

*Supply—National Defence*

Europe develop a defence against that kind of attack without the deterrent coming into action in the form of nuclear retaliation. The hon. member himself mentioned that one of our difficulties, indeed one of our dangers, is that we have an elephant gun and may not want to use it to shoot small game but may have to use it because we have not a .22.

So we have to have both. We have to maintain the deterrent, but surely we have to concentrate on the kind of European conventional defence which will be strong enough so the deterrent will not have to be used. This dual purpose is the core of our defence problem in the Atlantic community. My worry is that if we spend so much of our energy and resources—by “we” I mean the North American countries—on one aspect, the deterrent, we may discourage the members of NATO from doing what they should do to make the use of that deterrent unnecessary.

The hon. member said something else with which I most heartily agree, and this was also brought up yesterday. He said that we should develop to the greatest possible extent our air transport and make our forces as mobile as possible. That again has a bearing on what I have been talking about, because if we consider it necessary to use a number of our R.C.A.F. squadrons for continental defence—I think the number is nine now—as part of this giant effort, if we have to spend so much money and so much of our air resources on that phase—as the minister pointed out last night, we are not able to develop our air transport to a point where we can move one brigade by air. Here again it is a balancing of priorities. I suggest again that in the reassessment which I still think the government should give to defence policy they should consider whether the priorities in this matter perhaps should be altered.

Mr. Chairman, the member for Edmonton West and the member for St. Boniface both congratulated the government on the progress that has been made in civil defence organization as indicated in the minister's statement. We will have an opportunity to discuss civil defence, as I said last night, when the estimates of the Department of National Health and Welfare come before the committee. Perhaps I should say a word about this in so far as the Department of National Defence is concerned, since it has already been brought up. I did not read into the minister's statement that evidence of great progress which other members on his side have found.

I am not reading from *Hansard* but from the mimeographed version which I have marked, on page 28 of this statement he said that an order in council, known as civil defence order, 1959, had been approved by

the governor in council and tabled in the House of Commons. Presumably this is the basis for the statement that progress has been made in the association of the Department of National Defence with this problem. I wonder whether much more has been done in connection with this matter through that order in council than putting another minister in charge of part of civil defence.

I should like the minister to inform me whether the assignment given the armed forces under this order in council is very greatly different from those responsibilities which they had before it was passed. Then the minister said also:

On September 1 the Department of National Defence will assume full responsibility for the operation of the warning system in Canada.

Would the minister inform the committee as to what extent that is a change? What was the situation before September 1? I am of the opinion, and he will correct me if I am wrong, that this only represents a partial change over the previous situation.

Then the minister went on to say:

The Canadian army has organized a number of mobile support columns within the regular army and the militia. These columns will be based on major units and training establishments in the regular army. In the militia they will be based on groups of units. Each column contains rescue companies and such other elements as will permit them to perform re-entry and rescue tasks, as well as supplying manpower for maintenance of law and order and such other internal operations as may be necessary under conditions of war.

This, of course, is an important survival function, because it will be a question of survival if we are ever confronted with this kind of catastrophe. Does this represent any great change over the situation which existed previously? Is there not an important omission—we will come to this when we discuss the other departments—in the establishment of a relationship between these army support columns and the local authorities? Has the minister anything to say on that, the relationship which must be established between the army and the other authorities, municipal and provincial, in respect to the discharge of these functions and responsibilities?

Then the minister went on to say:

Requirements for communications equipment for national survival have been established and arrangements for procurement are being made on a priority basis. The requirement for radiation detection equipment has been established. Industry, however, is as yet unable to meet the standards in all cases. Action is being taken on a priority basis to obtain suitable equipment as it becomes available—

Detailed examination of other items of equipment normally held by the army is being carried out with a view to providing adequate scaling for survival operations for all troops involved.

The requirement for these things may have been established, but I would ask the