

*Supply—National Defence*

The present government—and that is nothing new, previous governments did it too—increases military expenditures year after year, reduces help to foreign countries, as can be seen from the estimates tabled recently, and postpones increases in family allowances and old age pensions.

Compared to other countries, the share of our national budget earmarked for defence is much too large. I should like to call the minister's attention briefly to a few statistics. Even though I have previously referred to this matter, in order to define a national policy, one must necessarily proceed by comparison and study other countries whose aims, whether national or international, are similar to Canada's, to find how much of their budget they earmark for defence purposes compared to their total budget.

Allow me to quote a few statistics I obtained in the library of parliament, and in case the minister should want further details, I could give them to him.

For the fiscal year 1964-65, Canada spent 24.7 of the national budget potential on National Defence. New Zealand spent 8 per cent; Australia, 18 per cent; Belgium, 12 per cent; Norway, 17 per cent; Sweden, 17 per cent; Italy, 15 per cent; Japan, 8 per cent; Czechoslovakia, 8 per cent and France, which is a large country and a major power with the United States, Great Britain and a few others, earmarks only 23 per cent for the fiscal year 1964-65.

And we, in Canada, are pipe-dreaming. We go off to war and get involved in all types of military adventures to spend 24.7 per cent of our national budget solely on National Defence.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I say we are not being realistic in our policies when we spend beyond our means in this area of national administration.

The second principle which a Canadian national defence policy should follow deals with the question of effectiveness.

Everything produced for our national defence should be for effective use and not as a symbolic or empty gesture.

The hon. members for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Churchill) and Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) have very aptly pointed out the problem of the Bomarc missiles, obsolete according to many experts, and which the United States has discarded.

Well, this was accepted and there was, at the time, talk of an agreement of which we

Canadians know nothing. We would like the hon. minister to give us some specific information on the subject: when will this agreement expire; what is the precise nature of our participation with the United States?

Also, are there conditions in case we withdraw? What efforts are made at present and, it seems, for the last two years, to repatriate our point of view on this question and to get rid of something which perhaps had to be accepted under the terms of an agreement about which we Canadians know nothing?

Mr. Chairman, I am saying simply that this Bomarc characteristic is precisely a criterion which proves there is a lack of efficiency, in many respects, with regard to the Department of National Defence expenditures.

If the Department of National Defence endeavoured to spend every cent of the taxpayers' money with maximum efficiency, keeping in mind the practical Canadian realities, we would not have this kind of budget. I feel that our policy would then be more profitable for Canada itself as well as for our relations with foreign countries.

At any rate, that agreement or participation with regard to the Bomarc is greatly detrimental to Canada's role as a peace maker, and to our sincerity with regard to nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, how can our representatives on disarmament commissions in Geneva, at the United Nations or elsewhere succeed, by means of high-sounding statements, in preventing the extension of the nuclear club if, at the same time, they advocate with an impressive eagerness the dissemination of nuclear weapons throughout the world?

If our own country accepts such weapons and if we are unable to define to the Canadian people or other countries our policy on this matter, then do we have a nuclear or anti-nuclear policy?

I am sure Canada is highly esteemed by all. One only has to travel throughout the world to feel that Canadians are welcome everywhere. Our role is one of pacifier and mediator, and we shall only succeed in playing that part fully if we give other countries, through our actions and our stand, the assurance that we are a peace making country, that we are not part of the nuclear club, and that we do not promote the dissemination of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

The hon. minister is to give us details on this point and also indicate clearly when our