

*Supply—National Defence*

there been in the excellent speech made by the Minister of National Defence this morning any statement that the reorganization, re-equipping of the Canadian forces would be of the nature for the establishment of such a force? I believe that this would be Canada's finest contribution, a world police force available to, and under the direction of the United Nations. We feel most strongly that in this way Canada's defence efforts would complement those of the United States and, at the same time, leave us free to exert a positive influence throughout the world.

In this regard we feel we should be made as fully informed as possible by our military chiefs regarding the whole problem of war in the future. Certainly, it has not yet been made clear how our disunified and heavily mechanized forces will operate in conditions of nuclear warfare when it can be expected that headquarters communications and supply lines will be disrupted or destroyed. Many very sound arguments have been presented for complete unification of the armed services in the light of modern conditions. I have no hesitation in saying that until authoritative and logical arguments are presented, and they have not yet been presented by the Minister of National Defence, by his chiefs of staff or by the Prime Minister, against unification, then we can only assume that hidebound tradition and vested interests are holding back desired developments in this most necessary field.

Another matter which must cause concern to us, and it was mentioned by the Minister of National Defence, is the present civil defence role of the militia which, quite bluntly, does not seem to make any sense at all. In 1939 no one expected the militia, which was stronger then than it is today, to be ready for war in less than six months. Now, however, in 1959 we expect an inadequately trained militia to be ready literally at a moment's notice to form mobile support columns—I think I am using the term used by the minister this morning—to aid our cities devastated by thermonuclear weapons. Let us be quite clear about this: A thermonuclear war is not at all the most likely form of future war. To prepare only for such a war, that is a thermonuclear war, which certainly appears to be the case, gives us the impossible alternative of defeat in the event of a non-nuclear war being waged. Our regular forces, and more particularly the militia, should be completely trained and equipped for such an eventuality, not only of the possibility of a thermonuclear war which military authorities do not think will take place because of the power of the U.S.S.R. and the power of the U.S.A., but they should be trained for the

greater possibility of a non-nuclear war. Having said that, I should hasten to add that even a non-nuclear war waged along modern lines would be most devastating and could see the release of such horrible weapons as are indicated by the phrases "germ warfare" and "chemical warfare".

As I say, we in this group as well as the members of the official opposition, with our limited resources, with what research is available to us, with all the advice in military articles, pamphlets and books, with the help of those now in the armed services and those who have retired who have the fortitude to speak to those who are not in government, have done our best to analyse the situation and put forward the problem, and to suggest what our defence policy should be. On behalf of the C.C.F., therefore, I shall try to condense the items just a little and say that we would recommend our defence policy should very definitely include the following:

1. In Canada there shall be no attempt to either manufacture atomic or other nuclear weapons; to use them or, for that matter, to store them on Canadian soil.
2. That Canada in its policy should devote its major efforts toward the creation of an effective, mobile and integrated force—that means army, navy and air force—capable of either performing in Canada in her own defence or abroad under the direction of the United Nations.
3. That Canada should proceed as quickly as possible to extricate herself from dependence upon foreign defence measures having the effect of making our foreign and defence policies less flexible than they should be.
4. That because of the interest of Canadians in peace; because of the interest of Canadians in defence in the event of aggression; because of the heavy load the taxpayers of our country have to bear in passing the estimates of the Department of National Defence and the Department of Defence Production; and because it should be known to the peoples' representatives how and why the money is being spent, there should be established a permanent defence expenditures committee representative of both houses of parliament of this country.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion may I try to sum up the thinking and the belief of the C.C.F. group in this house, although we represent a minority and what we believe is the feeling of the majority. I am certain that the members of this house will accept the statement—or at least I hope they will do so—that people generally—and by that I mean people throughout the world in general and the people of Canada in particular—want to think in terms of life and of