

Supply—Privy Council

opinion of experts about the effectiveness of the new weapons and the prospect of defence against them, must turn to the testimony of British and American witnesses before committees of their legislatures provided for that purpose. During the debate on defence policy in the last parliament, Conservative critics argued powerfully for the creation of a House of Commons standing committee on defence similar to those now functioning at Westminster and Washington.

Then he goes on to say that this party is in power. More than ever before we need some kind of committee to give us the different opinions of experts in this field so that we can take a national approach to this problem of national survival. I think that one cannot quarrel with what has already been done by the emergency measures organization. I think one would be wrong not to suggest that a great many devoted people have given a tremendous amount of time and energy to the work of this organization. I think they are doing the best they can on the information they have and the money which is made available to them. I will admit that only over the last year we have had a real focus on this matter or any real sense of proper perspective in this field of emergency measures. However, as I say, we still have not captured the Canadian people in this matter in any way whatsoever in terms of the number of people who are taking the advice they have been given by this government.

Last fall we held a civil defence exercise known as Tocsin B. As I said, I have the greatest respect for the emergency measures organization but I think we should not use this organization to project the number of variables in this matter which have no actual reality. For example, after the Tocsin B exercise ended last fall the Prime Minister announced that some 4 million people had been killed or that 3 million or 4 million had been killed as a result of that simulated attack.

Miss LaMarsh: And he was one of them.

Mr. Pitman: One of the hon. members suggests that the Prime Minister himself was one of those who was killed. However, that is irrelevant to my argument. The point is that after this simulated attack the Prime Minister said that some 3 million or 4 million had been killed. If all the facts were brought forward in terms of what kind of attack it was, I think we would realize that this was not a group of variables which would be likely and therefore this number of people killed does not really come down to reality as the number who would be killed in a thermonuclear attack in the circumstances we have read about. For example, there were only 17 weapons dropped with a total megatonnage of some 75. All the bombs were from one to five megatons or only one was

of 10 megatons. Yet Mr. Khrushchev himself has said that he would certainly use the largest size weapon he is capable of using.

The whole problem is not the number of megatons a country has at its disposal. It is a problem of getting them there. The United States authorities state that every bomber S.A.C. has could carry the 100 ton bomb that Mr. Khrushchev had exploded in Siberia last fall. I realize that certainly a 20 ton megaton bomb is not 20 times a one megaton bomb but it is sufficiently great in order to have great effect. In a full scale attack on North America it is not a realistic variable on which to say that a certain number of people will be killed.

Mr. McGee: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Pitman: Yes.

Mr. McGee: He has suggested that certain assessments were unrealistic. Will he give us his assessment, which presumably will be realistic?

Mr. Pitman: At the beginning of my speech and during it I think I simply stated that there are a tremendous number of variables which no one can determine. I think the most unrealistic thing is to state any number of people killed on the assessment of a simulated attack. If the hon. member will listen to what I have yet to say, I think he will find that the number that was assessed is not realistic in the kind of thermonuclear attack which is envisaged.

Mr. McGee: What is realistic?

Mr. Pitman: If the hon. member will listen maybe he will learn. Only six bombs were delivered by I.C.B.M.'s, it was suggested in the simulated attack. There was not one single bomb that was dropped by mistake. There were no Russian bombs which were directed at United States cities and which ran out of fuel. I am sure we have a great deal of admiration for Russian technology but surely it is not quite that good. In addition, no assessment was made of the number who would be killed during the interception of bombers over our territory by our Bomarcas. Perhaps this is realistic, but none the less it is not included in the assessment of those who would be killed as a result of a thermonuclear attack on North America. There is no account of any nuclear devices released from submarines, one item which is suggested here.

You have a group of variables for the smallest possible attack which could be deposited, if it could be deposited at all. For example, there were only 350 individual aircraft attacking. On the knowledge we have

[Mr. Pitman.]