

*National Defence*

for Nanaimo made several statements during his speech on April 3 which is reported on pages 1091, 1092 and 1093 of *Hansard*. He stated that he had seen with his own eyes a vast reservoir of manpower in the countries of Europe from which the infantry components of NATO could have been drawn. He said that the manpower was there but that it lacked adequate equipment. He laid stress on the importance of our contribution to NATO being that of a mobile and thoroughly modern organization.

In addition to what he said in the house yesterday the hon. member for Nanaimo made other statements on his return from Europe last year about the 27th infantry brigade in Germany. The first of these statements was made in Paris and was reported by Canadian Press dispatches which appeared in Canadian newspapers on December 24, 1951. He then made a political broadcast on "The Nation's Business" series over the trans-Canada network on January 15. I do not know whether the Canadian Press report is correct, but in any event it does not appear to have been publicly denied or contradicted.

These statements indicate such an amazing position for the military spokesman for the Tory party to take that I think they should be placed on *Hansard*. In doing so and in criticizing the hon. member for Nanaimo I want to say that I have the utmost respect for him personally and as a soldier. But I simply cannot understand the statements he has been making.

Here is a Canadian Press statement which appeared in the *London Free Press* on December 24, 1951. Mr. Pearkes says:

But I do not believe that the money which is being spent by Canadian taxpayers is getting anything like the return in defence assistance to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that the Canadian people have a right to expect.

I feel that the Canadian government had not fully informed itself or the Canadian people as to actual conditions in Europe before sending the 27th brigade and committing Canada to a long-term policy which to my mind is unwarranted and extremely expensive.

Here we have the spokesman on military matters for the Conservative party advocating Canada should not make her contribution of ground forces to the integrated forces.

Let us look further into this proposal that Canada should leave the fighting on the ground to the men of other nations. To my mind that is like the old rhyme:

Mother, may I go out to swim?  
Yes, my darling daughter:  
Hang your clothes on a hickory limb  
And don't go near the water.

In two wars Canada sent substantial ground forces to Europe to assist in restoring peace. This time the North Atlantic treaty nations

[Mr. George.]

are trying to build up forces including, and particularly including, ground forces to preserve peace. Shall Canada not be represented in this effort? Would the member for Nanaimo say that we should discharge the 10,000 men raised for the 27th brigade or should we keep them in Canada? There is no point of our having in Canada larger forces than those needed for the immediate defence of Canada as well as for administration and training and the supplying of a nucleus for the build-up of our own potential.

The statement by the member for Nanaimo did not meet with approval in Canada, nor presumably in the ranks of his own party. Any editorial comment that there was was unfavourable. The *Victoria Colonist* of December 25, 1951, says this:

It would be easier, of course, to sit back and send only equipment, arms and technicians. For a nation so prosperous as this one, that would scarcely dent the national composure.

**Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** Will the hon. member speak more loudly?

**Mr. George:** Yes.

It is always a comparatively single gesture to extend help in the form of a donation rather than to participate in the endeavour itself.

The *London Free Press* of December 26, 1951, says this:

In the United States there are a great many people who feel, like General Pearkes, that all that is necessary is to send American arms and equipment to Europe, and that the dispatch of American troops is wasteful. From a military standpoint, this may be true, but from a psychological standpoint, it is dangerous. The Germans exploited this feeling in the last war when they sneered that the British were willing to fight to the last Frenchman.

Only by sharing the actual perils of front line resistance with the Europeans can the people of this continent hope to rally the western Europeans to anything like a successful defence effort.

I have several other quotations, Mr. Speaker, but I shall only read one more. It was published on January 9 by the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, a very famous paper which supports certain parties in this house. It says:

Canada can claim no exemption from the front line service in the cause of western alliance. General Pearkes does not speak for the Canadian public. He does not speak for his party, and speaking for himself he has gone badly astray.

That, I repeat, is from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of January 9, 1952.

**Mr. Drew:** Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but I wonder if he is aware that when the member for Nanaimo did amplify his statement, subsequently the *Globe and Mail* wrote a very different editorial.

**Mr. George:** That may be, Mr. Speaker, but unfortunately I have not got it with me. I can assure the leader of the opposition the