

*National Defence Act Amendment*

unification. Fifth, what are the criteria for militarily effective forces? Could these be met to the same degree in a single force as in a three service system. Finally, would a single military force be capable of operating effectively with the military forces of our allies, remembering always that none of our allies at this time have a single military force?

• (8:50 p.m.)

I believe that the Minister of National Defence owes it not only to TRIO, who have pointed out so well the questions that are troubling them, but also to the people of Canada to tell them much more explicitly than heretofore just exactly what are the advantages and disadvantages, what are the pros and cons of this whole matter of the unification of our forces.

It has been suggested, especially by the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) that a United Nations police force would be one of the most effective ways of maintaining peace in this world. I recently read a very interesting article by Major General Carl Von Horn, who indicated in the article that he was deeply critical of the United Nations peace keeping missions. General Von Horn, who is a Swedish officer, took over from Canada's General Burns as chief of the staff of the UN truce supervisory organization in Palestine in 1958. He went on to command the United Nations forces in the Congo and later in Yemen. He writes that the troops he commanded were excellent, that their morale was high, despite humiliations, but that the United Nations civilian administrators "were so petty they made the soldiers feel like second class citizens".

This is a very damning indictment against the United Nations. I read his remarks with a great deal of interest because I spent some time at the United Nations a few years ago at a very interesting session. I had the opportunity there to watch the direction that the United Nations was taking, and how rapidly it was changing with the advent of the many small African nations. Not only does General Von Horn say that United Nations peace keeping efforts have been a complete mess, but he makes the charge in his memoirs that corruption is rife among United Nations officials on peace keeping missions. These are very serious charges. I believe that in this world, with two great power blocs, the U.S.S.R. and the United States, the really serious arguments will have to be settled by

direct negotiation between the United States and the U.S.S.R.

I should like to put on record the opinion of two of Canada's most distinguished generals, which I do not think have been put on record in this debate before. I refer to General G. G. Simonds and General Vokes.

They had this to say:

The aim of military policy in peace time must be to prepare for the worst eventuality, which would be the outbreak of a major war in which we would become involved. No matter how remote this eventuality may seem, employment of our standing military forces on peace enforcement tasks is a contingency which is secondary to the above aim. To prepare for war is not militarism. It merely faces up to the cold, hard facts which will govern our future existence as a sovereign power.

Generals Simonds and Vokes say that our military structure in peacetime must be so organized that it can pass rapidly and efficiently to a war footing. Therefore it must be measured by this: Is it capable of assuming the burden which will be placed on it in the event of the requirement to mobilize our military force to maximum national capacity? If it does not measure up to this, then it is of doubtful value. This preparation for war does not demand a large standing military force in peacetime, but it does require the maintenance of professional and military know-how by maintaining the trained nucleus to provide the framework for a planned and tidy mobilization.

Fortunately since world war II and because of our military commitments through membership in NATO and the UN, Canada maintained standing military forces today that are many times greater than at any other peacetime period in our history. Because of this the military expertise which began to flower in the Canadian Armed Forces in world war II has remained in bloom. Thus the regular Canadian sailors, soldiers and airmen are highly skilled, professional military men. Those who have risen to senior rank by education and experience are military experts of a high order, and their advice on matters pertaining to the military service should never be disregarded. It would appear that in far too many cases this has been so.

It is very easy for the government to impose its will on senior service officers by retiring them out of hand if they disagree with the policy which, because of their training and experience, they know to be dangerous to the future military welfare of their country.