

*Supply—National Defence*

being introduced through all components of the Canadian army. As reported at page 5355 of *Hansard* he went on to say this:

To date over 750 armed forces personnel have received survival training at the civil defence college at Arnprior and over 1,000 at the joint atomic, bacteriological and chemical school at Camp Borden. The army commands across Canada have conducted numerous courses to provide instructors in rescue operations—

Army headquarters have prepared and issued training directives and provisional training instructions in all aspects of national survival training.

This is a departure from the laissez-faire policy of the Liberals. In 1955, on August 31, at an annual conference held in Edmonton, Alberta by the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, experts including Dr. Alvin C. Graves, scientific adviser, Nevada test site operations, Los Alamos scientific laboratory, Los Alamos, New Mexico; Wing Commander Sir John Hodsoll, chief civil defence adviser to NATO at that time; General Charles Foulkes, then chairman, chiefs of staffs committee, Ottawa, Ontario; and Major General F. F. Worthington gave some extremely enlightening addresses. I should just like to read a few paragraphs so as not to take too much of the time of the committee. At page 5 of this volume—and I may say this is from the library of parliament here—of the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities entitled "The New Dimensions of Civil Defence", Dr. Graves states as follows:

People in Canada have a problem which is somewhat different from the problems of the people in the United States. The reason for that is the geometry of the earth and the line-up of the powers of the earth today. The reason is that if an aircraft were despatched to attack the United States under present circumstances we would expect it to come over the north pole of the earth down from the Arctic regions and down through the plains or the mountains or eastern portion of Canada, attack some targets in Canada, attack many targets in the United States. The plan would be to try to shoot as many of these planes down as possible.

I would like to say one thing, though. When those airplanes are shot down they will carry with them the atomic bombs or thermonuclear bombs with which they were despatched. What of these weapons? Will they crash to the ground and do nothing? I cannot answer that question since I do not know the Russian plan, but it is perfectly possible to put a mechanism on an atomic or thermonuclear bomb such that it will detonate when it drops below a certain altitude. It is perfectly possible to provide that it will detonate when it strikes the ground.

I think we would be more than foolish if we did not at least assume that the Russians might do that.

I should now like to quote from Sir John Hodsoll's address at page 6 of the same book:

Can I highlight a few points? First of all, we are going to keep peace in this world today by being strong, and our strength is not only the armed strength but it is also civil defence. If we

[Mr. Regnier.]

ever got into a war there would be two fronts, the military and the home front. They both have to be defended, and they have both got to be held.

So I want you again to feel that every single thing you are doing in civil defence; every day your strength in civil defence grows you are adding to the chances of keeping the peace. After all, there is nothing finer on earth to think about than that.

Then at page 7:

So far as NATO plan is concerned, we are working on the assumption that the first thirty days are the vital ones and within this first thirty days the first three or four days may be the most critical. Our whole emphasis must be "Do it Now". If it cannot be done physically then let us have plans and let us have them tested out just as you are testing out at Calgary this question of evacuation.

We in NATO believe most firmly that our main problem is survival during that period, and when I say survival, I mean human survival. You can rebuild a city but you cannot rebuild human life and provided that we can keep our populations alive and, if possible, unwounded during that critical period although there may be frightful disasters so far as material things are concerned, they can be repaired but each NATO country will have survived and if the war is not over by then, we shall have the strength to put that extra bit of punch in which may make all the difference between defeat and victory.

I repeat, that is only going to be done by facing up to it today with the entire determination that no matter what type of bomb it is, we can defeat it, and we can if we face up to it and think about it.

After this warning by those experts I am really scandalized and shocked that the Liberals of that time did not act upon the instructions of the experts. Today I am pleased to congratulate the present government for doing something about this matter.

From listening to the discussion of the minister and the opposition members, all we get is a gloomy and grim picture of the world situation. The threat today is as great as but not greater than it was in 1955, for example, when experts from the United States and Great Britain visited Canada to address the conference of mayors at Edmonton.

To summarize, I think we know that our only defence is the defence of deterrence, because we have not the means to wage a conventional war. Our only defence is the threat of a thermonuclear war.

This can be summarized as a powder keg policy. It is a policy based on fear of total destruction on both sides. Both sides are holding a lighted match over a powder keg. I have no quarrel with our holding the match over the powder keg even though it is a desperate attitude, since it is a deterrent against attack and a necessity to maintain peace; but what I cannot understand is that we should all stand around the powder keg, exposed without protection, when it may be necessary to drop the lighted