

*The Budget—Mr. Best*

it is an interesting and difficult position for Canadians. There is a large body of opinion which is concerned, as indeed we all are in Canada, about our problems with nuclear weapons. This party has decided to commit itself to the fact that Canadian soldiers will not, I gather, in Canada or presumably in western Europe, use tactical weapons of this sort, or even possibly not use tactical weapons of this sort when the foe they might be facing is certain to be using them.

I question this very delicate, this very, in a sense, distinct line along which this party is moving; and in the opinion of many Canadians it must be moving toward a markedly neutralist position. I say this because our Prime Minister and our Secretary of State for External Affairs, as shining examples, are leading our country in international deliberations toward nuclear disarmament; toward peaceful and controlled disarmament; and I think this man, our Secretary of State for External Affairs, deserves the compliments of all Canadians for the work he is doing in this connection. This, I think, is the honest, the straightforward, the progressive approach that we must take rather than committing ourselves not to using certain weapons, even though we hope we never will, not to doing certain things, toward pulling out of certain negotiations and certain commitments. This is the stand taken by the Liberal party, and I hope it will not be ours.

I think the party rally last week might have gained useful experience from certain members of the New Party. I am quoting from a letter which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of January 10, 1961 from the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Fisher). In it he emphasizes some of the remarks he had made earlier regarding the new party. He says:

I hope the new party will have success in its search for power; I hope to help prove some of my doubts wrong. It is a conviction, perhaps a delusion, of mine, that such hopes should not keep one from analysing things as they seem to be or may turn out.

I would recommend to the Liberal party that they try to take some of that philosophy for constructive and useful criticism in their party deliberations. There was a great lack of that last week, and it is only to be hoped that it may come in the future.

Regarding defence matters, one might quote again from the *Globe and Mail* of January 11. A lot of things were happening about the country around that date, it seems. The leader of the C.C.F. party in this house, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Argue), is quoted as saying at Hamilton, Ontario that there is no defence in nuclear war and that our armed services should disband. Perhaps that is an

extreme point of view; no defence and no armed forces. What would we do? Would we just sit and wait, and get out of our commitments and decline to work with our allies? Are we seeing here an example of the Liberal party working toward these socialist principles of isolation and a complete withdrawal from commitments, from national defence, defence abroad and joint agreements abroad? Perhaps we are. There may be some further decision coming in the Liberal party's annals, some further planning in the dark recesses of their minds in preparation for getting out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and severing our commitments and relations with this powerful and traditional bulwark of freedom. These are the things I think Canadians will question in the months and years ahead in connection with this rally which we saw last week.

The matter of the flag, of course, was brought up and a two-year time limit was set if they returned to power. Little was said about the decades of time during which they might have dealt with this matter before 1957, or of the committee which was constituted, I believe in 1945, and which was flooded with thousands of possible flags and which 12 years later, in 1957, had not made a decision. Little was said about this, but they set this two-year limit, supposing they should be in office. These are the things we saw.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I should like to make three constructive points unrelated to the entertainment event of last week. They are three points which are related one to another, and I hope the Minister of Finance and the cabinet may consider them. They are matters of interest to myself and I am sure to other members in this house and to people across Canada. First of all, I should like to make a few remarks about the Royal Society of Canada. This organization, which is a body of scholars in various fields, in the arts, letters and sciences, I believe, is one which could be strengthened in our country. At the present time it is my information that they use some office space in the national research council building. I think it might be a project for the government in the years ahead to promote the independence and strength of this important body, possibly by providing some funds, by which the society might have here in Ottawa a building as its own home. I put forward this suggestion. It is not a new one; it is one which has come from some of the members of this society.

Second, I should like to propose the idea of an agricultural research council for Canada. Speaking in this house last year I complimented the government on the establishment of a new council, the medical research