

Supply—Finance

A number of questions have been asked in the press and elsewhere especially dealing with the question of survival. These studies that have been made have been based upon various attack situations. Also regard has been had to the several sizes of nuclear bombs. The results of these studies point to the fact that even with modest preparations many people would survive even the heaviest type of attack.

The provinces' responsibility is in the field of the preservation of law and order, control of traffic, reception services, medical, hospital and public health services, highways, utilities systems, fire fighting services and also in the field of the training of civil defence workers.

The question of evacuation has been referred to on a number of occasions. What is the policy in this regard? The government has issued a statement of policy which was the subject of communication with the provincial premiers in November, 1959. In essence it recommended that the evacuation of probable target areas should be based upon a voluntary decision on the part of individuals and the probable target areas should develop traffic plans to facilitate whatever voluntary evacuation is likely to take place.

Mention has already been made of the assistance under the National Housing Act in connection with the building of shelters. Some have suggested that the shelter will not protect. This fall-out shelter was designed by a team of government employees including scientists from the defence research board and the national research council. It is a proved scientific fact that a mass of dense material such as earth and concrete will reduce the intensity of radioactivity.

Questions have also been asked with regard to who would be responsible for the implementing of civil emergency planning. That responsibility rests on the Prime Minister and also on the three federal departments to which I have already referred.

Expenditures on civil defence have increased very greatly. In 1959-60 the total amount was \$10,028,345 and in 1960-61 it is \$36,824,500.

I believe that that generally represents something of the situation and brings the record up to date from the explanation I made last year.

Let me emphasize that the action being taken does not imply that we believe that war is imminent, but it would be less than wise for the Canadian people or for people anywhere in the free world not to take those precautions which can be taken now. All of us pray that the occasion will never arise when Canada or those nations associated with her in the free world will ever require

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

to implement these plans of precaution. We in the free world pray there will be peace and we can cause those who from time to time threaten and bluster to realize that whatever number of survivors there may be, a nuclear war, if it did not destroy civilization, would at least set it back to the dark ages for generations to come.

A question was asked today by the Leader of the Opposition as to the disarmament commission meeting next Tuesday. As I am about to conclude these estimates I express the fervent hope of hon. members in all parts of the house and of the Canadian people that those who today would by their action threaten with awesome declarations will realize that such threats deny disarmament without which mankind today is in greater danger than at any time in its march to better things.

One does not like to bring before parliament a picture that in the twentieth century preparations have to be made for survival. What we are doing, what we have done, is designed not to constitute an attitude of defeatism, defeatism when measured in the light of the international situation, but rather the taking of that action which is a responsibility that rests on the shoulders of those who endeavour to discharge the responsibilities of government.

Mr. Pearson: Mr. Chairman, this is, to use the Prime Minister's words, an awesome and a frightening subject to be discussing at any time, but it is one that must be discussed and must be faced. If we do that in this parliament it does not mean that we are thinking, let alone acting, in terms of war rather than peace. But it does mean that we have an obligation to act to ensure the survival of some if the madness of man leads him into the abyss of nuclear destruction. There are those who deny that obligation; there are many, and I am one of them, who find it difficult to come to a conclusion as to the extent of the obligation we should undertake.

I approach this subject—and I intend to say only a few words about it, Mr. Chairman—from two points of view, from the point of view of policy and from the point of view of organization. The first point of view, that of policy or almost of philosophy, has a bearing on the problem of what our obligation is in this situation. There are those, as I have said, who feel that we should and can do nothing; that if there are nuclear attacks it is hopeless to try to do anything because that would be at the end of everything and we shall get, all of us, what we deserve; that we have forfeited our right to survival