

Supply—National Defence

the fact that such arrangement would permit the efficient utilization of productive capacity throughout the alliance—more defence for the same cost.

Defence is not a permanent solution to the world's problems. I cannot close without referring to the statements put forward in good faith by many of our church leaders in this country and by many editorial writers. They have taken the attitude that our contribution is not a significant one and that we should not continue to do as much in defence as we have in the past. Historically, Mr. Chairman, we learn the lesson that people living in a world where moral principles are not applied have to suffer the consequences. It is not too many years since the great depression, a time when we were burning food, when we were pouring milk down the drain, when we were killing little pigs to keep them from becoming a surplus on the market, and this when people were starving and others were going to bed at night hungry. We cannot continue to survive in a world where we do not accept our responsibility toward our fellowmen. We must apply moral principles in a world governed by moral law.

In the meantime, all I am suggesting is that, by our defence efforts in a collective alliance, we can buy time and continue the military stalemate, and with this time, if we take proper advantage of it, we can solve the problems of our own country and of the world in which we live. We can make our own system sufficiently attractive that it will command not only the confidence of our own people but will deserve emulation by others in the uncommitted parts of the world.

We have to learn to overcome the situation of chronic unemployment. We have to produce as much as we can and to make part of our surplus production available to less fortunate peoples in other parts of the world. If we do this, if we apply ourselves to the solution of problems which previously have not had the attention they deserve, then our money spent on defence will in fact have been well spent and the day will come more quickly when by universal agreement we can come together with persons all across the world and write a disarmament agreement which can be enforced and which will ultimately allow a lesser expenditure by people on both sides of the iron curtain. In the meantime, I feel that we must keep our defences strong because only under the shield of strength can our diplomats and we as people interested in solving world problems make the progress necessary to effect lasting world peace.

Mr. Carter: Mr. Chairman, the estimates now before the committee represent the largest and most important single item of government expenditure. The minister informed us this morning that they total \$1,680 million and represent five per cent of our gross national product and 27.3 per cent of our tax dollar. It is obvious, therefore, that these expenditures are important. They are important not only on account of their magnitude but because they are related to our very survival. Survival implies attack and we must not let these huge expenditures, this great emphasis on military defence, blind us to the fact that there are other threats to our survival just as deadly and perhaps even more dangerous.

This morning my leader referred to political attack, economic attack, psychological warfare, and to those I think we can also add ideological attack because that too, although much confused with the others, is something quite different. Attack by the enemy's armed forces is probably the last resort because he relies mainly on his other forms of attack to attain ultimate victory. He will use his armed forces only if all other forms of attack fail, and perhaps this great effort in military defence may really turn out to be not only the most expensive but perhaps the least effective.

A national defence policy must, therefore, take into account these other threats, and military defence must be developed in conjunction with other measures to ensure economic and ideological defence as well. Military defence, must of necessity be developed within the framework of what we can afford without danger to our economic structure. That amount is a finite sum and so we are posed with the problem of dividing that sum between our NATO commitments and home defence.

The minister told us this morning that we are passing through a transitional stage. Technological progress is advancing at such a rapid rate that conventional weapons, manned aircraft, the bomber and so on, are gradually being phased out and pushbutton weapons such as missiles are gradually being phased in. Under these conditions our economy will not permit us to go into the fields of nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles, anti-missile missiles or even ballistic missile early warning systems. For that reason we must depend upon collective security. We must depend for our protection upon the nuclear deterrent of our great neighbour, the United States. We must depend also on the integrated and balanced forces of our NATO allies.

I think, apart from the policy we have at the present time, that the question in people's