

Supply—National Defence

to take part promptly should we be called upon as a member of the United Nations to make any contribution.

I do not think the minister's reference to the early days of Korea was a very happy one, although as operations proceeded and there was time—time having been gained by these hastily raised troops, time having been gained by the forces of our allies—Canadian troops acquitted themselves most admirably in that Korean war. The lesson which should be drawn is the fact we had nothing at that time and apparently, according to the minister's statement I have quoted, we had not very much ready a year ago and no reference has been made to that.

In connection with the cold war and in connection with the possibility of having to send forces to aid the United Nations, I would call attention to the words of President Eisenhower as reported in this NATO letter. The president said:

Arms alone, the President said, can give no permanent peace, no confident security. If we are to preserve freedom in our own land; "it must likewise thrive in other important areas of the earth". For the welfare of ourselves and others, we must, therefore, help the rest of the free world achieve its aspirations. For our mutual benefit we must join in building for greater future prosperity, for more human liberty and for lasting peace.

This would indicate that if we are to play our part as a member of the United Nations, and as at least a middle power, we must be prepared to take part in that third class of war to which I referred, the bush fire war. Finally, we have to be prepared for the war of survival if all our efforts to deter the enemy should fail.

I should like for the rest of my time to examine our forces today. Are they in that state of efficiency which is indicated in order to be able to carry out these various tasks to which I have referred? In order to give some indication as to the problem in so far as the spread of Soviet imperialism, may I say that in this same NATO letter to which I was referring, on page 10 Mr. Dulles points out that the Soviet type of communism which in 1945 ruled some 200 million people of the world has now extended its rule to cover nearly 700 million people belonging to no less than 13 independent nations. It is, therefore, no surprise that the Secretary of State for External Affairs should have said a few weeks ago that NATO is at the crossroads.

Now, we cannot, and no opposition has the right to, accept a statement to the effect that our forces are more effective than they have ever been without examining whether the expenditure of \$1,775 million this year on

national defence is being spent to the best advantage from the point of view of the Canadian taxpayer. On page 4 of the white paper we are told:

In the current phase of collective security, Canada's principal support of the west's retaliatory striking power is our contribution towards early warning and air defence on this continent.

The minister has referred to the early warning systems which are now being developed. He has referred to the fact that the United States is paying for the early warning chain, known usually as the D.E.W. line, which extends across the Arctic. Reference has been made to what Canada is doing in the way of building the mid-Canada line and what has been done in building the "Pine-tree" line, as well as how that "Pinetree" line, which is to a very large extent a fire control system, is being developed. The minister indicated that the main purpose of the D.E.W. line was to warn the United States strategic bomber force of an approaching striking force so they could get off the ground and start on their mission of massive retaliation. I do not think anybody could find any fault in that. I am quite certain—at least I would hope—that if there were a force of hostile bombers crossing the D.E.W. line within the next year or two, sufficient warning would be given for the United States bombing force to get off the ground and start on its mission.

It is possible, as has been indicated outside this house, that as the power of the offensive increases and we are entering into the era of the intercontinental missile, the equipment of the D.E.W. line may not be able to pick up that form of attack. That is something we have to accept, and I think we should hold the minister guilty if he did not take such measures as he considered right to provide the best early warning system that he can devise at the present time, and hope that not only will the means of offence increase but also that the means of detection through advances in electronics will keep pace with the event.

Therefore I have no criticism to offer on the principle of the development of the D.E.W. line. It is an expensive operation. We do not know exactly what it will cost, and as it is being paid for by the United States as a joint United States-Canadian effort we have little comment to make. One does question the wisdom of having United States contractors manning and operating this D.E.W. line for the next three years. Naturally, having some pride in our own Canadian sovereignty, we would have preferred to see Canadian personnel doing that work.

Then I come to the question of the mid-Canada line. I think there is some ground