

Supply—Privy Council

I am sure all hon. members realize that the preparations which are being made at the present time depend upon a tremendous number of variables. So far, at least in this country, we have not made an investigation of the variables and the direction in which our efforts should be directed. We do not know how big an attack we might have. We do not know essentially whether it would be by bomber or I.C.B.M. or what the effect would be of an attack on the North American continent by nuclear submarine. We do not know whether the enemy would attack our cities, our military establishments or our communications. We do not know whether there would be a single first strike or whether in an attack on the North American continent there would be a series of strikes assuming that the enemy had a great degree of mobility in its attacking instruments. We do not know whether there would be an all-out nuclear war or some kind of limited nuclear war, assuming the nation receiving a certain amount of punishment would wish to negotiate peace and therefore forestall a certain amount of destruction. We do not know whether the main emphasis would be by a blast or a series of concentrated blasts or whether the enemy would rely upon the effects of fall-out.

With as many variables as those I have outlined and others which may occur to hon. members I submit in all humility it is difficult to decide exactly what efforts should be made in the field of emergency measures. As the Prime Minister indicated when he introduced the related main estimate last autumn, speculation on this subject has ranged the spectrum from the attitude of Nevil Shute who sees virtually no existence or life on the planet after a thermonuclear war to the equally ridiculous position adopted by *Life* magazine which assumes that by taking a few simple precautions 97 per cent of the population would survive without severe ill effects. Somewhere between these two fantastic positions at opposite ends of the spectrum we must adopt a position that has some reality.

What must be done is to determine how this can be done. Across this country there has been active questioning about what we have done so far. As I have said, it is easy to ridicule in this area. One has only to consider the number of variables in relation to the kind of attack and the kind of war which might take place and it is easy to ridicule the program introduced by any government or individual. As it now stands the Canadian people are extremely concerned and for proof of this one has only to examine the facts and figures.

[Mr. Pitman.]

Following exercise Tocsin last autumn there was much publicity concerning the fact that under the terms of the National Housing Act it was possible to make application for allowances for the construction of fall-out shelters in new homes. What has been the result across the entire nation? The figures for the provinces are as follows:

Number of N.H.A. loans, for new houses which included allowances for fall-out shelters, to January 31, 1962.

Newfoundland	1
Prince Edward Island	nil
Nova Scotia	nil
New Brunswick	1
Quebec	30
Ontario	13
Manitoba	2
Saskatchewan	1
Alberta	11
British Columbia	3
	—
	62

As all hon. members realize the value of N.H.A. home improvement loans for the construction of shelters has been given some publicity in the press. It was hoped that because of the emphasis placed upon the construction of home shelters by this government through the distribution of pamphlets and newspaper publicity people would take advantage of this means of constructing shelters. What have been the results across the country? The figures are as follows:

Number of N.H.A. home improvement loans for fall-out shelters, to January 31, 1962.

Newfoundland	nil
Prince Edward Island	nil
Nova Scotia	nil
New Brunswick	4
Quebec	17
Ontario	27
Manitoba	2
Saskatchewan	10
Alberta	18
British Columbia	16
	—
	94

Only 94 Canadians have taken advantage of N.H.A. home improvement loans for this purpose and only 62 have made use of the provisions in relation to the purchase of new homes in a country with a total population of approximately 18 million. I am not saying that these are the only shelters that have been built. Obviously others would have obtained money for this purpose through normal channels and some would have built shelters from their own reserves. But I am sure the government would not claim that a substantial number of people have taken the advice of the government in building shelters.

The *Ottawa Citizen* of March 13, 1962 reports the attitude of Premier Roblin of Manitoba:

Premier Roblin told the Manitoba legislature Monday he has decided he won't recommend shelters to the public.