

Supply—National Defence

Also notable is the development by the board in Canada of an air-to-air missile know-how and handling capability.

These guided missiles, as I am sure every one realizes, are very complex devices which require a variety of special skills and techniques in a number of engineering and production fields. These did not exist in Canada up to five years ago when the missile program began. There are now, however, some hundreds of trained experts available so that Canada is in a position to carry out a selected guided missile through any or all its stages from development to production.

The pioneer work was done on the "Velvet Glove", which so far has fully come up to its original specifications. However, because a somewhat similar United States missile is of more advanced design, it has been decided not to adopt "Velvet Glove" for operational use, but to modify the "Velvet Glove" program and go into production of one of the Sparrow series for use with the CF-100 and the CF-105.

In the anti-submarine field, the board is completing the final stages of development of new submarine detection equipment for naval destroyer escorts, which will greatly increase their effectiveness. Research into other promising anti-submarine devices is also under way.

From time to time we hear suggestions that we should not push ahead with some part of our defence program but should wait a few years for something better.

In our long-term defence planning there always has to be some reasonable balance between waiting for the ideal and getting a weapon with which to fight, if called upon, immediately. World war II would possibly have been lost by the allies if the United Kingdom had waited for the jet plane and not made shift, magnificently, with Hurricanes and Spitfires. Canada must not be left undefended while waiting for weapons that might not be available for ten years.

Within the limits set by considerations of cost and time, there will always be a healthy tug-of-war between the enthusiastic designer, who looks far ahead, the practical military man who needs his weapons now and not tomorrow and the financial official who must provide the money for both. And there is, of course, no finality in matters of this kind. We must therefore proceed with imagination, but with a sense of practicability dictated by the state of world affairs and our own financial capacity.

May I now say a word or two concerning what Canada has done to support her NATO allies.

[Mr. Campney.]

The Chairman: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I am obliged to advise him that his time has expired.

Mr. Drew: It is agreed there is no time limit.

The Chairman: Has the hon. minister unanimous consent to proceed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Campney: Thank you. I might here announce that after training more than 3,800 aircrew, at a cost of \$328 million to date, Canada's NATO air training program is being reviewed and probably will be adjusted downward starting in 1958.

The original plan was to provide trained pilots and navigators to build up the front-line strength of aircrew in the NATO countries. This has now been achieved and the training of aircrew for replacement purposes can now be taken over by most of the NATO nations themselves.

Besides what has been done to train NATO aircrew under Canada's mutual aid program, this program since its inception in 1950 has done much to strengthen the defences of our allies in Europe. As their own capability increases, our program of aid is being scaled downward. More and more the equipment we are supplying is from current production rather than from existing stock.

The value of mutual aid to our NATO partners now totals more than \$1,274 million. This includes, as an example, the provision of more than 600 modern fighter planes and more than 1,000 aircraft engines.

I should like now, returning to the Canadian scene, to say something about manpower in which, as in some other fields of military action, Canada's role, within limits imposed by our size and productivity, has been a pioneering one; pioneering, that is, in the emphasis placed on having highly trained professional services. Until recent years, we have never in our history had standing forces in peace time in anything like the numbers we have today.

While we must always have regard to the need, we must never lose sight of what this country can afford. A balanced program in the three services and the defence research board now costs us about one and three-quarter billions of dollars a year. Few countries spend a higher percentage of their national income on defence.

In any event it is not the size or the cost of our defence forces that is the main requirement. It is the quality. I should like here to pay tribute to the evident quality of our services, of their equipment, of their morale, and to the calibre of young Canadians who are coming to us to be moulded and trained.