want to refer now to what the Minister of National Defence said as to the proper course when he spoke today. He went on to say:

It would appear then that the most satisfactory solution is to have well balanced, broadly trained forces to draw from as required.

That just shows the cleavage between ministers in the government.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): There is no cleavage.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I realize that the hon. gentleman always finds difficulty in seeing that the antithesis to something is not the same. I point out that the minister has quite frankly admitted that if the other nations would favour such a force Canada would then be in the van along with them; but the other nations are not going to have it, so my earlier request that parliament should have the opportunity to examine the matter fully before such a force comes into effect is surplusage.

One tries to follow in the sequence taken by the minister the various matters he discussed. Without a prepared script, but simply anticipating what might be considered to be important, I have endeavoured to place before the house as objectively as possible the views of the opposition. We share with the government—no party has a monopoly in this regard—the desire that the objective, the dedication and the first consideration of all of us shall and must be peace with justice, a world under law, a world in which each nation will regard itself as a keeper of all other nations.

In external affairs we try at all times to maintain an essential unity. That unity will be maintained by the opposition whenever questions of external affairs come before the house. However, when one considers that the Hon. Howard Green for three long years, in the face of contemptuous ridicule, pursued the objective of ending nuclear tests as a preliminary to the wider field of ultimate disarmament, I am sure no one will object to my saying that, despite the outcome of the election, he has the satisfaction of knowing that he builded better than he dreamed.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, we in this party welcome the opportunity presented by the introduction of the estimates of this department to take advantage of the wide-ranging debate on Canada's role in international affairs. I, too, would like to congratulate the minister, who seems temporarily at least to have left the chamber, on