

hon. member had to say. I would suggest, though, that there is a further serious defect in the hon. member's remarks, that is, his failure to come to terms with the serious financial questions which are involved in the political exercise of balancing defence expenditure against expenditure on other aspects of the economy.

Mr. Forrestall: That is your problem.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He advocates the spending of millions of dollars more on the enhancement of Maritime Command. But he gave no reason for doing so. One suspects they might not be unrelated to the fact that a great many of his electors are associated with that command. It might have been good politics but there was a total absence of policy in what he had to say. He suggested that millions of dollars ought to be spent in a number of defence areas but he failed completely to come to grips with the serious question which arises at the political level—how much of a national budget should be allocated to defence and how much to other needs. Indeed, I was left wondering whether he was advocating a tax increase, a reduction in other programs unspecified, or some other solution. Where is the money to come from which would be needed to carry out the virtual doubling of defence spending which he suggests?

The hon. member referred to a defence budget of nearly \$2 billion as representing an insignificant amount. Well, it impresses me as being a very substantial sum to have to provide. I really cannot agree with the approach he has taken here. I am sure we would have been interested to have heard from the hon. member about the priorities in respect of which substantial additional sums ought to be expended, and the way in which they would be provided.

Mr. Forrestall: We want to know what you have to say.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member says he and his friends want to know what I have to say. Our priorities were set out in the statement of April 3, 1969. Again I would remind the hon. member that the first priority in terms of Canada's defence forces is to provide for the protection of Canadian sovereignty and the maintenance of Canada's internal security. In effect, these are the priorities that were set out by the hon. member for Greenwood in his speech.

• (3:00 p.m.)

At some stage there seemed to be a lingering opinion, even among official opposition members, that somehow this should not be the first priority of Canadian defence policy. We are talking about protecting our own territory, maintaining surveillance and control over our own territory, maintaining our internal security and doing these things ourselves. If we do not do these things ourselves, we cannot ask anybody else to do them for us. Therefore, this must be our first priority and any state should plan its defence policy on that basis.

I found the statement of the hon. member for Greenwood helpful in the sense that he set out to state priorities. I found myself in total agreement with his first two,

National Security Measures

as I have said—namely, the preservation of internal order and the defence of Canadian sovereignty. I also found myself in substantial agreement with his general statement of a third priority, contribution to international order, though I would disagree in regard to some aspects. In his remarks I think he disagreed with the notion that Canada can still play a role in protecting the deterrent so that a stable nuclear balance results. Obviously we disagree with his opinion in this regard, though we agree with the essential proposition that he put forward, namely, that the best way of ensuring the defence of Canada ultimately is by making an effective contribution to international order.

The hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) who preceded me gave us a first-class flashback to vintage 1950 "cold war" days. The thrust of his speech was: Who thinks that the west has anything to gain from opening negotiations with the U.S.S.R.? Well, Richard Nixon thinks so. Willi Brandt thinks so. The NATO alliance thinks so. But apparently the hon. member for Calgary Centre does not think so, and presumably he was speaking for his party in this regard. I would remind the hon. gentleman, and his colleagues, of the statement made by Sir Winston Churchill, that in the question of international security it is far better to jaw, jaw, jaw, than to have war, war, war.

Mr. Harkness: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Calgary Centre (Mr. Harkness) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Speaker, I object very much to the attempt of the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) to put into my mouth words that were not there. To start with, I said that trying to work toward peace, to increase trade and the other matters contained in the preamble of this protocol, everybody could agree with and that I agreed with them.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can interpret his speech any way he wants, but the fact of the matter is—

Mr. Harkness: *Hansard* has the report of my speech.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): *Hansard* may well have it—but in fact he was deprecating the opening of negotiations, whether bilateral or otherwise, with the Soviet Union. I think *Hansard* will establish that whatever he may say now, that is what he said at the time. The hon. member asked: Who thinks that the west has anything to gain from these negotiations? I put it to him again, Richard Nixon thinks so. Flashing back to the hon. member's vintage speech of the 1950s, it will be recalled that Richard Nixon at that time was not exactly a flaming left winger. During the period of time that these negotiations have been carried on, the United States has pressed forward with the strategic arms limitation talks. However, the hon. gentleman seemed to deprecate progress there, though I think we all stand to gain from those talks.