

The Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence had a subcommittee which discussed the matter of peacekeeping. Among other things, we visited the United Nations. We discussed this matter with representatives of the United Nations, representatives of the great powers including France, the U.S.S.R. and the United States. Without exception, they said there was a future role for peacekeeping and that Canadian forces, by reason of their expertise, training and background of their country, might well be needed as a crucial component of a peacekeeping force to preserve the peace and security of the world.

These three functions, internal order, defence of sovereignty and aid to international order are all essential. We in this party approve of them. We believe our armed forces should be geared to perform these particular functions and trained and armed for these purposes. We do not think that Canada has much part to play in the major, strategic over-all defence of the North American continent. We are the neighbour of a superpower. Whether we like it or not, we are under the umbrella of that superpower as far as strategic power is concerned. We are not asked and do not need to make a contribution to that.

We in this party welcome the apparent move toward a limitation of the antiballistic missile system which appears to have been arrived in the SALT discussions between the United States and the U.S.S.R. We have stated many times in this House that multiplication of the antiballistic missile systems is another step in the mad momentum of the nuclear arms race, to be followed by further steps of escalation which would in turn minimize the changes made by the installation of the ABM system and leaves the parties exactly where they were before. We warmly welcome what appears to be a move in this direction as announced yesterday by the President of the United States.

I want to deal with some of our other roles. I want to deal with one role which we should now discard as obsolete. That is our participation in the NORAD system. I have said this before and I say it again. As everyone knows, that is a system of defence against manned bombers. It costs us at least \$200 million a year. The estimates show this directly. We are not against co-operation in principle with our American friends, but we say that this particular defence is long obsolete. In the missile age of today, it is absolutely useless. A couple of well placed missiles could destroy the main bases in Canada which are used by NORAD.

As long ago as 1964, Mr. McNamara, the secretary of defence of the United States, said the only useful purpose of the NORAD system that existed at that time, and still exists today, was as a target for missiles which the U.S.S.R. had in limited numbers at that time. Since then there has been an increase in the number of U.S.S.R. missiles. One thousand high powered missiles would be a low estimate of what they actually have available. This defence, which was installed at great expense—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please, the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Roberts) would like to ask the hon. member a question on this point.

National Security Measures

Mr. Roberts: Does the hon. member recall that Mr. McNamara's statement was perhaps referring to the skybolt missiles and not to the NORAD detection and warning system in its entirety?

Mr. Brewin: I may stand corrected. There certainly was the missile system involved in NORAD. He may not have been referring to NORAD as a whole. I am trying to point out that even that usefulness has now disappeared.

In 1964, General Simonds, a very distinguished Canadian soldier, pointed out to the committee on defence the reasons that this system was obsolete and should be scrapped. One of the reasons he gave was that the major defence against any attack by armed bombers was the fact that they could be detected shortly after they left their bases. We had detection systems on the North American continent to detect incoming bombers within a two hour duration of those bombers leaving their bases in their own territory and arriving at their targets in North America. Within two hours, the target planes could leave the ground and immense retaliation would be poured on the country that launched the attack. General Simonds said the Russians would have to be crazy to launch such an attack with manned bombers. What he said then applies today. Can anyone suggest, particularly at this time when our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is discussing protocols of friendship with the Russians, that their government would be crazy enough to launch destruction on themselves and the world by a manned bomber attack?

Once you have a system installed, it is easy to carry on with it regardless of whether it makes sense. There is a self-perpetuating tendency within military systems. I urge this government to have the courage to negotiate with our American friends and say to them that we are prepared to continue co-operating with them in detection systems, but anti-manned attack systems have not made sense for a long time, do not make sense now and regardless of what the Americans can afford, we cannot afford hundreds of thousands of dollars on something unproductive and useless.

My colleague, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), is going to discuss the question of NATO. It is well known that this party has expressed a desire to withdraw from NATO. I do not propose to discuss this except to deal with one aspect. I do not know how NATO can have credibility in the world when the principles which it proclaims in its charter are clearly flouted by the members of NATO. I refer to Greece and Portugal. The purpose of NATO is supposed to be to protect human rights, yet in these two countries and in the colonies of one of them, these human rights are disregarded by military dictatorships. If NATO is essential to the defence of the so-called free world, some steps should be taken to ensure that its members respect the basic principles. Instead of that, the United States has recently rearmed the colonels in control of Greece.

Mr. Nowlan: How about Czechoslovakia?