

*Supply—National Defence*

minister to ask parliament for whatever he needs, and we will support his requests in so far as he will make known to us what his needs are. Of course we want to be shown exactly what the needs are, and we want as much information as we can get; but we are not going to choke him off in any way.

Furthermore we want the minister to know that we think the country is capable of producing all that is required in order to protect us from being placed in jeopardy at any time. Let us not fail at all times to keep in mind the cost to us and to humanity if we are not adequately prepared when and if difficulties arise. I think we have to keep that in our minds at this time. I should like the minister to make it clear whether or not the information I got as to this morning's proceedings was correct.

**Mr. Claxton:** I appreciate the attitude of the hon. member for Peace River. As he has opened the way, I may tell him at once that I did not make any such suggestion. What I said was that if we had an extra \$200 million for defence, in my view a large part of that amount would be spent on equipment rather than personnel. In other words the deficiencies that we and other countries under the North Atlantic treaty have are in the first place in the field of equipment, and second, in personnel. But all of us have deficiencies, and we are working to overcome them. If we were to have a war this year, \$425 million would be a small amount compared with what we would be seeking from parliament. We would probably be seeking an unlimited blank cheque, if we were certain to be engaged in a war, in order to put the whole economy to work in the quickest possible time for the purpose of devoting as much as possible of our total effort to war. In the second world war that resulted, as we know, in our being able to devote more than fifty per cent of our total economy to wartime effort. That was a large proportion in any country. If we did that today we would cripple our country. We would be doing exactly what the communists want us to do. Consequently it is necessary for us to strike a balance between what might be needed, what might be desirable, and what we think it is proper and useful to do. Defence expenditure must be regarded as in the nature of an insurance premium. We may not be paying enough, or we may be paying too much, all depending on the calculation of the risk.

**Mr. Low:** Does the minister think we are spending enough?

**Mr. Claxton:** Having regard to the situation as I know it, and from what I have

[Mr. Low.]

been told, I feel we are spending as much on defence at this time as we can properly spend out of our national income. In consequence of developments resulting from what took place on Saturday, I might have to come back and say that the situation has changed, but up to that date it is the view of the government that this is the right amount for us to spend at this time. It is being spent in the best way we know how. It is being spent to build up progressively forces which will be the best means of defending Canada immediately and of contributing to the defence of our allies should an emergency arise.

**Mr. Adamson:** I should like to refer to the F-86 fighter now being purchased. I do so in order that the minister may have an opportunity to say something on the whole question of jet aircraft, which is one of such vital importance to this country. There has been and is today considerable controversy about the F-86, not only here but also in the United States where it was designed. I understand that even as late as last week a further modification was made in the design of this interceptor. I bring that to the minister's attention so that he may have an opportunity to make a statement about this aircraft.

I also want to say a word about the Canadian jet aircraft industry. Not only has it done a magnificent job for Canada, but in many ways it leads the world. The British magazine *Flight* is my authority for saying that the CF-100 and the C-102 are the leading aircraft of their types in the world. The CF-100, a fighter bomber, will shortly fly the Atlantic. It has tremendous speed and hitting power. I understand that the C-102, a jet transport, will shortly fly the Pacific, and is the leader in its class in the world. I also understand that the design, and certainly the construction, of this aircraft are largely of Canadian origin.

I should like to quote what was said before the United States senate investigating committee concerning aircraft, and particularly air transports. I am quoting Mr. Robert Ramspek, executive vice-president of the air transport association, who had this to say concerning the performance of Canadian and British jet passenger aircraft:

... Mr. Ramspek declared that the U.S. could not even come close to matching their development. He said that as far as he knew, there were not even any plans for a transport which might compete with the Avro Canada jet lines. He further warned that American domestic air lines would have to buy foreign jet transports ...