

*Supply—National Defence*

how to improve it and do not want to be obsessed with the fears of a devastating third world war; not to be fed a daily dose of cold war manoeuvres and taxed to supply even more deadly weapons of aggression or of reprisal. We in this corner of the house have a trust in the people of this country and have a trust in the potential influence of this country, if properly expressed, to say that surely right now they can give a lead to the world in vigorously promoting a required common denominator, namely a demand from this House of Commons, speaking on behalf of the Canadian people, for a permanent ending to nuclear tests, the banning of weapons of mass destruction, and intensified efforts for the promotion of world disarmament.

**Mr. Benidickson:** Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member who has just taken his seat a question. I refer to what I would regard as the third last portion of his interesting speech. He indicated that he had reluctance to approve, as the Leader of the Opposition had indicated, the extent of integration that might have developed under NORAD. But I took it that he felt that in the matter of co-operation of detection devices he had some approval but that he had no approval for co-operation between this country and the United States with respect to aircraft development for defence purposes. I ask him this question. In the knowledge that detection devices were a joint enterprise, would he say that once the information was obtained in a practical way through the detection devices, it should not be passed on to another country?

**Mr. Winch:** Mr. Chairman, I should say that there is nothing in what I said in a prepared text from which that implication can be taken. That is why I asked the privilege of speaking from a prepared text.

**Mr. Hellyer:** Mr. Chairman, at the end of world war II there was again amongst people of many nations the feeling that we had won for the world a period of peace and prosperity, of good will and international comradeship. Our dreams were soon shattered with the realization that in the world there were people who did not share our views and peaceful aspirations, people who sought and still seek to impose their ideas on the world at large by any means including military force, if it is expedient for them to do so.

The United Nations, which was launched amidst high hopes and eloquently rounded phrases, was not able to cope with the situation in the real world. Canadians have been and may continue to be proud of the fact that we were amongst the first to recognize that if we were to prevent the Soviet union from

[Mr. Winch.]

further military expansion, we must form a new alliance, a partnership of free nations dedicated to protecting each other from any act of aggression. I think it is a matter of particular pride to those of us in the official opposition that our present leader, along with our then leader, Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent, together were a team in the forefront of the shaping of the concept of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

NATO was born and with it a new concept of collective defence and mutual co-operation. What each of the signatory nations would be unable to do alone, they would be able to do as a group working in concert. From humble beginnings, NATO forces have grown in strength and have become a shield of containment against soviet imperialism. The retaliatory power of the United States strategic air command and the existence of the NATO shield have until the present time been of sufficient strength to deter soviet aggression in Europe. As my leader stated earlier today, there have been many new and far-reaching developments in the world, demanding a re-appraisal of all old concepts and a rethinking of future possibilities. It is toward these infinitely complex problems that we must turn our attention. Today we are being asked to vote \$1,680,194,006 as the Canadian contribution toward the collective defence of the western world which, incidentally, is our only defence because it is impossible, as everyone well knows, for Canada to defend itself. This is a considerable amount of money, and we have the responsibility before granting it to Her Majesty to ensure in as far as is possible that the money is being well spent, and that it is in fact going to be translated into an effective contribution. In order to judge it is necessary, of course, to have the fullest possible information. This we have been denied by the government.

I think as an indication of the interest in this subject, we should note that after the speech we have just heard from the defence critic on behalf of the C.C.F. party there is no one from that party who is interested enough to remain in this house to listen as the debate continues. Therefore, I think we can put into better perspective some of the suggestions which they made.

The government has in fact no real defence policy and consequently has lost the confidence of parliament and the Canadian people in defence matters. To try to hide from this parliament and the Canadian people the state of its confusion and lack of policy the government has clamped down what I call a rigid insecurity blackout. The white paper on defence, the first one since the new government has taken office, tells us nothing.