

Supply—National Defence

heads: War is no longer feasible; science and technology have overcome the war planners and rendered them impotent.

But science and technology have placed other weapons in our hands and there are innumerable places in the world where these weapons should be employed today. Sometimes we forget that there are more than two nations in North America. A month or two ago I visited the third, the nation of Mexico, a country upon which some of us have been inclined to look patronizingly perhaps, as one which has not been well developed and where there are vast differences between wealth and poverty. However, when I was there the Mexican budget for the current year was presented—and 80 per cent of that budget is being devoted to education.

I would suggest that on any scale of civilized values a nation which devotes 80 per cent of its budget to education is vastly superior intellectually and morally to a nation which devotes 25 per cent of its budget to a war which will never take place, or if it does, to a war which the contribution of that country would be pointless.

I would recommend to the Minister of National Defence—and I know he has done something along these lines—to set up a program of training the men in our armed forces to undertake such tasks as this. And I would suggest that he return to the treasury of Canada the vast bulk of the sums which have been provided in respect of what are useless expenditures, expenditures which can provide us with no real defence. Further, I suggest the establishment, for one thing, of a comprehensive program of administrative training for people in those areas of the world which are now emerging into the twentieth century. This could be merged with the role the men in our armed forces might well play in the world of tomorrow. If we could achieve this, we would have less antediluvian talk about whether this weapon is better than that weapon. In the world of today no weapon is of any value at all in the face of the enormous, the devastating advances in science and technology.

Mr. Dinsdale: It has been some considerable time since I had an opportunity to take part in a discussion of defence. Unfortunately, in the limited time at my disposal this afternoon I shall be able to make only a few introductory remarks before we reach the hour of five o'clock.

It is not that my interest in defence matters has diminished over the years. I think my

interest in the operations of the Department of National Defence has increased rather than diminished. The reason I have been less active in recent years is because of other responsibilities and because I personally got out of touch with the activities of the armed forces, having myself become obsolete in 1957. Up to that point I was active in the excellent MATP program as a reservist. But the year 1957 was the beginning of the streamlining process, which had become necessary within the armed forces of Canada by reason of the crash program launched in the early fifties consequent upon Canada's participation in the Korean conflict.

Immediately after the war we scaled down our armed forces to an irreducible minimum, as seems to be typical of the approach Canada has taken over the years in defence matters. As a result, by the mid-fifties we had built up a defence force of a comparatively large size upon the basis of what the minister of that day, Hon. Brooke Claxton, referred to as a crash program. Then it became necessary in 1957 to carry out some streamlining.

Since there have been bouquets handed around the chamber this afternoon, and the name of the present Minister of National Defence has been mentioned, together with that of the associate minister, I think I should pass a bouquet to a former minister of national defence, Hon. George Pearkes, who is really the man who began the streamlining process designed to increase efficiency in the armed forces. We are all aware of some of the strange anomalies which occurred during the early fifties as a result of the crash program. The situation produced errors of huge proportions, as well as humorous aspects. I refer of course to the Avro fiasco which was debated furiously in the house at one time, and also to the lighter incident, the famous "horses on the payroll" episode which the minister will remember so well.

The first point I wish to make is that Canada has had this "on again, off again" attitude toward defence matters for most of its history; we can look back over the history of the past 20 or 30 years and find this to be the case. While integration is important, and while it was initiated by the former administration, particularly by the minister to whom I have referred, I wish to point out that under the present minister there has been frantic haste and frantic public relations in the spirit of the 60 days of decision—an approach which has created