

*Supply—National Defence*

face the alternative of accepting defeat on the narrow ground of the enemy's choice or risking a general holocaust.

The third sphere of Canadian participation is its contribution to the United Nations. As mentioned by the leader of the Liberal party in his address this morning and this afternoon, Canada should take the initiative in providing a brigade group as a nucleus for a United Nations permanent force to be made available to the United Nations on a request by decision of the general assembly. If we can learn anything from history, it is that situations have risen, and are likely to rise again, where such a force and such a force only would have the prestige and moral backing to prevent outbreak of hostilities in a troubled area. It is a suggestion which should be borne in mind and supported by the government and the people of Canada.

The question naturally arises, how is Canada with its limited resources going to be able to pay for the cost of participation in these three spheres? Anti-missile missiles, atomic submarines, manned interceptors, air portable brigade groups, these are all expensive. If one examines the figures more closely however, it is obvious that we could do all these things, phased over a period of years, with approximately the same annual expenditure as in the fiscal years between 1955 and 1958.

Canada has always been proud to do its share, even eager to do its share. Our defence expenditures, as a proportion of governmental expenditures, have been declining. Similarly, defence expenditures, as a proportion of the Canadian gross national product, have been getting smaller. There has been a suggestion that we are not able to do as much in the future as we have been doing in the past. This contention, of course, does not hold water if analysed. During the years of our heaviest defence expenditures Canadians enjoyed a high standard of living. We enjoyed relatively full employment and in most of those years the federal government had a budgetary surplus available for reducing Canada's debt. We have not really made any sacrifice.

The question has been asked, "What have we to show for all of the money that has been spent?" The answer is, of course, that in addition to those permanent installations which are still of value and to the defence and technical industry which has been built up, the most important, indeed the only important consideration is that our house is still standing. A person who has paid fire insurance premiums for years without the necessity of a claim does not expect a return of premiums. He rejoices in the fact that he has been spared a holocaust and is happy

[Mr. Hellyer.]

to have paid the small amount for the security and peace of mind provided.

Actually, when speaking about cost, one remembers that through the inefficient use of our manpower and other resources we have lost through unemployment in the last two years enough total production to have continued with the Avro Arrow program, balanced the national budget and have something left over to assist at home or abroad.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Order. I am sorry to advise the hon. member that his time has expired.

**Some hon. Members:** Go ahead.

**The Deputy Chairman:** Is it the wish of the committee to give unanimous consent to the hon. member to continue?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Phillips:** Read a little faster, please.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I appreciate the indulgence of the committee, especially that of my hon. friend.

**Mr. McGee:** Speak instead of reading.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I will do that after supper. In the meantime, I invite my hon. friend to rise and participate in the debate. I think that someone on the government side in addition to the minister should show an interest in this important and far-reaching subject.

**Mr. Nesbitt:** The minister knew what he was talking about.

**Mr. Hellyer:** We should apply the positive utilization of our resources and not shrink from our responsibilities.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, we can well afford to do as much as we have in the past and without sacrifice. What remains to be done is to work out and insist upon a proper sharing of defence production and responsibility between the several members of the NATO alliance. The case has been well stated in an editorial which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* on Saturday, November 1, 1958, entitled "Sharing the Work". It states what we all know to be the fact. This country is well able to manufacture most of the new weapons; or at any rate, component parts thereof. All that is needed is United States permission. We must agree with our allies that we shall produce some piece or pieces of military hardware required by them, and produce it in quantity. We will then be in a position to exchange our production for the various other weapons required to equip our forces. In this way we will not only be able to hold our heads high, knowing that we are doing our full share, but we will be able to take comfort from