

*Supply—National Defence*

We can do that; we must do that, otherwise we cannot hope to arouse our young people to the need to give everything that is in them when the need arises.

If \$1½ billion are needed to develop our military defences, then surely we have a case which must be put before the nation, a case which must show the critical situation in which democracy finds itself. The youth of our nation would respond to the appeal of truth and changed heart. I submit to you that if no such call is given, if no such challenge is thrown out, then in my judgment there is no justification whatsoever for the huge expenditures on defence that we are contemplating today. The two things must go hand in hand. It seems to me that if we are going to spend the money then we have to tell the people why. This government it seems to me leaves far too many things unsaid. I do hope that they will come to see the great gains that are involved in the things I have mentioned.

The purpose of highlighting this serious inconsistency and lack of balance on the part of the government and the reasons for the failure of the government to do certain important things is not by any means to expose or to carp, but rather to induce the government to give that kind of serious attention which this matter deserves. The west has been losing the cold war. We need not be in that very serious position, because we have the greatest and the most effective way of life ever devised to sell to the people of the world if we would just clear away some of the abuses and make our democracy that vital thing it can be. Then we should sell it to the world.

I believe that if the government would enlarge its defence program by adding a great ideological offensive we might be able to forestall the awful possibility that the great arms race might lead to another terrible conflict. At the same time let me say that we in this corner urge the government to keep on trying to find a way to a safe and honourable peace and disarmament. Do not go about disarming in any foolish way. Do not consider disarming until we have an effective guarantee that the others who are our enemies are going to disarm, and effectively.

At the same time, too, we urge that the government carry on an unceasing effort to find and remove the causes of war. It is our hope that the "three wise men" who are meeting on this very day, as they discuss the problem that is common to us all, the problem of the defence of the western world, will

be successful and will not prove to be, as Canada's representative himself has said, three blind mice.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** There are always certain difficulties in dealing with the estimates of this department because, of necessity, so much of the information that should be given to us has to be kept confidential, in the public interest. Further, I suppose that the only member of this house who really can be considered an able strategist is the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. The rest of us might well be described as armchair strategists, although from the facts presented in the white paper and in the minister's estimates certain logical conclusions can be drawn, and I think we are entitled to draw them.

I thoroughly agree with the statement made earlier this afternoon by the minister that we must be constantly on our guard and we must not be lulled into a stupor by Russian propaganda that is dished out with a smiling face. Most of us can remember only too well what happened at Pearl Harbor, when the Japanese diplomats were in Washington bearing the "cherry" branch, and I think it is certainly well for us to remember that.

As my time is somewhat limited, my remarks will be directed chiefly to the role of the navy. In the minister's white paper it is stated at page 4:

Canada's naval role is the defence of our coastal areas, as always, and co-operation with our NATO allies in the defence of vital sea lines of communication . . .

I note that the first priority is the defence of our coastal areas, and the second is co-operation in NATO with respect to the defence of the sea lanes. There has been another suggestion, though it is not made in the minister's white paper. It has not been announced by the government, though I would be delighted to hear any comment in this regard, but it has been suggested that at the forthcoming commonwealth conference the question might be raised that some of the commonwealth countries might take over the duties the United Kingdom navy is at present carrying out with respect to certain areas. It has been suggested on the editorial page of the *Toronto Telegram* that possibly Canada might look after certain areas of the southern Atlantic and the West Indies, but I do not wish to deal with these questions because they are problematical; they do not deal with policy, but are only suggestions in the press.

My remarks will have three aspects with respect to naval policy. First of all, what do we have to do? Second, what do we have