

National Defence Act Amendment

Canada? Does the hon. member think that for a minute?

I can see something in standardizing training. Certainly we should train all our officers so that they have a broad knowledge of military affairs. We live in a complicated world. In future wars we will probably want to transport our troops by air. It would therefore be very desirable if all our officers, and men if we could do this, had a working knowledge of airplanes, tactics and aerodynamics. However, as an ex-service officer I know this cannot be done. I know that you cannot make an expert artillery officer, an expert submarine commander and an expert jet pilot out of each and every one of us. We all know this, so why pretend? If we realize that we cannot do this, why not spell it out and say so? If we do not expect men to be jacks-of-all-trades and masters of none, let us spell it out and say that we still need specialists.

The minister does not say this; he uses ambiguous language in this bill. As we discuss the clauses of the bill we will take every word and deal with its significance. It is said that in an emergency servicemen can be transferred. Gentlemen, war is an emergency. The only reason for having armed forces at all is the threat of war. We are not spending \$1.7 billion a year to maintain a gentlemen's club. The object should be to train men for war. That is the only reason for our having a Department of National Defence.

I would be delighted to make some contribution to a world peace keeping force. As hon. members know perfectly well, the recent suggestion by Canada has already been turned down. I have no doubt that as the United Nations gains in world prestige and as the communist nations in particular mature and recognize the need for world peace, nations will be willing to go along with the consensus of the world. I hope this will be the case, but we have not yet seen any indication that it will be. Russia has consistently refused to pay her way in the United Nations. China is not yet seated in the United Nations. We are not debating that topic at the moment; we must look at the world situation as it exists. Every move made by our Department of National Defence must be toward the security of this nation. The Department of National Defence should be taking a long term view in this respect. We must put wishful thinking in the background, which is its proper place.

The last speaker mentioned one or two things with which I cannot disagree. We need men of courage. We need men of character.

We need men who are not afraid to lead. We need men who cannot be panicked in any situation. We need men who will put the defence of Canada first. We must have men whose characters stand up between wars, who are prepared to take a cold, hard look at the situation in the world and say that we must remain prepared and must remain strong.

● (5:10 p.m.)

I would like to see Canada so strong at home, so united, so well trained in our armed forces, and so well able to protect this sprawling northern half of the North American continent that she could afford to give some of her armed strength to the underprivileged nations of the world, in the name of the United Nations. I am proud of the contributions we have made so far, but if we take 29,000 men and spread them out to put out six spot fires in the world, what are we going to do if the ugly shadow of a war were to hang over Canada?

I do not know whether I am making my point clearly. I am not only criticizing; I am offering an alternative. My alternative to unification, as it is laid down in the bill, is standardization. It also means national service. This is supposed to be a dirty word; it is supposed to be one we are afraid to use in this country. Why should it be? What is wrong with serving Canada? I am not asking anyone to go off on Anglo-Saxon wars. I am asking that Canada be defended. Why should it be otherwise?

Some of my ancestors were in this country when Jacques Cartier landed. Let nobody give me the senior citizen act, in other words, "We were here first and you took our country away". We did no such thing. The Anglo-Saxon part of my family came out here looking for exactly the same thing as did the glorious French settlers. They were looking for a better life. They were looking for freedom. These people have made me proud to be a Canadian.

We Canadians of the two founding races stood together on two occasions when we were invaded by the now friendly nation to the south, something it has not seen fit to do again in 150 years. It was not because our soldiers were dressed in a common uniform. They had no uniforms: They fought in their overalls; they fought in their skirts; the women helped, the children loaded the guns. The only unification we had then was the unification of our dedication to Canada. We will not