

The Budget—Mr. Brewin

Canada. Indeed, Mr. Schlesinger's statement, which I quoted, is to the contrary.

One could only wish that Canadian military plans were not based upon obsolete and outmoded concepts, but upon new developments. There are highly important new developments taking place in military concepts and weaponry which affect NATO and Canada. I refer to the "smart" bombs, which is a nickname for what are more accurately described as precision guided weapons, which use lasers to secure an infinitely more accurate means of hitting targets, promise revolutionary changes. Throughout the course of military history, very few weapons actually hit the targets. These new precision-guided weapons will, in fact, hit the targets.

They can be used with light portable weapons with greater accuracy and are effective anti-tank and anti-battlefield aircraft weapons. They enhance defence and strengthen the position of smaller powers.

There is still much development required before "smart" bombs are in general use but they promise the strengthening of defence, and such defensive alliances as NATO making more important the individual contribution of trained men. They may indeed represent a sharpening of the distinction between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons.

Haziness of distinction in this field is one of the greater dangers of war developing into an all-out nuclear holocaust. It would be a happy change if proposals for Canadian expenditures were imaginative and looked forward, rather than proposing the substitution in obsolete roles of more obsolete weaponry.

In the *Scientific American* of October, 1978, there is an interesting discussion on precision-guided weapons, and there is an Adelphi Paper published by the Institute of Strategic Studies in 1975 by James Digby of the Rand Corporation spelling out in some detail the implications of the PGM.

There is one good ground for questioning the proposed expenditure on the acquisition of fighter interceptor plans, and that is that it has never been clearly explained. The whole process of seeking these replacements has been shrouded in secrecy. It is not enough for the Minister of National Defence to say that these planes contribute to our national security. Such a statement begs the question. Nor can it be said that they are demanded by our commitment to NORAD or NATO. Both of these treaties leave to individual member countries the decision as to the nature of their contribution.

In the debate in the United States Senate on the neutron bomb, Senator Clark set out the Senate approach as follows:

Any program with respect to nuclear armaments shall include a complete statement analysing the impact. The requirement of an arms impact statement is fully justified for it demands of the executive a thoughtful and reasoned analysis of the over-all significance of the weapon under consideration.

● (2052)

Senator Clark added:

The requirements of the law are clear; before we appropriate money for a system, we must know what the system will do; we must have this statement; the lack of this alone justifies withholding Senate approval at this time.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Not only has this House not received any such impact statement related to these proposed purchases, but we are told a new white paper on defence is on the way. If I understood the minister today, they are too busy at present to get out a white paper, so what we are doing is this—we are putting the cart before the horse, we are getting the weapons and then deciding on a policy to fit them, rather than deciding on a policy and then acquiring the necessary equipment. So the minister is doing precisely the reverse of what he should be doing. The minister emphasized the advantages to Canada of providing "offsets" by the employment of Canadian resources and the development of Canadian technology. Others will no doubt do the same thing. This, it is said, will be followed by other advantages. Offsets are the amounts of money which will be spent by those who sell the planes to employ Canadian labour and technology. This is supposed to provide considerable advances in Canadian technology. The argument is without substantiation. At the present time the aircraft industry is extremely buoyant and the effects of further purchases in this field will be highly inflationary.

There is a very good article by Mr. Sheppard, the Executive Director for the Science Council, which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of October 2, in the course of which the author stated:

The answer ought to lie in the transfer to other sectors of Canadian industry, technologies critical to our future competitiveness in commercial markets, for instance in energy products, automobile parts, communications equipment, transportation and computer equipment.

We are not objecting to spending money on improving Canadian technology. What we wonder is whether it is necessary to improve technology to supply weapons systems to countries which are already, in the global insanity of the day, spending \$400 billion a year on armaments which, if they were ever used, would destroy us all and which, if they are not used, will suck up the resources, both material and monetary, of the whole world so that the pressing problems of mankind cannot be met. There is no need for us to contribute to this madness. My plea to the government has nothing to do with a choice between various suppliers of aircraft. We do not care whether there are three, four or ten possible suppliers. My plea is that we look carefully at the question of the basic need for what we would be committing ourselves to buying if the government goes through with its plan.

The first decision to be made is whether we should proceed with the purchase of fighter planes at all. I know there have been verbal commitments, that promises have been made, that there have been talks about all this, but there is no firm commitment at the moment, there is still room for the government to use a little common sense and change its attitude toward the whole thing. There are many roles of great importance that Canada has to play in the military field. One of them, of course, is the protection of our sovereignty by providing surveillance of our air space. Another is to build the naval craft necessary to protect our sovereignty over our territorial waters and, incidentally, to protect our fishing industry from depredation by fishermen of other countries. Lastly, there is a continuing need for Canada to supply peacekeeping forces all