

Supply—National Defence

survive attack and to strike back with desperate, devastating force. For, paradoxically, it is in the awareness and abhorrence of nuclear war that we must probably look for our best defence against its breaking out. As Sir Winston Churchill said last year, if I might repeat his oft-quoted words in that connection:

It may well be that we shall, by a process of sublime irony, have reached a stage in this story where safety will be the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation.

The story of civilization is spelled out in the painful, plodding accumulation of knowledge and understanding. In time it will, we trust, be evident to everyone that, in this nuclear age, world war has become too hot to handle. For in such war there could be no victory—victor and vanquished would alike be levelled in the radioactive dust.

Surely no one could look forward, with equanimity, to year after year of uneasy expectation of that dread day when the first H-bombs might fall. However futile our best attempts may have proved so far, we must keep on trying for disarmament. And we must come to grips with some of those central problems that have led to war: ignorance and hate, disease, privation and poverty.

For it is clearly evident—and it is on this note, and not a defence statistic, that I want to end my opening remarks to this committee—it is clearly evident that, for us and for the generations that will follow us into the wonders and hazards of this thermonuclear age, there must be some surer guarantee of peace, some less uncertain protection against disaster, than military might can hope to provide.

Man's inventive genius, which has sought out and set free the power of the atom, can surely make it serve and not destroy us.

Mr. Pearkes: Mr. Chairman, first of all may I be privileged to thank the minister for his very kind reference to myself and the Minister of Labour, who are having the opportunity to attend the centenary celebrations to be held next week in London. On behalf of all the holders of the Victoria Cross, I am quite certain that they all appreciate the facilities which the government has made available to enable them to travel to the United Kingdom.

Regarding the remarks that have been made by the minister this afternoon and the white paper that was issued to members of this house last Monday, after studying the white paper during the last few days I certainly gained the impression that it had been prepared a good many months ago. Possibly it had been drawn up as the original draft of

the report of the Department of National Defence for the fiscal year ending in 1956. From the remarks made by the minister this afternoon it is quite obvious that large sections of that white paper were out of date before it was printed, because the minister has told us of several important developments which have not been included in the white paper and hardly even forecast.

I cannot help recalling the fact that year after year the members of this party have supported the government in its endeavours to create an adequate defence force for this country. If we have supported the general policy, we have of course pointed out the way in which that policy should be further developed. It is interesting to note that in this afternoon's remarks the minister has obviously taken heed of what members of the opposition have told him in the past and is making some halting steps in the direction that we have suggested.

It was several years ago when we urged that more attention should be devoted to the continental defence of this country, and repeatedly we have urged the modernization of the Canadian army and the provision of adequate transport for the forces that are in being. I remember urging very strongly about four years ago that the forces of our Canadian army must be forces in being and that they must be readily transportable by air, if not actually airborne.

The white paper hardly reflects the changes which have taken place in the world situation. I think it might be well to refresh members' minds with some of the statements that have been made recently indicating the changes which are now taking place. I should like to call attention to the words of General Gruenther published in the last NATO letter we received dated May 1. After referring to the state of the NATO defences when he first took over command a year ago, he went on to say:

... we now have a strong superiority in long-range offensive air power, in the form of the American B-47 plane, and also because of the V-bombers which are now being produced in the United Kingdom. At this stage in the technological development of defence against offensive aircraft, the offence has a tremendous advantage over the defence. In other words, the B-47 airplane and the V-bombers can fly so fast and so high that there is, as of now, no defensive answer to this type of attack. This means that if certain parts of Europe should be overrun our retaliatory attacks would ensure the defeat of the Soviet bloc.

Following along the same line, the British white paper on defence published this year refers to the increased power of the deterrent and says that the nuclear weapon and the means of delivering it have made global war more frightening and less likely. Again, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs