

Supply—Privy Council

that immediately it was followed by the suggestion of how difficult that would be. He said, "How could this be achieved, in effect?" He said that it was going to be a tremendously costly proposition to provide public shelters, that the estimate last year was some \$4 billion to \$5 billion and the estimate now is somewhat higher. Then he stated that he thought the proper course to follow would be to cover the whole field and to assure equality of security and survival now but rather to decide on priorities. Then he asked this question: Who is to have priority? By asking that question he fairly well answered his suggestion as to a national emergency shelter program financed by the people of Canada.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): I think I said children.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He said, "Where do we start, who is to have priority?" Those were the words he used. In doing that he showed his capacity for getting to the heart of the proposition. He was in favour of the general principle that all should be assured of equality of survival and he dealt with it immediately by that question, a fair and reasonable one, the one that actually is the nub of the problem we face, the question of priority.

There have been changes in viewpoint in the United States. Mention was made by the hon. gentleman of the fact that in the United Kingdom there have been changes in this regard. The hon. member for Peterborough spoke of the vast number of variables on many of which we have not full information and the difficulty of arriving at a program in the face of a problem that we hope will never be an actuality, one that we have never faced previously and one that in the days ahead we hope will not have to be faced.

We have also to look at the thinking of the people. If we act as we did in connection with Tocsin B, some say that we arouse fear in the hearts of the people; and mention was made of that matter today. On the other hand if we do not act, we bring about a state of mind that is not in keeping with reality. The same problem has been experienced in the other countries. The hon. member for Essex East mentioned the United Kingdom. In recent months I think there has been a vast alteration of viewpoint in regard to this whole matter. The hon. gentleman quoted from authorities to the effect that there could be no survival and a little later he argued that action should be taken in order to secure survival. No one in any part of the world today knows with finality the course that ought to be followed.

Mention was made of the U.S.S.R. which has the dictatorial power of directing where

persons shall go and where they shall not go. The hon. member mentioned an item in today's *Globe and Mail*. The report was to the effect, as I saw it, that in that country basement shelter construction started to diminish in the mid-fifties and was abandoned in the late fifties. On the other hand, pre-attack evacuation planning in that country has been receiving some emphasis as well as an apparent increase in the construction of what are called "free standing" shelters. These two aspects in the U.S.S.R. seem to indicate a combined shelter and evacuation policy.

Until about five years ago, if Canada had a policy, it was one of evacuation. Today it is a combined policy of shelter and evacuation. It was for that reason that we instituted the various programs and national exercises that have been undertaken.

In view of the mention of the U.S.S.R. I think I should place before you something of what it is doing in this field. The possibility of a surprise attack is admitted by the Soviet authorities. However, they think that actual hostilities will be preceded by a period of growing tension. The central responsibility for civil defence was until January 1960 that of the ministry of the interior, and its responsibility was abolished at that time. The head of municipal civil defence is the chairman of the town executive committee. In each town and city actual planning is carried out by the civil defence staff of the municipality. Residential areas and educational establishments organize "self-defence groups" numbering from 45 to 73 people. Groups are formed for administratively convenient units, varying from 200 persons in rural areas to 700 in densely populated urban ones. Each group consists of leaders and six teams: preservation of order, fire, decontamination, rescue, medical and shelters. They have training schools. In those schools instruction is given about the capabilities of nuclear weapons, starting with a 10-hour lecture course. They also have a further course of 18 hours which recently was brought into effect and which introduces information about fall-out. Shelters against blast, fire, radiation, and biological and chemical agents have been incorporated in basements of new buildings. Basement shelter construction started to diminish in 1955 and seems to have been abandoned in major urban centres since 1959.

Pre-attack evacuation is receiving considerable emphasis but at the same time, there has been an increase of "free standing" shelters. They have a mass training system in order to train the leaders in the various communities to take their parts.