

*National Defence Act Amendment*

This is what he calls the strategic position of the government at the present time. He goes on to say:

This would require the country's air and naval units to play largely a support role for the army, rather than the semi-independent part they once took.

I do not know whether that represents the thinking of the government, but in many quarters there is a very strong suspicion that it does. From what has been going on I am afraid that it is a reasonably close approximation to what the minister and the government have been thinking and where they are heading, whilst at the same time trying to lull the Canadian people into a belief that our defence is perfectly well looked after, that the force has never been in better shape, and things along that line. This is a strategic document, as Mr. Young calls it, and the fact is that the government contends it will meet the necessities of Canadian defence or the stated objectives of our defence policy as laid down by the minister in the white paper of 1964. It would be totally inadequate to meet those objectives. The first of these aims is the direct defence of Canada, the surveillance and control of our land, water and air, and the ability to deal with any infringement of or attack on these. This of course requires naval, army and air units, each so far as its effective use is concerned acting in its own sphere.

Surely the best way in which to meet this need of Canadian defence is by maintaining the present three services. To substitute a mobile force which is mainly army, in which naval and air elements would take only a supporting role, would not enable us fully to maintain Canadian sovereignty even over our own water, land and air space. As a matter of fact if we came to a situation of that kind we in effect would have to depend on the United States for the direct defence of this country, even in the event of minor incursions. In my view this is a concept which is utterly at variance with the sovereignty and independence of this country.

Further, the objectives of our defence policy are to maintain peace by deterring and preventing the outbreak of a third global war and to maintain the security and independence of Canada itself. Clearly these objectives are, in the past 15 or 20 years have been, and in the future will be attained only by alliance with other free democratic nations and by making the United Nations an effective force. I believe that Canada's defence policy primarily must be based on strong support for NATO and a willingness on our part to make

a proportionate contribution to its strength, according to our population and economic position.

The western alliance of NATO has prevented any general war breaking out during the past 18 years, and at the same time has stopped the Soviet take-over of any further countries in Europe. The deterrent power of the alliance depends on its military strength, both nuclear and conventional, and on its evident will to use this strength if necessary. It is on this point that I disagree completely and thoroughly with the ideas put forward by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) on behalf of the New Democratic Party. There has, of course, been this deterrent so far as Soviet-western relations are concerned during the past two years. I think this has lulled a large number of people into the belief that there no longer is a serious threat so far as the Soviet Union is concerned. I believe this is a completely false and incorrect assumption which, if it were followed by the other powers, eventually would result in disaster. The Soviet aim of imposing communism on the world has not changed. There are likely to be continued probing actions on their part to make what gains they can and to test the will of the west to resist. The Russian adventure in Cuba was an outstanding example of this. It demonstrated very clearly, when the United States, backed by other members of NATO, showed that they were willing to employ all their military strength if necessary, that the Russians were not ready to carry the matter to an all-out war.

In order to prevent an all-out war I think the western alliance must be maintained and the members of that alliance must be prepared to continue to play a fair and reasonable part in the alliance. The military contributions of each country to NATO are based on the ability of each to contribute to the common defence. They are arrived at by negotiation and agreement, and must of necessity change with changing circumstances. I have no quarrel with the contention that the military commitment to NATO should be renegotiated, because as conditions change this becomes a necessity. However, while contributions may be increased or decreased, or one contribution replaced by another, the main thing is that when it has been agreed that certain forces will be provided, and other members of the alliance depend