

Supply—National Defence

defence, in the light of situations and circumstances which do not any longer exist. I think we should, as I have said, make a complete re-assessment of the nature of our defence effort and our defence expenditures in the light of the fundamental changes in the last two years.

But Canada has to pay its fair share of the collective insurance policy against war. While we might be able to cut—and I think we could do so—defence expenditures, no one on this side of the chamber would advocate doing that at the expense of our security or at the expense of our position in the NATO alliance. I think it is possible to make a more effective contribution for less expenditures because I believe some of our expenditures now are not justifying themselves in the return they make to our security.

Above all, I believe, as I said at the beginning of my statement, that while military defence remains important and while a deterrent has to be maintained, while these millions have to be spent, the only real defence is peace, and everything must be subordinated in this government as in other free governments to the search for peace by negotiation to make the astronomic defence expenditures unnecessary in the long run. The minister said this morning that the world is perhaps approaching the stage when the use of force is no longer valid as an instrument of policy to settle man's differences. The minister might take the word "perhaps" out of that statement. The world certainly has approached that stage, and defence policy cannot surely in these days be based realistically on any other consideration. While military defence remains essential and while military deterrents remain essential, the use of these deterrents and the use of this force as an instrument of policy to settle man's differences has now become intolerable.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Chairman, the estimates which are now before us are of the utmost importance to all members of the House of Commons in particular, and of course to the people of Canada in general. May I first of all offer my congratulations to the Leader of the Opposition for the speech he has just concluded. The Leader of the Opposition in his lifetime of service has undoubtedly made a great many and memorable speeches, but personally from what I have read of his speeches or from what I have heard of them, I consider his speech this morning and this afternoon one of the finest of his speeches. It is not only my own but the sincere wish of the group in this corner of the House of Commons that the questions which have been put by the Leader of the Opposition directly

[Mr. Pearson.]

or indirectly will be answered directly by the Minister of National Defence at a later time in the course of discussion before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, may I also make it clear at the outset that any remarks which I have to make upon these estimates are not directed personally at the Minister of National Defence, because I know him as a personal friend in this House of Commons, as a personal friend outside the House of Commons, and we came to know each other very well in the last world war when he was a G.O.C. of western command and I had the honour and privilege of being the leader of the opposition in the province of British Columbia.

As I said, Mr. Chairman, this is an important debate and discussion. I did not have the opportunity of serving overseas, but in the past second world war as a member of the armed forces in the militia, as only a two-pip wonder and training officer, many hundreds of men passed through my hands. It was my responsibility in the Irish Fusiliers, Vancouver regiment, second battalion, to teach young Canadians how to kill and stop being killed. Unfortunately perhaps I was not too successful in the latter because many whom I came to know so well are no longer with us because they are buried heroes in Sicily and in Italy. But one who has had that experience, and there are others, in my humble estimation has a very grave responsibility as a member of parliament; that is, to put forward proposals, recommendations and criticisms which we hope will play a part in establishing a Canadian, foreign and defence policy that will make it as certain as one can make it in this world today that never again will Canadians be placed in the position of kill or be killed.

I commend the Minister of National Defence for taking the opportunity of making the presentation in approximately one hour of his analysis of the defence situation in Canada, the defence situation throughout the world, and his view of our own Canadian defence policy. He spoke, most understandably, from a written script. The Leader of the Opposition spoke very well extemporaneously and from a written script. It is most understandable on such important estimates and such an important discussion that there should be very full notes. So, Mr. Chairman, although it is a most unusual procedure for myself, I hope I may be granted the privilege of using extensive notes. May I say it is most unusual for me to have a written script, because I am not speaking for myself personally in the short 30 minutes I am allowed to try to present in as concise a form as possible the findings, which we came to in the last analysis only shortly before eleven o'clock