

*Supply—National Defence*

minds today is, what should the policy be during the transitional stage which will perhaps be with us for the next two or three years during the missile gap? What will it be when the missile age has become completely established? What will be the effect of these different stages upon our defence industry and, above all, how can we get the best for the little we can afford?

I think hon. members will realize that never at any time has there been a total defence. Always the enemy has been able to get through and we must ask ourselves what other defence is worth while if we cannot have a total defence in a nuclear age. If some of the enemy are going to get through, and that enemy is going to deliver atomic warheads, what does it matter if we shoot down 85 or 90 per cent when the other 10 per cent that gets through, in all probability, will be sufficient to destroy us? I think we should be asking ourselves, is the money that we are spending today for ground defence going to be effective? Are we just going through the motions and trying to keep up appearances? If we face the question honestly, is it worth anything at all in terms of defence? I believe that is the fundamental question in the minds of many Canadians today. It is one that deserves an honest answer because there are many things that can be done if our main protection depends upon a nuclear deterrent.

There is a danger, I feel, in the development of a defence psychology, not only in Canada but also in NATO. We know that the best defence is attack. While we are not an aggressive nation, and while NATO is not an aggressive organization, yet there is no reason why we should not take the initiative in as many ways as possible while relying on the nuclear deterrent capacity of our allies.

Coming nearer to home, I think the question in our minds respecting our various armed services is, what will be their particular role? This morning the minister gave us a very clear-cut picture of the role of the navy. The navy's role is anti-submarine operation. We have developed in that field destroyers of which we can be justly proud. At the same time we must realize that technological advance will make these obsolete. Already we have heard that the best anti-submarine weapon is another atomic submarine. I suppose this raises the question, first of all, whether we can afford to develop or purchase nuclear powered submarines, and if so to what extent we should do that.

When we come to the role of the army and of the air force, the picture is not nearly so clear-cut as it is in the case of the navy.

We are told that the army's chief role will be to carry out survival operations. I think the term "survival operations" in the minds of many people is associated with the operations of civil defence. I should like to support the suggestion made by my leader this morning that we should have an attack formation, a brigade group of highly mobile paratroopers, fully trained, and which could be moved from any point in Canada to another to deny our land to enemy forces. If we are going to be realistic about this, and if a war does break out, Canada, of course, will be the no man's land. Even the tremendous advance in technological progress has not made the foot soldier obsolete. Even when atomic weapons were used in the last war the infantryman had to come in and take over the subjugated territory.

I cannot envisage any situation, even in the future, where an attack is made in which the enemy forces will not have to be consolidated and in which they will not have to take physical possession of the territory. I think if we are realistic we will realize, too, that Canada is not the prime target. The main objective of the enemy, and there is only one enemy, is our neighbour to the south. In order to take possession of a country of that size the enemy will require some territory in which he can assemble his formations, consolidate his supply lines, and he will require to use that territory as a base of operations to take possession of the country which has been devastated by nuclear attack. Canada is a very suitable country for that with its sparsely scattered population and wide open spaces. Surely we need forces in being to prevent the enemy from getting a foothold in our territory. In my opinion, this is something outside a role which could be included in the term "survival operations". We need, I think, a hard-hitting mobile formation which will be equipped with the best weapons we can give them and which will be effective in preventing any enemy from getting a bridgehead on our soil.

The role of the air force, I think, is going to be very doubtful. I was glad to hear the minister announce this morning that in Europe the air force would be utilized in tactical support of ground troops. Under conditions which I have just mentioned, we would need something like that here in Canada as well. I mentioned earlier that there were other forms of attack, and of course we are well aware of the economic attack. It would be foolish for us to build up defence expenditures which would undermine our economy and cause it to collapse, because that is a prime objective of our potential enemy