

*National Defence Act Amendment*

Another piece of corroborative evidence is that at the United Nations last fall, Canada's largest and principal project was a peace-keeping resolution which it introduced in the General Assembly. I have a copy of that resolution here. It is rather long, Mr. Speaker, and I would request that it be placed in the record of today's proceedings as an appendix to *Hansard*. As I say, it is a resolution which was presented by the government of Canada to the United Nations General Assembly last fall.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order. Does the house give unanimous consent to have this resolution printed as an appendix to *Hansard*?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[*Editor's note: For text of resolution referred to above see appendix.*]

**Mr. Nesbitt:** The Secretary of State for External Affairs had the responsibility for this resolution, which was a very good one. In general terms it laid down guidelines as to how the United Nations could provide funds and troops at the request of the Secretary General. The Secretary of State for External Affairs and his departmental officials should be commended for it. However, at the United Nations we found that for a good many reasons peacekeeping is not in vogue any more, and this commendable resolution put forward by Canada was badly defeated.

Although we expected the Soviet Union and her allies to oppose it, much to the surprise of some of us we found that the following countries, many of them members of the Commonwealth, did not support the resolution: France, Australia, Brazil, Burma, Ceylon, Ghana, Iceland, India, Ireland, Jamaica, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Philippines, Singapore, Trinidad and Tobago, Tanzania and Zambia. When our close friends, plus a great many other countries, did not support our resolution the conclusion is that peacekeeping is not at all popular at present in the United Nations.

If it is the intention to provide an integrated force mainly for peace-keeping operations we should be very careful of what the United Nations is thinking because, as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) during the question period some time ago, we might have the force "all dressed up and no place to go". I am sorry that peace-keeping operations are by no means popular at the United Nations at present but the facts of life, unpleasant as they may be, are the facts of life.

[Mr. Nesbitt.]

As further corroborative evidence I would point out that from time to time many of us receive information from what the gentlemen of the press refer to as "reliable sources". People tell things to those of us who have been around here for a while, and the information which I have received from various sources and in various places is that the government's plan for a single service is to make it available for United Nations peace-keeping operations and perhaps occasionally for specific NATO purposes. I might add that two members of the government party have quite frankly said that this is the government's intention.

This suggestion was put forward by myself during the debate on December 7, and also by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), the spokesman for this party on defence and vice chairman of the parliamentary defence committee. We have posed these questions to the minister on other occasions and there has been no reply to our suggestions.

**Mr. Hellyer:** That is not true. They were categorically denied.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** I would like to know just when they were denied?

**Mr. Hellyer:** The last time you raised them.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** The minister, as usual, makes a vague remark. Perhaps when he is answering he will deny these things. He has not denied them to date. They were brought up the other day right after the minister spoke. The hon. member for Edmonton West again raised these points. I do not know when they were denied. They certainly have not been denied in this house nor have I seen any reports that they have been denied outside the house.

I do not wish to create the impression that members of this party are opposed to peace-keeping operations by the United Nations. Far from it. We are certainly most in favour of this sort of operation but we are not in favour of putting all our eggs in one basket, having all our armed forces designed for one purpose, to serve the United Nations and possibly help NATO fight brush-fire wars. I think the United Nations should be the third priority. The defence of this country and this continent should be the first two priorities.

● (5:00 p.m.)

If the government's intention is as I have outlined, I would like to hear the minister speak on that point when he replies because