

National Defence

flat top. The heading is: "Britain's super flat top catapults jets into new sea role." The article reads:

It is a colourful business to catapult jet fighters off the Royal Navy's latest, largest, and fastest carrier—the first ever designed especially for that purpose. Or to receive them back with the arresting gear that brings them up short on \$47,250,000 worth of floating airfield as though they were falcons landing on bird lime.

To compare that with the aircraft carrier, one has only to read this article to realize just how obsolete is the *Magnificent*. The article goes on to say:

If one were to come in and attack, those radar robots would train guns on it without human assistance and keep them trained on it while the barrels pumped out their steel. This is one of the most significant changes in combat since world war II—the increased ability of anti-aircraft guns to fasten upon a fast-moving target.

I may say it is fifteen months since England began experimenting with this type of aircraft. She now has two. I think hon. members would be interested to know just what the situation is regarding this aircraft carrier, which I believe takes about one-tenth of the cost of naval expenses and also has a thousand or more men employed. If she is obsolete, then we should get rid of her. That is one thing we would be interested to know.

I was very glad to learn that our army was to be equipped with the Centurion tank. I know there has been a controversy between the United States and Great Britain as to which is the better tank. I believe that in the tests they have made in Korea it is now proven that the Centurion is a much better tank; that it can climb over those rocky hills, whereas the United States tank has great difficulty in moving only a very short distance. I think we are to be congratulated on accepting the Centurion tank. For my part, I was very much concerned when a year ago it looked as though Canada was going to adopt United States equipment instead of British or Canadian equipment. I was aware that the commonwealth has always had superior equipment to what they have had in the United States. However, I do not say that we should not adopt the best that we can get anywhere, but to adopt United States equipment simply because it is United States equipment would be a great mistake.

I am trying to cut my remarks as short as I can. The other day the minister spoke about the defence of Canada, and at page 1086 of *Hansard* of April 3 he said:

The main possibility of attack would be by air, and therefore we have worked out with the United States an arrangement for air defence entailing radar stations with the necessary communications

to enable the effective operation of fighter squadrons. These radar stations will be successfully brought into operation to replace the mobile stations we now have.

He also spoke about the training in the north. Well, it would be very difficult I think for a large army ever to invade Canada. There is no doubt that if an army did invade Canada it would be by parachute troops, and that Canada would have to be prepared with her air force to convey our own parachute troops from one part of Canada to another. We should also have aircraft which could carry tanks, and also a type of tank which could easily be transported by aircraft, and carried from one part of the country to the other.

No doubt we would be advised by radar of an attack, and the direction from which it was coming. We would have to be prepared not to use great numbers of troops, but be prepared to carry paratroops and tanks, and to rush into the position where the attack might be expected.

I was also disappointed when the minister did not give us some information regarding training areas in Canada. That matter was under considerable discussion a year ago, and even two years ago. We were disappointed when troops for Korea had to be trained in the United States. When one thinks of the great, broad areas in Canada, it does seem strange to us that we have to go to a foreign country to train our men. It would seem to me there must be areas in this country where we could train not only our own men but all the men needed in the allied forces.

I do not know whether the minister has yet selected a training area in Canada. I understand several were examined in the maritime provinces, two of which I believe were in my own province of New Brunswick. But it has always seemed to me that one of the best areas that could be found for combined training purposes would be that in the locality of what is known as Utopia camp in New Brunswick. The minister has not told us just what is required for these training areas. I know however that there was a large camp at Utopia during the war. There is a military airfield in the immediate vicinity, and it is also near the bay of Fundy. Then, there are great back areas in which very few people live, and it would seem to me that the Utopia area could be developed into a very fine one for purposes of training.

I can hear my hon. friend from Annapolis-Kings (Mr. Nowlan) clearing his throat. I know that he thinks there is a very fine area in Nova Scotia. I agree that there are some suitable places in that province; but I do not think they have any as good as the Utopia