

*Supply—National Defence*

time contemplate the possibility that it alone can meet the onslaught of the one aggressor that threatens our freedom and the freedom of other nations. Nevertheless, under the broad terms of the joint responsibility which is implicit in the Atlantic pact, we must ask ourselves how close we are to having those forces in being which will take their share as part of one combined team whose strength will be such as to deter the Russian aggressors simply by evidence of immediate and effective strength.

We still can be greatly impressed by the efficiency with which these tasks are carried out. Last Thursday many hon. members had the opportunity to see the demonstration of fire power at Petawawa. Petawawa is one of the finest artillery camps in the whole world, if not the finest. In general layout, in area available, in facilities for fire training, it is probably not exceeded by any other artillery camp anywhere. Those who saw that demonstration of fire power saw highly efficient gunners under highly efficient officers showing what can be done with artillery weapons, both in accuracy and in massing of fire power. From speaking to those who saw that demonstration I know that it did convey an impression both of efficiency and of strength. It is certainly no reflection of any kind on the men who carried out those tasks so efficiently to recall that this was a relatively small demonstration with 1945 equipment, and this is 1950. We all know that the equipment of 1945 and the gunpower of 1945 were extremely effective at that time. But today we must examine any demonstration of this kind in terms of the most modern equipment, and we must seek to ascertain whether the very large appropriations we are making are providing our armed forces with the most advanced equipment, with the most advanced instruments, with the most advanced system of communication and air co-operation, so that the force in being is one which is established and equipped in terms of the world conditions and the world realities that we are called upon to face.

I repeat that from the estimates before us we do not know, and there is no way in which we can know, what part of this tremendous expenditure is being devoted to the acquisition of the most modern equipment, how much of it is going to produce armed forces in being on an active service basis with regard to the fact that we must not only be armed and equipped as well as the Russians, but, because of our smaller numbers, that our arms and equipment in every branch of the services must be far beyond theirs and in keeping with the superiority of our industrial technique and our industrial production.

Let us see what we obtain from the estimates. We are dealing with a single item covering \$384,932,304 out of a total of \$425 million to be voted. A substantial part of that is for pay and allowances, civil salaries and wages, other fixed charges, and a number of details of a strictly administrative character; but the bulk of that figure is not made up of items of that kind. In what are described as details on page 168 of the estimates we find these bulked under such uninformative wording as, under the heading "Navy":

## General—

Acquisition, construction, purchase, maintenance, repairs, rentals and operating expenses of properties.

We know of course that many of these properties are service properties which form an essential part of our actual service requirements. Then we have:

Personnel supplies and services; stores and equipment.

There are other general terms after "Stores and equipment." There are similar items under the heading "Army" and similar items under the heading "Air." Instead of giving the details, these items are worded in the most general terms to embrace practically the whole field of our defence requirements, outside of wages, salaries and other fixed charges. These amount to extremely large totals. In the case of the navy, the items under "General," which are described in such all-embracing terms as those which I have mentioned, amount to \$58,265,022. The so-called details under the heading of "General" in the case of the army amount to a total of \$59,183,144. The general items under air, again in the same broad and general terms, amount to \$126,164,221. The total of these general items under the heading of navy, army and air is \$243,612,387. That is a huge sum.

That amount will not be challenged by the people of Canada, nor do I think it will be challenged by any member of this house. But what should be sought by the members of this house and by the people of Canada is a great deal more information than they now have as to what lies behind these broad and general terms and what we may expect in the way of military forces being ready to play their part under the terms implicit in the Atlantic pact. We have been told by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who was only repeating in this house what had been said by the representatives of other governments occupying similar positions, that no longer can any nation which hopes to preserve its peace expect to be able to prepare behind the ramparts of sacrifices of some other nation.