

Supply—Privy Council

Premier Roblin is reported to have said:

I don't think we've had sufficiently clear directions from federal authorities to make me enthusiastic about building more shelters or putting them in public buildings.

That is the position of Premier Roblin. Surely of all people in Manitoba he should be the one most concerned about emergency measures.

Let us turn now to Saskatchewan. In an article dated November 19, 1961 by Patrick O'Dwyer which article emanated from Saskatoon it is stated:

Saskatchewan's farmers are bristling with annoyance at what they consider an inept federal Department of Agriculture pamphlet designed to help them fight fall-out.

I realize this does not come under the item we are dealing with but it is part of the picture of confusion and concern. I continue:

The reason for the farmers' annoyance is that the Ottawa pamphlet is of no real value in helping them prepare for survival. Many of them have complained that instead of being helpful it is a study in futility. This blueprint, of which 200,000 copies have been printed, is a dud.

The Peterborough *Examiner* of November 29, 1961 carried a Canadian Press dispatch from Edmonton under the heading "Fall-out Advice for Farmers 'Fantastic'". It reads in part as follows:

Ed Nelson, Alberta farmers' union president, described as fantastic Tuesday a dominion agriculture department pamphlet designed to help farmers fight fall-out in the event of nuclear attack.

The Ottawa booklet says: "After heavy fall-out you may be advised to plow the topsoil under so as to bury the fall-out as deep as possible before seeding or planting."

United States government scientists have said the ill effects of fall-out would continue to contaminate plants for years if the affected topsoil were plowed down, Mr. Nelson said.

Mr. Nelson said most of the directions are so impractical "that many farmers after reading the pamphlet are apt to throw their hands up in horror—"

In dealing with this matter last September the emphasis in both Canada and the United States was on the construction of individual shelters. Protection thus depended on the means of individuals to construct shelters in their own basements. At that time hon. members of this group were somewhat critical of the fact that the building of shelters should be related in any way to the means of the individual to undertake this construction. Similar criticism was made in the United States and since last September the emphasis has changed from the construction of individual shelters to the construction of community shelters. A recent press release from Washington indicates that under the program of the Kennedy administration fall-out shelter protection for virtually all United States citizens will be provided within five years at a cost of between \$5 and \$6 billion with the

federal government contributing approximately \$3 billion. In Holland the Dutch government plans to construct 400 community shelters in 1962. Each shelter will have room for 100 persons. There are presently 262 shelters in the Netherlands with room for 50 persons in each. The country's population is more than 11,500,000.

Then this last fall we had the Canadian municipalities arguing in a brief to the government that the cost to carry on a national program of fall-out shelter construction will be enormous but that the cost of not doing so may be completely disastrous. It seems to me that this is an area in which the dominion government has a responsibility. Surely throughout the history of mankind the defence of its citizens has been of importance and surely this is about the only area about which you can use the word defence in its true meaning, that is the defence of the life, freedom and the security of people of this nation. I am afraid this is an area to which we have given too little time and thought and emphasis at the national level.

I should like to read from a book which is certainly more attuned to the posture of other parties than is this one. It is a book by James Eayrs called "Northern Approaches". His position is that we need this for the first time, that we cannot as I stated, give partial service to the people of Canada. There has not been any great enthusiasm for what the government has been doing now. Perhaps this is because they did not have sufficient knowledge about this matter. One of the things I think we need in this country is some kind of committee on defence which could solve the problem, which could deal with the problem, which could bring witnesses and allow this house to deal with this problem. It is very easy to say that. Last September the Prime Minister said, when he was discussing this problem, that these scientists who are in the know are those who know something about it. But the problem is that those who know seem to be the ones who are creating the most confusion. You have one physicist disagreeing with another physicist. I am suggesting now that Iowa physicists were attacking Dr. Willard Libby who has suggested certain measures for survival in case of atomic attack, by saying this:

It is extremely dangerous to give the impression to the public that the building of fall-out shelters will enable the average citizen to survive a nuclear war.

These are the remarks of James Eayrs in his book "Northern Approaches" at page 20:

It is a tremendous affront to the people of this country that such knowledge as is available of the chances of survival under atomic attack has not been placed squarely before them by their own government. A Canadian citizen, desiring the