

## NATO

and examined by the Defence Staff. Some of these plans will be incorporated into the over-all plan and others will be discarded. I want to assure hon. members, and especially I want to assure all of the members of the Canadian Armed Forces, that our plans will not be announced until we feel confident that every option has been fully analysed by itself and in relation to other options. I want to repeat to the forces that conjecture will be simply conjecture.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members will agree that defence problems never remain static. The members of the Canadian Armed Forces have demonstratively proved that they are ready and able to adapt to any new change, perhaps more than any other segment of our society. The Canadian Armed Forces must continually make readjustments to meet changing defence problems. As hon. members are well aware, the members of the Canadian Armed Forces have been undergoing a change towards unification for the past few years. It has not been an easy task, but their professionalism and sense of duty have overcome many of the obstacles.

Now, we must undertake new tasks to meet the new policy roles. How these tasks will be carried out, as I said before, is being examined by the Defence Staff. I am sure that we can expect the continued high degree of professionalism from the forces that they have so ably demonstrated in the past. In return, I think every Canadian should, by whatever means he can, recognize that our forces have made many sacrifices in the past and have endured many hardships in the performance of their duty. This is a part of their life which they are willing to accept, providing the objectives are clear and sensible.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** Order, please. I am afraid the minister's time has expired and the only way we could proceed with a question is by unanimous consent. If there is unanimous consent to extend the minister's time, then we could allow the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) to put a question. Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Brewin:** May I put a question to the minister?

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** By all means.

**Mr. Brewin:** During the debate the subject of Canada's contribution and attitude towards anti-ballistic missiles was raised. I appreciate

the minister did not have time to deal with that subject, but will he arrange to discuss it as soon as possible with the Committee on National Defence and External Affairs? I think it is a subject of great importance and interest.

**Mr. Cadieux (Labelle):** Mr. Speaker, what I would have to say would depend on whether the meeting was held in camera or not. I have had a brief prepared, which could be very extensive. It was not prepared by military people but by scientists of the Defence Research Board, and it could be presented to the committee.

**Mr. Brewin:** Thank you.

**Mr. J. M. Forrestal (Dartmouth-Halifax East):** Mr. Speaker, my remarks, following immediately upon the comments of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux), will be a little bit disjointed. I would like to make some comments on the minister's explanations, but in the absence of a text it is difficult to bring the whole thing into clear focus. I hope that later this evening someone will have an opportunity to deal with one or two points that the minister attempted to clarify, but about which questions were left dangling as a result of his explanations. The matter raised with him by direct question just a moment ago is one of them.

In the context of any defence review, it is difficult to ignore what is topical and of major concern. Here, I refer to the A.B.M. system. It is a matter of understandable regret that the minister was not able to deal with it. It is also a matter of regret that he was not able to give us more specific information, particularly from the standpoint of those who are serving in our armed forces. As long as questions such as this remain unanswered there will be uncertainty and fear in the minds of officers and men, not only among those serving in continental Europe but also those serving in Canada.

I join with everybody else who has said that we would welcome a proper opportunity to get out of the business of war, out of anything that has to do with war, so that we could bring our troops home from Europe. As a matter of fact in that context, we would even welcome the disbandment of Maritime Command, but I caution the minister in any review he undertakes not to lay a finger on it.

I intend to restrict my remarks to the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. That report