

*National Defence*

that there is a great danger facing civilization; and I think the people of Canada also realize this fact.

We usually think of defence as being simply military defence. But as we know, in this country and in other parts of the world, defence is not only military defence but includes civil defence. We also hear of psychological defence, and it is as important as any other. But the basis of all defence, as we are told and as we know, is our economic preparedness. These are the principles which are laid down by countries today which are preparing for the defence of civilization. I was pleased indeed to read not long ago an account of preparedness in Sweden. Sweden is a country that we hear very little of, in connection with the defence either of Europe or of freedom; but she is a country which has been quietly preparing her defences, and I think she is one which might well be taken as an example to smaller nations of just what a nation can do. Having regard to her size, I think today she is probably doing as much as or more than any other European country, with the exception of Great Britain.

This article that I read told how Sweden was preparing for defence. It gave an interview with General Helge Jung, I think his name was, and he told just what the army and other branches of the services were doing and how they were being prepared in Sweden. The article says this:

The army is developing into smaller units with additional mobility and increased fire efficiency. Our air force has laid chief stress upon the fighter aircraft. By imports it has partly been equipped with jet fighters of good quality. Aircraft sheds are to some extent built in the rocks and new ones are being built to protect the materials on the ground.

The navy is adopting small and speedy warships with great fire efficiency. It is supported in its operations by a coastal defence in rocky fortifications and by vast natural archipelagos. Even for the navy, sheds are being built in the rocks.

Then Helge Jung went on to say that every Swede capable of bearing arms has to be trained for national total resistance. Another thing he said, which is very important, and which we have been emphasizing here today, is that they are demanding the utmost economy in all their expenditures.

Sweden emphasized the newest scientific weapons. That is, they were not to have the old and obsolete weapons; they must have the very best. That was one of the first and last things emphasized in the defence of that country, and that is what the hon. member who has just taken his seat has emphasized. That is what the hon. members who have spoken for the opposition party here have emphasized. If there are obsolete weapons we must get rid of them, and they must be

[Mr. Brooks.]

replaced by the very finest and best weapons that can be procured. I was very interested to hear what the hon. member for Queens had to say. As a matter of fact, he stole some of my thunder. He spoke about radar in England during the battle of Britain. There is no question that there would have been a different story as far as the world, and as far as Great Britain and freedom are concerned, if it had not been for the great invention of radar. England did not wait until the war was on. Anyone who has read Chester Wilmot's "Struggle for Europe" realizes that they were preparing some years before. While the Germans had an air force which was two or three times greater than that of Great Britain, Great Britain, with the help of radar, was able to keep off that large armada and eventually discouraged them from making an attack on that country.

He spoke of the atom bomb and a long list of other modern scientific weapons which I will not weary the house by repeating; but I agree with what was said by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Pearkes), the hon. member for Queens and others, that use must be made of the very finest and most up-to-date equipment we can find. In that connection I should like to call the minister's attention to an article on the aircraft carrier *Magnificent*. We know that not only last year but the year before there was criticism in this country and criticism among naval men of this great aircraft carrier, as to whether she was a white elephant, whether its expense was too great, and so on. At that time it was felt that the aircraft carrier *Magnificent* was more or less obsolete. That was only two years ago. With the advance that has been made in the last two years with aircraft carriers, I wonder whether we are justified today in retaining that craft, which to all intents and purposes must be greatly out of date and obsolete. I am about to read from an article which was published in 1950 headed: "*Maggie* is not obsolete but her future debated." The *Maggie* I may say is the *Magnificent*, and not one of the *Maggies* that we heard about a while ago. The article says:

There have been published statements that the *Maggie* is "already antiquated, her elevator decks too weak to hoist modern carrier planes," that the arm itself has "never really been developed," that it showed signs of poor morale.

And so on. If this was true two years ago, it is much more true today. The people of Canada would be justified in asking whether this vessel is to be returned to England, whether it is to be remodelled or whether it can be remodelled.

In speaking about modern flat tops, may I say I just ran across an article in the *Christian Science Monitor*, of Tuesday, April 1, which gives a description of Britain's super