

National Defence Act Amendment

conflict here. We say the statement does not give any clear indication of the future role of the Canadian forces or the forces that the minister and the government want to have. The government indicates that, after two world wars, a small populated country like Canada is going to have an over-all air force, an over-all army and an over-all navy. Obviously Canada cannot do that because we have neither the money nor the manpower. Obviously the government has to decide the future role of the forces on the basis of the best contribution Canada can make toward world peace. Having reached that decision, then we can understand at least to some extent what is meant by unification.

In view of the minister's own outline and the stress he places on mobility, what it means in men, equipment and training, we feel there is a strong argument for a definite statement of policy from the government so that by the time the new NATO agreement comes up in 1969 Canada will have removed its forces from Europe. We believe it is time to give real consideration to that, particularly in view of the fact it takes a while to accomplish this after the decision is made, and because the new agreement comes up for discussion and signature in 1969. Surely after so many years and all the redevelopment after the devastation of the second world war, those countries are basically able to look after themselves, especially with the Canadian mobile force at hand as outlined by the minister.

We in this group are not the only ones talking about withdrawing troops in two or three years. This has been discussed in the United Kingdom. If you want to bring it closer to home I would refer to an article in the *New York Times* of January 20 with a Washington dateline. It reads:

● (6:00 p.m.)

Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield, criticizing the administration for "marking time" on European policy, has reopened his campaign to bring about a substantial reduction of U.S. forces in Europe.

With the support of most of the Senate Democratic leadership, the Montana Democrat reintroduced a resolution saying a substantial reduction could be made in the present six U.S. divisions in Europe without "adversely affecting" North Atlantic Treaty commitments.

It was identical to a resolution last year that the Senate leadership decided not to press after the administration gave assurances that it was studying future U.S. troop levels with the NATO allies.

The resolution is to be referred to the armed services and foreign relations committees, and

[Mr. Winch.]

Mansfield said he expected the two committees to hold joint hearings and act on his proposal some time this year.

Should the resolution reach the Senate floor, the appraisal of Senate leaders is that it would receive approval by a large majority.

Canada should think not just of renegotiating its position in NATO but of getting out of NATO. The only phase of activity I can see where we might continue is in that having to do with the anti-submarine specialty of the Canadian navy on the Atlantic coast.

The future role of our forces is not made clear, is not outlined in any way by the Minister of National Defence. Having mentioned NATO I ought to mention NORAD. It is understandable that there should be a close relationship between the United States and Canada on defence matters. No reasonable explanation can be given why, in regard to defence co-operation and our relations with the United States under NORAD, we should have nuclear weapons in the hands of Canadians and on Canadian soil.

An hon. Member: It is a matter of policy.

Mr. Winch: When the Liberals came to power, following our friends on the right who had agreed to the introduction of nuclear weapons in the hands of Canadians and the storage of nuclear bombs on Canadian soil, the Prime Minister made it clear that Canada would move immediately to negotiate out of that commitment. We have not heard a word about it since. We accept our Prime Minister's word. We tell him to negotiate out of that commitment and to remove atomic weapons from Canadian soil and from the hands of our troops overseas. I do not know how the Minister of National Defence can maintain the present position of having these weapons in face of the absolute contradiction contained in those beautiful, constructive yet sanctimonious speeches prepared by the Department of External Affairs and delivered at the United Nations. One was made at a NATO conference in Paris not too long ago. The speech warned against the proliferation of nuclear weapons of any kind. As a matter of fact, the whole thing becomes ridiculous.

Having said what we urge, let me now refer to something that appeared in a newspaper. This article deserves to be printed in every newspaper in North America and possibly throughout the world. It is datelined Washington and reads:

The United States, Britain and Russia signed a treaty Friday which bans nuclear weapons in space—