

policy as outlined in the 1964 White Paper would be maintained "until some announcement is made to the contrary."

I want to know about the words "until some announcement is made to the contrary". The minister said today that he is not prepared to make an announcement to the contrary but he knows that we are only going to continue in our present role for this year. What is to happen beyond then?

In another edition of *Canadian Aviation* magazine, August, 1965, there is an interesting statement with regard to Canada's nuclear role. In his speech last night the minister spoke at great length about Canada's defence force having become a flexible, mobile unit designed to participate in keeping world peace. His speech on Friday dealt with the fact that he sees Canada's participation as being in keeping world peace. He does not think there is the slightest danger that Canada will find itself at war. We are to participate in a mobile force to keep peace in the smaller countries throughout the world.

I refer to the article by John Gellner in the August, 1965, edition of *Canadian Aviation* where he writes about the suitability of Canada's role in defence.

Nobody really believes any more that a limited nuclear war is possible.

The question before the defence committee some time ago was whether limited nuclear war was possible. I am sure that all members of that committee came to the conclusion that it certainly was not possible.

If we had been convinced in the first place through the warnings of those who did not believe, we could have saved upward of one billion dollars for the nuclear weapons systems Canada has in her arsenal.

What a huge amount of money we could have saved the taxpayers as far back at least as 1963 or perhaps as far back as 1961 if we could have foreseen that a limited nuclear war was not possible and that Canada had no place in any other type of nuclear war. The article goes on to say:

The wars that have been fought since 1945, that are being fought now, in Viet Nam, on the Malaysian-Indonesian borders, and in the Yemen, and that we have to be prepared to fight if we must, are conventional wars of all sizes and shades.

That certainly does not mean a nuclear war. If the minister is not prepared to answer this question now, I think it should be one of the initial questions that the Defence Committee should settle. I should like to have the minister tell the house now that this whole question of Canada's participation in a nuclear role of any description will be put on

Supply—National Defence

the doorstep of the defence committee and that he will say to the committee: This is your first problem.

Bring in the experts, call in whoever you like. Call in the military experts of any other country, but let us quit wasting money. Let us not waste again the \$1 billion wasted in the past five or six years in the gathering together of the nuclear weapons systems that are in Canada's arsenal today. Surely we can decide this question rationally without further expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

I was interested last evening when the minister in his reply dealt with the CF-5. For a while he talked about the CF-5A and although he did not mention the CF-5M I gathered from his remarks that several modifications were to be made to that aircraft. The minister did not assure us that his cost estimate for the CF-5 would not escalate, as was the case with the Avro Arrow. I believe that in 1952 the Avro Arrow had a certain projected cost but I do not know the figure. However, that cost figure finally escalated into something like nine times the original estimate. The minister in his description of the CF-5 last night kept saying: "Well, with modifications and with the super-enlarged engine it will require a shorter takeoff run," and so on. I was disturbed by those remarks. Can the minister assure the house that there will not be an escalation in the cost of this aircraft, if he is prepared and determined to buy it?

I noted with interest that in talking about the CF-5 last night the minister kept saying "I have been informed" or "I have been so advised". He was describing the aircraft which he is purchasing. The minister has been bargaining for this aircraft and is spending something like \$250 million but what I am really wondering is, did he buy the aircraft or was he sold it? This is the whole question. I should like to think that he made some attempt to buy it. All the evidence that I can gather, however, points to the fact that he was sold it. This aircraft is not new. It was first on the drafting board in 1955, 11 years ago. In the final result the United States government turned it down. Whom are we to believe, as the *Ottawa Journal* points out? Are we to believe the minister and his experts or the members of other parties who have stepped into this debate and who have their own sources of information?