

*National Defence Act Amendment*

there is some logic and merit in the apparent position taken by the government. It is argued that Canada cannot defend her huge area and enormous coast line all by herself, that we must rely on the United States to help us and, therefore, that it is better and more efficient for the United States to do this by herself. Then Canada could carry its share of the burden of keeping peace in the world by providing forces for United Nations peace-keeping emergency operations and also take a part in fighting "brush-fire" type wars on behalf of NATO.

As I have indicated already, I have no doubt that this new force could perform this function very efficiently. There is some logic in the position of the government in this regard. There are, however, certain arguments against such a proposal. Perhaps I might enumerate these. First of all, if the defence of the continent of North America is almost completely turned over to the United States, then the United States for her own protection and for the protection of the continent eventually must take over and use the military installations in Canada. In addition, the United States would probably find it was necessary to set up new installations in Canada. In view of the present increasing Canadian nationalism I would doubt very much that such a proposition would be acceptable to the Canadian people. As was suggested to me the other day, I hardly think it would be very acceptable if United States troops were quartered in the citadel at Quebec. That is just one example.

There is no one in this house who is any more a friend of the United States than I am. I believe it is all very well to have close alliances with friends, but once one starts turning over his household to them there can be only one result. In this case it would only encourage anti-American feeling in Canada even more than the C.B.C. is doing at the present time. I do not think this is at all desirable. If a situation were to develop in which United States troops of different types were quartered in Canada, then foreign countries could only assume under these conditions that Canada was little more than a military province of the United States. Should Canada be regarded as merely a military province of the United States, would our troops then be acceptable by the United Nations? I think they would not.

In the United Nations peace-keeping operations it recently has been the practice that the major powers such as the United States and the Soviet Union do not provide forces nor do

their immediate close allies. Were Canada to be placed in such a position, I do not think our troops would be accepted by the United Nations. They could not be used. Then what function would they perform?

The third objection, to which I have alluded already, is that at the present time the United Nations is not disposed to undertake peace-keeping operations. This may change in the future, and I hope it does, but at the present time the United Nations is not disposed to undertake peace-keeping operations because of the many internal difficulties it has had in this regard. I shall not take the time of the house to enumerate these. Those members who are interested in this matter already know the reasons.

It is alleged that we have a faint voice in Washington, but if we should leave the defence of the continent entirely to the United States then under such conditions we would have no voice at all. At the present time we have a very good position internationally. However, there are a number of serious questions concerning matters which ultimately could seriously affect our sovereignty and position internationally. The government has not yet answered any of these questions. A few moments ago the minister stated that it has. I do not know where these answers are. I hope the minister will clarify this situation so that there will be no misunderstanding.

Is it the intention of the government to provide a single unified service, sort of a hybrid force, just for the purpose of U. N. peace-keeping operations or to take part in certain brush-fire wars on behalf of NATO? It seems to me that this is the case. There is a good deal of evidence to back this up, including private observations made by members on the government side of the house. If this is a fact, then the minister should tell us. If it is not a fact, he should deny it specifically right down the line, because I think this is the most important issue in this debate.

Matters such as economies, uniforms, what happens in respect of the various units and so on, of course are important, but the really important thing is how our foreign policy may be changed as a result of this program. The minister, in a sense, is in an awkward position in a debate of this kind because he cannot answer until the debate is wound up. However, I suggest to the minister, and I hope he will seriously consider the suggestion, that the subject matter of this legislation be sent to a joint meeting of the committees on national defence and external affairs so that we will