

## Supply—National Defence

Then I come to some of the remarks which were made by the minister, and I am again forced to wonder whether his speech of this afternoon was also drafted some time ago, shall we say before the *Montreal Gazette* of this morning was published. In discussing the role of the jet interceptor in connection with the D.E.W. line the minister made an interesting statement. He said the CF-100's, of their sort and of their type, are and will remain for a long time yet effective fighter planes. Now I turn to the *Montreal Gazette* of this morning and find there a quotation from some senior R.C.A.F. air crew officers who say they have doubts whether the CF-100 jet interceptor, Canada's chief defence weapon, could fly high enough to get at the latest Russian bombers if they attacked North America. Then the news story goes on to say:

The government itself has made it pretty plain that it's worried, too, about this main aspect of defence.

Then it refers to the white paper, in which the government remarks on the urgent requirement for the supersonic CF-105 jet interceptor, now being developed at Malton.

That also seems to leave us one or two steps behind the thinking of other military forces in the world, because on Monday of this week the *Ottawa Journal* published a news report from Washington in which two United States air force generals, Generals Earle Partridge and Curtis Lemay, have raised questions about the effectiveness of the costly radar warning lines in Canada and even of the United States air force fighters, ranging up to 1,600 miles per hour in speed, or as fast as or faster than the CF-105 Canada will put in the air in a year or two. I am given to understand that the CF-105 is expected to have a speed range of up to about 1,500 miles per hour. It is not coming out for a year or possibly two years. Yet Generals Partridge and Lemay have grave doubts as to whether it is not already obsolete.

I can readily understand the difficulties of any defence department introducing arms and equipment before they become obsolete or obsolescent, but I think it is time we were facing some realities. When I heard the minister speaking this afternoon of the profound effects on our defence thinking of these new developments I was reminded of the statements made by an even more eminent authority, if I may say so with all deference, than the Minister of National Defence of this government. I refer to an article published in June of this year, written by Earl Attlee, former prime minister of the United Kingdom and minister of defence of

the United Kingdom from 1945 to 1946. I presume when Earl Attlee made his statement he did so after having had the opportunity to discuss the matter with the leading military experts of the United Kingdom. He had this to say:

We must accept the logic of events, and in the light of them consider afresh our defences. The situation has wholly changed since Labour was in power and introduced national service. We can reasonably hope, despite the frustrations of the disarmament conference, that no state will embark on a major war because of its inevitable consequences to victor and vanquished alike. The conceptions of armies of millions of men fighting land battles is out of date, and therefore the basis of national service—which was the provision of large reserves of trained men for land warfare—has gone. I gather also that the best opinion is that the long-distance guided missile cannot be dealt with by piloted planes, and this entails a review of our air forces. A navy operating from ports within range of the guided missile seems to be equally impossible . . .

I am certain that at the present time much of the enormous cost of armaments could be cut down. I am sure that there are masses of weapons now obsolete which are still maintained or even being produced. There will inevitably be great opposition to the kind of drastic reorganization which is required. It will require a government with a strong will to undertake it for inevitably most of the experts will be thinking of the last war.

I think, sir, we are perhaps in somewhat the same position today in Canada. We have heard this afternoon from the Minister of National Defence, dealing with the radar lines and the joint use of those lines with jet interceptors. I have quoted the opinions of the two leading air force experts of the United States, who cast grave doubts on that concept and on its value in any way at all in light of the long-range high-speed bombers which it is known the Soviet union has now developed.

It is true enough that the D.E.W. line may still be of value in providing sufficient warning for the United States strategic air command to get those bombers into the air to proceed with massive retaliation. In that regard it is of inestimable value to the western world, but I would point out that it has nothing whatever to do with Canada's part in the protection of North America. Apparently we are relying on equipment that is now considered, by those who should know, to be quite out of date.

That, of course, does not even consider the problem of the intercontinental ballistic missile which is now known to be well on its way in development, both in the Soviet union and in the United States. In this morning's *Globe and Mail* there was a news story from Washington that Lieutenant General Donald L. Putt, United States air force development chief, said that the United States is keeping