

National Security Measures

have invested in it. I hope the minister will be able to sell it. The Germans might be interested in it. I wish the minister well in his negotiations with them.

I wonder how the minister will de-emphasize the anti-submarine warfare role of maritime command. That has been its traditional role. How will he de-emphasize it? I know that the minister has not been happy with the DDH-280 program. He must find the money to pay for the vessels. One of the great psychological blocks to changing the role of maritime command stems from the names that we give to that role. Surely we must recognize that the role of maritime command in recent years has changed. Its role now is preponderantly one of surveillance, monitoring and detection, as opposed to its former role which involved anti-submarine warfare. The terminology used in connection with anti-submarine warfare dates back to the 1914-18 war, which was before my time and before the minister's time. I know that terminology was used in the Second World War. The term "anti-submarine warfare" no longer reflects the role of maritime command today. We should drop the term "anti-submarine warfare" denoted by the letters ASW. The role of the command involves surveillance, monitoring and detection, and "SMD" sounds much nicer than "ASW". These changes involve questions of psychology. I think the minister would find it much easier to sell his ideas to cabinet if he used new terminology and dropped the archaic terms that have been used to describe maritime command in the past.

We need a true submersible if we are to maintain, as the Prime Minister has suggested we should, our national sovereignty. We need a submarine. We need a nuclear submarine to be exact. We need three or four of them at least if we are not to pay mere lip service to the control of the north.

What substantial changes can be anticipated with respect to the size of our forces? Surely the white paper will deal, as well, with the widespread disquiet within the forces resulting from the continuing application of what may be described as archaic labour-management practices. On a number of occasions the minister has indicated clearly that there would not be an expansion of the forces but that there would be, rather, a realignment of trades. We must make certain that we can meet our external commitments.

The development of policy solely on the basis of our willingness to make available resources seems to me to be dangerous. If the threat is not real, then the government has the responsibility of saying so and of acting accordingly. On the other hand if, as I believe, it is real, then we must adopt a policy that will reflect honour on our country and the wisdom of the professionals in the Canadian forces. The white paper should say to our friends that we stand with them in the interests of preserving world peace and that we will play our role to the full. We will play the fullest role that our resources will permit in the preservation of those principles within which, and only within which, peace can be achieved and sustained. I urge the minister, in the final dotting of the

"i's" and the crossing of the "t's", to show some concern for the professionals who serve our country so well.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the official opposition for introducing this important subject for debate. Having said that, I must also say that as far as this party is concerned we do not agree with the motion and we do not agree with the emphasis of the speech of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall).

Of course the subject is important, Mr. Speaker. The future security of Canada depends upon our armed services and our defence measures. Our contribution to the security and peace of the world depends upon our defence measures and the actions that we take for defence. We spend about \$2 billion yearly of the taxpayers' money on defence. The function of Parliament in this field, as I see it, is not to attempt to discuss the details of hardware to use the jargon of those involved with defence; rather, it is to determine what shall be the essential roles to be served by the Canadian forces and to distinguish between those roles which are essential to the peace and security of Canada and those which are unproductive and wasteful and which lead to inflation and dissipation of the resources of the Canadian people in useless and obsolete systems.

I wish to ask some questions, and I think all hon. members of the House in debating the subject of defence ought always to ask these questions. I hope the forthcoming white paper will consider what roles the Canadian Armed Forces should play. I suggest that the first of these is the preservation of internal order in aid of the civil power. We know very well that the army played a big part in the disturbances of last October. We know that we live in an insecure world—it is insecure internally as well as externally—and the army has a back-up role to play of great importance in that particular field.

• (12:30 p.m.)

Second, the most functional role of our armed services is the defence of Canadian sovereignty against incidental attack or invasion of our territory or territorial waters by the forces of other countries. Precisely what that involves, I do not know, but I hope we will learn from the white paper and perhaps hear from the minister a definition of what he thinks is essential to the defence of Canadian sovereignty. I think all Canadians agree that the armed forces have a part to play in that defence.

The third aspect of defence which I regard as absolutely essential is a contribution by Canada to international order, building a world community, strengthening the United Nations and making forces available for peacekeeping. At the present time, it is fashionable for people to say that peacekeeping is a thing of the past and did not work. That is not true. We now have a peacekeeping force in Cyprus which may still be helping to preserve a measure of peace in a very disturbed part of the world, the Middle East. Every time there is a disturbance in the world, it is proposed that United Nations forces should act. Sometimes this is not acceptable and they do not act.

[Mr. Forrestall.]