

Abandonment of Defence Projects

dialogue with our friends, and we hope to continue to do so indefinitely, for we must try to solve together our common problems.

True, because modern technique changes so rapidly, we must constantly study and revise our defence policy, but when millions of dollars are involved, we just cannot keep on disrupting everything, especially when we are part of a defence system that must be as invulnerable as possible.

The storing of nuclear warheads on Canadian soil does not shock me. In my view, such a thing is inevitable. I believe that Canada, being a free country, should play the role it can afford to play in the defence of the free world. It is time we stop playing upon words and even claim we are losing our influence as a pacifist country. Our reputation is well established and the Prime Minister is recognized throughout the world as a man of peace.

Do we or do we not belong to the western bloc? What would have happened if the Cuban crisis had degenerated into a nuclear war, with or without nuclear warheads in storage? If we had had to defend ourselves, I think we would just have stood there gaping, unable to do anything.

Let us be serious. Would we be more to blame for accepting those weapons than for selling the great quantity of uranium used in the manufacturing of American atomic bombs?

The hon. member for Lapointe referred to the unanimous opinion of members of parliament and citizens of the province of Quebec. But when he found that members on the government side did not share his opinion—heaven forbid—he accused us of having sold out to the Americans and went off into considerations of petty politics which are typical of him.

Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I would be less afraid of American domination than of a dictatorship offered by the Gregoire-Caouette group, which might be similar to that imposed by the idols of the hon. member for Villeneuve, namely Hitler and Mussolini.

Those people do not accept other people's opinion and readily condemn those who dare to think in a different way.

Mr. Speaker, before closing I wish to point out the fact that this country has a role to play in the world, that we cannot be isolationists, neither from the economic point of view nor from the standpoint of defence of the free world. That role must be examined thoroughly and it can be changed according to circumstances. As a matter of fact, I urge the Minister of National Defence to keep up his good work. And, so as to prove to the hon. member for Lapointe that nobody dic-

tates our policy, and that within the Liberal party, every member is free to think as he pleases, I am going to make a suggestion to the Minister of National Defence, that is to consider the possibility of setting up in Canada a system of compulsory military service, which, in my opinion, might benefit directly the Canadian people.

In fact, it is noteworthy that in every country where such a system is in effect, it has fostered unity and has proven profitable to the nation. Indeed, a stay in a disciplinary corps is, in my opinion, a supplementary training which is a good preparation for the future, inasmuch as it instills into a man a bit of discipline and a sense of responsibility, which is something that our young people need today and which is also lacking in the Caouette group.

This service should not be on the same basis as service in an emergency but it should be oriented so as to provide the young people with the opportunity of attending trade or specialization courses, as well as civil defence classes, all this without interfering with a general education. In other words, a formula related to that of our military colleges but very much simplified.

It would be, in my opinion, a contribution to the economy, that is an expenditure which would benefit directly the Canadian people and which would, at the same time, alleviate unemployment among our young people.

Mr. Speaker, the people are watching the House of Commons, wondering certainly what is in the minds of the opposition parties, at a time when the government shows increasing evidence of its ability to give our economy the guidance it needs.

Mr. Gerard Girouard (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, my first grievance today will certainly be directed against the party in power, because it is due to the absence of fifty-odd Liberal members that we are still discussing today a subamendment which has already been put to a vote, no matter how the hon. members for Lapointe and Villeneuve (Messrs. Gregoire and Caouette) feel about it, without the approval or support of the members of the Social Credit party. But it is not for me to teach the members of the party in power a lesson; I guess that was taken care of, and strongly too, at the caucus this morning.

In any case the party in power gives us the opportunity to talk again about nuclear arms, and I think we are about to have a little fun.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to go over the whole story from 1957 to 1963, because a series of contradictions coming either from the party in power or the opposition would