

Abandonment of Defence Projects

Mr. Real Caouette (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member proposed the subamendment, and I must now recognize another hon. member, because he took part in the debate.

Mr. Gilles Gregoire (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, may I point out it is six o'clock?

[Text]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona.

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the house took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Terry Nugent (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the subject of defence is a very complicated one and the prime mistake I shall likely make tonight perhaps is to reduce it to too simple terms. I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject, and I think that should be most encouraging to the house, because we have had nothing but confusion from all the experts. I have, however, paid more than a passing interest, as I am sure have most Canadians, to this subject which is of such vital importance to us.

We sometimes lose track of the object of defence, which I think is simply to protect the security and integrity of our country and our way of life, and to maintain our freedom and independence from all other nations. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, when we consider defence policy I would think that no matter what subject or what items under the heading of defence we are considering, we have to measure them by asking whether they add to Canada's defensive armament. Do they give us an extra weapon, or a choice of or share in extra weapons, which will make our country more secure?

In this respect I do not think we can over-emphasize the changed position in the world today as compared with the last world conflict in which Canada became engaged. Today it is not a question of whether we have enough fire power to protect ourselves, because having enough fire power is impossible; it is indeed impossible for any nation. There is, Mr. Speaker, too much fire power on our side, and also too much on the other side. The whole world can be wiped out many times over, so obviously any defence policy whereby

Dionne	Millar
Doucett	Monteith
Douglas	Moore
Fane	More
Fisher	Muir (Cape Breton
Fleming	North and Victoria)
(Okanagan-Revelstoke)	Muir (Lisgar)
Gauthier	Nasserden
Graffey	Nesbitt
Gregoire	Nielsen
Gundlock	Noble
Hales	Nowlan
Hamilton	Nugent
Herridge	Orlikow
Howard	Pascoe
Howe (Wellington-	Perron
Huron)	Peters
Irvine	Pigeon
Jorgenson	Plourde
Kennedy	Prittie
Kindt	Pugh
Knowles	Rapp
Korchinski	Rheaume
Lamb	Ricard
Lambert	Rondeau
Langlois	Scott
Laprise	Simpson
Loney	Southam
MacEwan	Stenson
MacLean (Queens)	Thomas
Macquarrie	Webb
MacRae	Weichel
McIntosh	Willoughby
Madill	Winch
Mandziuk	Winkler—85.
Martineau	

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the ruling negatived.

[Translation]

Mr. G. C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted to uphold your decision.

[Text]

Mr. Brown: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to sustain your ruling.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to uphold your ruling.

Mr. Cardiff: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Remi Paul (Berthier-Maskinonge-Delaudiere): Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted, I would have voted against your decision.

[Text]

Mr. Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I was paired. Had I voted I would have voted to uphold your ruling.

[Translation]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The debate bears on the subamendment.

The hon. member for Villeneuve—