

*Supply—National Defence*

effect in the United Kingdom alone in deterring potential immigration than all the now notorious articles in "The People".

I should like to return, Mr. Chairman, and elaborate on a matter with which the minister dealt this morning, the nature of the threat that faces us and, after that, what defence have we against it. The main threat in terms of a major war, though not perhaps the only threat, perhaps at the moment not even the most imminent threat because we may be facing more imminent dangers than a calculated all-out nuclear invasion, but the particular threat upon which so much of our defence has to be based is nothing less than one of total nuclear destruction. I do not want to put on the record of the committee a great deal of evidence to support this, because we know it is true. Nevertheless, perhaps it is just as well to remind ourselves, on this pleasant summer afternoon, that the biggest bomb dropped in world war II carried the equivalent of ten tons of t.n.t.; that was the grand slam bomb. The atom bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima had the equivalent of 15,000 tons of t.n.t.; that is a jump from 10 tons to 15,000 tons. The first hydrogen bomb exploded in 1954 carried the equivalent of 15 millions tons of t.n.t. These figures certainly give us cause to ponder.

One of the most outstanding United States authorities in this field of nuclear development, a man who is not given to emotional statements and a very hard realist in these matters—I am referring to Dr. Teller, who had so much to do with the decision to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb—said not long ago that "50 of these bombs could make the United States uninhabitable".

I do not know on what basis these calculations are made. I know they are made by men with scientific knowledge and, I think, political responsibility. The office of civil and defence mobilization of the United States, before a committee of congress, said the other day it estimated 49 million people of the United States would be killed in a hydrogen bomb attack of the kind of which the Soviet was now capable. General Partridge, who is well informed on these matters, and who incidentally is an officer of Canada as well as the United States because he is commander of the North American air defence command, told a house of representatives subcommittee on defence: "If the enemy launches an all-out attack against us I think we must be prepared to accept casualties in the millions".

Surely this is sufficient evidence that the only potential enemy of this country has the capability for such an attack, and makes all our references to defeating him and knocking

the stuffing out of him in a nuclear attack seem rather meaningless. What form would this attack take if it ever were permitted to develop? What is the particular nature of the threat? Again I return to General Partridge's evidence before the United States congressional committee last February and I quote from it. He said this:

At the present time the Soviets can attack us only with bombers. We do not think they have any operational intercontinental missiles.

This was last February, but only the other day the secretary of defence of the United States amended this statement and gave evidence to the effect that it was the view of the defence department of the United States that the Soviet would have ten of these missiles before the end of this year. That is quite a change from General Partridge's statement of last February. But General Partridge in his earlier statement went on to say this:

We think that in the future they—

That is the Soviet.

—will reduce the numbers of bombers in their inventory.

That is something the minister has confirmed in his statement in this house.

Our national intelligence estimates are that they will improve the quality of those bombers, and that in a few years they will have a supersonic rather than a subsonic bomber force. This means that we must not only maintain the defences against bomber attack which we have today but we must also improve those defences so we can counteract a supersonic attacking force.

In other words, there will be a mix in attack of bomber and missile. According to General Partridge there must therefore be a mix in the defence. But that mix is obviously changing in favour of intercontinental missiles against which, as I ventured to say this morning and as the minister confirmed before I spoke, there is now no defence. Senator Russell who, I think, is the chairman of the senate armed services committee, speaking in Washington a few weeks ago said this:

If the Russians attacked us tomorrow—

This is contrary to the view usually expressed.

—it would not be with manned bombers; it would be with missiles.

While the house military appropriations subcommittee report, after a great deal of evidence was taken from a great many experts—and this is the report of May 27, 1959—concluded with this:

During the early 1960's Russia could have three times as many intercontinental "ballistic missiles in position" as the United States.

That is one aspect of the threat, and it is a sombre enough one. But there is another