

Supply—Privy Council

of the number of bombers the Russians have—and this is brought before both the houses of parliament and congressional committees—is this realistic in terms of the total attack which could be made? As I have said, there are a great many variables. I realize that it is not easy to deal with this matter. However, I suggest that it is wrong to assume and to tell the people of Canada 3 million to 4 million people will be killed in a thermo-nuclear attack unless you are assuming a set of variables which has some relation to what we know of the variables present in various other systems of government. For example, here is another thing in terms of the number of bombs which undoubtedly will be unleashed on the United States; and yet in the whole population of Canada there were only 180,360 radiation sickness casualties as a result of the nuclear explosions in the United States. Is this realistic in terms of the kind of attack which would take place? I think the position we have taken so far has not worked out. We have not got the Canadian people aroused about the problem of emergency measures. A great many people, of course, feel that they do not want to survive a nuclear attack. Indeed, the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said as much, and I refer to a newspaper report of a speech he made in Victoria in which there is the following:

It wouldn't be worth surviving a nuclear war, external affairs minister Green told the Victoria branch of the United Nations association Thursday night. Civilization would be "blown apart", and the end of the war would mean a "return of the dark ages", said Mr. Green. "Many would survive of course, but I doubt if it would be worth surviving. We must learn to live together."

I think the problem is that if we are going to survive we should be surviving together, and I do not think the Canadian people are very much enthused about the idea that we can build shelters singly, that those who have money should build shelters whereas in the case of those who do not happen to have homes and who happen to live in apartments or in blast areas obviously no shelters are possible. There are so many other areas where the problems would be even greater in terms of getting shelter.

Nor are the people very enthused when they receive so much information that is in direct conflict with what they receive through official government channels. For example, I think a great many hon. members are familiar with *Consumers Reports* which publishes information on a great many different products. These articles are published by an organization which has no advertising interest in the products involved and therefore they carry a degree of reliability which a great many people in this country and in-

deed in other countries respect. What does *Consumers Reports* say about fall-out shelters?

—the fall-out shelter, which is the specific kind of protective device around which our great debate has centred, must be distinguished from the blast shelter. The essential difference between them is that a workable blast shelter, which would provide great protection if one could be devised, really does not exist in the nuclear age; while a fall-out shelter, which can be devised very easily, really does not work.

This generalization, like all generalizations, can be made to yield exceptions. For, given the proper conditions, anyone can devise a shelter which would work to some extent. The trick is to get the conditions, and whether anyone might get them unfortunately is not known and is largely unknowable.

The article goes on to point out that really the individual fall-out shelter is not insurance protection as we have been talking about it, but rather is a bet. It is simply a bet exactly like a bet on a horse race. What you have to assume is that this series of variables will come together in such a way that your particular shelter will protect you from a certain amount of fall-out. But the point is, and a great many scientists have been indicating this, that this group of variables is not very likely to occur so far as fallout shelters are concerned and a great many believe that the only way we can meet the problem is through community shelters built at public cost.

The cost of such a program in Canada would be fantastic. Probably in no country in the world would it cost more in view of the size of our nation and the way in which our people are spread about. But surely this is the problem about which the people of Canada are concerned and which we are not meeting with any kind of conviction. We are just doing something. We are not sure at all whether that something has any relation to what the danger really is.

If we do develop a shelter program, and here I bring the committee back into focus again, we must deal with a great many problems. Will this develop a war psychosis? Will it enfeeble our desire to prevent war? Will we spend money and energy on shelters when it could be spent on programs to alleviate the tensions which create war? Will we lose our democracy in the very act of defending it?

The debate that took place in the house a couple of nights ago was in my opinion rather interesting and illustrates exactly what we are saying. The Minister of National Defence said that they cannot do anything about these people who graduate from our survival courses, that they cannot keep track of them because this is a form of conscription and because our system of government and democracy deny the right to keep track of these men. Members of the opposition and to some