

National Defence

omission was not intentional. In the face of all this, it is not surprising that the member for Nanaimo would change his tune. In a speech over the radio he said this:

It is the form of help that I consider so wrong. In spite of the fact that in Europe there are hundreds of thousands of young men available for the infantry regiments of their own armies, the government of Canada failing to take advantage of this country's industrial ability and its unique facilities for the training of armoured formations and air units, have sent the very type of soldier most plentiful in Europe, placing reliance upon numbers rather than hitting power. Surely the reverse should have been our policy. It is not a few extra riflemen that are required, and after all a brigade is soon swallowed up by the larger formations, but highly mobile hard-hitting units able to develop the greatest possible volume of fire with the minimum number of men, and to repeat the number over and over again.

Then, further, he says:

The cost of maintaining one Canadian soldier in Europe is, therefore, out of all proportion to that of maintaining a European soldier in his own country. Such disparagement can only be justified provided the Canadian soldier possesses much greater power than his European counterpart, for after all, one man carrying a rifle is worth exactly one man, one rifle. The British have recognized this fact and their army in Germany is organized on the basis of three armoured formations to every one of infantry. Yet Canada sends an infantry brigade with only a small armoured component all this distance at great expense to the taxpayers.

It is not possible for me here to give in detail the composition of an infantry brigade group or of an armoured brigade. Everyone knows that an infantry brigade group has armour in connection with it sufficient to enable it to fight as a self-contained formation. It is the minimum formation that can fight as a unit. The 27th brigade is established on this basis in Germany. It does not constitute a part of a division or corps. It lives and trains as a unit. An infantry brigade group is the only formation of which I know that can do that. I think you will all agree that it is desirable, other things being equal, that it should do that. To do this job it has precisely the armour considered necessary by the British and Canadian staffs. It has the same quantity of armour as Canadians have used so successfully in Korea. There the army is equipped with Sherman Mark IV tanks which have been found useful. Incidentally, we have a number of these tanks in Canada, but subsequent models in the United States are not sufficiently advanced in development and production to justify proceeding to acquire them. Accordingly, we have arranged with the United Kingdom to buy a similar number of Centurion tanks. Our brigade in Germany is to be equipped with them, and they are very good tanks.

An armoured brigade is not a self-contained unit. It does not fight as such. If armour is to be used in a predominant role, you would

never use anything less than one division of armour. Then, it would be advantageous to have a second armoured division in reserve. An armoured brigade always fights in association with other units. It has no infantry, no artillery or supporting and administrative formations. I repeat that the infantry brigade group is the only formation short of a division which is self-contained.

An armoured brigade would have faced us with one of two choices. On the one hand we would have had to build up a self-contained brigade by adding other formations, and in this way we would have had a pretty fair sized division, resulting not in the saving of manpower as suggested by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes) but in a greater expenditure of manpower. The other alternative would have been to fit the armoured brigade into a British corps. The brigade then would have lost its identity. I can assure you that is one thing Canadian soldiers do not want. I, as a serviceman, strongly support the servicemen of Canada in that view. There are a great many other reasons of a military nature why it is desirable to have an infantry brigade group. One is that it is very easy to build it up to form a division. Already we have in existence and fully trained virtually all the component units to do this at any time. Other military reasons I am afraid I cannot go into. Yesterday the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) gave an excellent speech on armour, quoting such famous generals as Martel, Fuller, Hart, and others whom we all know and have studied. However his treatise on armour did not deal with an armoured brigade group but with at least one division, or an armoured corps.

There are two things I would like to discuss further. In the first place, when we joined the North Atlantic treaty nations we retained, as did all other nations, the final say as to what each should do. We have not relinquished any of the authority of this government over the forces of Canada. We agreed to work with the other nations, and this we have done and shall continue to do. As I understand it, the suggestion made to us in the first instance by the standing group and later by other agencies of NATO was not that we should contribute an armoured brigade but that we should contribute what we have contributed, namely an infantry brigade group. I know of no country ever having contributed to any force an armoured brigade alone. I suggest this is a military monstrosity.

Finally, unless we send to Europe the Mark IV tanks we have in Canada, I do not think enough tanks would be available to arm an armoured brigade. They do not exist. We are