

house. My remarks, I hope, have for their basis the national interest. I submit that we are trifling with our defences.

Montreal is the greatest city in Canada; that is, it is the city with the largest population. It is the crossroads of all lines of transportation, be they by air, by water or by land. It is a seat of great deposits of goods, whether produced in remote parts of the country or fabricated in Montreal. It is a home of industry, of the arts and the skills, of schools and universities, and of all the great assets of the nation. They are all found on an island that is separated from the mainland to the south, to the north and to the west by bridges. There are no tunnels. As honourable senators know, tunnels are a normal and essential means of communication between an island and the mainland. All big centres of population located on flowing water are connected with other areas by tunnels. We know there are many important tunnels: for instance, those between New York and Jersey City and the Bronx; the one across the Mersey, at Liverpool; the Detroit-Windsor tunnel; and others which connect industrial locations, whether mines or other sources of production, the one with the other. Yet this matter of tunnels between Montreal and the mainland has not been discussed in Parliament, and a great city, an important source of our energy and strength, is left unprotected with an essential means of survival. In one place it was mentioned in a very cursory manner that the cost of a tunnel as compared with a bridge puts the former beyond consideration. But I contend that when Parliament is spending moneys as we have been called upon to spend them, for all manner of devices, such as television, experimentation on defence, and the rest, the very heart of our country should not be left unprotected by any other means than bridges—which are the most likely target for attack. This is in effect to deny a huge urban population the means of protection in time of danger, as well as other avenues of fluidity of movement, the opportunity of speedy transit from one place to another.

I repeat that this possible safeguard has not only been overlooked, it has not even been discussed, and that, in ignoring this situation while passing huge sums for other defence measures we are taking unnecessary and unwise risks. Of course there is little or nothing that can be done about it at the present time; but it is well that we of this chamber should realize that, in sanctioning vast expenditures in fulfilment of legislation before us which must be financed through national taxation, we are spending money on almost everything but on the very heart of Canada, the great, pulsating industrial city of Montreal.

**Hon. John J. Connolly:** Honourable senators, I do not propose to detain the chamber for more than a few moments, but in view of what the honourable gentleman from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Hackett) has said, I do feel it is important to give a little thought to federal expenditures on defence, and what these expenditures mean and have meant in the past.

Some 40 per cent of the Government spending in this calendar year and perhaps for the past number of years has been allocated for defence purposes. Most of these commitments have arisen out of Canada's participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I am sure those who were privileged a few months ago to hear General Gruenther discuss the military side of NATO were deeply impressed with the importance of the picture he painted not only for countries close to the Iron Curtain but for countries like ours which, although not close geographically, are within close range of the missiles that could come from behind it. I think all of us realize that if it had not been for NATO after 1945 there might have been another war in Europe, perhaps even a world war. So it does seem to me that despite the heavy burden of taxation which Canadians must assume in order to make their contribution to NATO, that organization is necessary today in the interests of not only our national life but of the continued existence of the West.

I do hope the time will come when these huge expenditures of money can be devoted to more peaceful pursuits and to more constructive purposes; but until such a time arrives I do think national defence, to a larger degree than perhaps the honourable gentleman from Victoria has considered it, is going to be a most important consideration of the Canadian people. I did not rise for the purpose of disputing what the honourable gentleman said in connection with the defences of the great metropolitan city of Montreal, but I feel that Canada's first look at defence should be the one she gets as a member of NATO. I am sure everyone in this Parliament and in any of the free parliaments of the world would hesitate before taking any step which would weaken the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** Honourable senators—

**The Hon. the Speaker:** May I remind the house that if the honourable senator speaks now he will close the debate.

**Hon. Mr. Macdonald:** I was very much interested in the remarks of the honourable senator from Victoria (Hon. Mr. Hackett). I am pleased that he did not embark upon a criticism of too many of the items in the bill before us. No doubt he would disapprove of many of them, and I think it speaks very