

*Supply—National Defence*

threat that the minister also mentioned this morning which surely must have an important bearing on western defence policy and on Canadian defence policy, especially naval policy. That is the threat of the submarine, of which the Soviet union now has hundreds of the more modern type and will no doubt soon have nuclear-powered submarines, though I believe there is no evidence that the Soviet possesses any of those at the present time. Admiral Rickover of the United States, who is perhaps as well informed on this question as anybody on this continent, said in his evidence before the house subcommittee, and it is in their report:

Russian submarines can come near our coasts. They can fire missiles. If their submarines come off our coast they can drop hydrogen or atomic warhead missiles into our cities. One such missile, accurately placed, could destroy a city.

Then he added this:

The best way we know to destroy these submarines is by other atomic-powered submarines.

I may have a word to say about that matter when I come to what I think should be our Canadian policy in this field. Then the admiral added this paragraph, which certainly has a significance for us. As reported at page 439 of the testimony he said:

What nuclear power has really done for the polar regions—

He had been talking about the submarine in the polar regions.

—is to make another large area of the earth insecure and bring it into warlike focus.

This is an area very much the concern of Canada. He added:

It has been immune from war up to now, but any nation that possesses nuclear submarines can now use that area for warlike operations.

What are the nature and effectiveness of our present defences against this threat which I have outlined and which the minister outlined before me? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a good deal of unrealistic talk about this matter, a good deal—if you like—of bluffing. The minister is reported as having said over C.B.C. television on Sunday, June 7, as follows, and I quote from the text of what he is reported to have said:

The CF-100 was designed for and is capable of meeting the threat which the Russians now have.

I have given some indication of what that threat is. Yet, Mr. Chairman, that statement by the minister has been denied, denied by the minister himself. It was certainly denied by the Prime Minister in the statement I have just read from our debate on the CF-105, that the CF-105 would itself be obsolete before it came into squadron operation. If the CF-105 would be obsolete in those circumstances, how can we accept the view that the

CF-100 is capable of meeting the threat the Russians now have? I have just indicated what I think that is.

The minister himself in this house, or perhaps it was before the estimates committee last year and repeated by me when I was quoting him in this chamber, said the CF-100 was capable of engaging the majority of Russian bombers. If the CF-100 is capable only of engaging only the majority of the Russian bombers, how can we consider the CF-100 to be an effective mechanism in the context of the threat I have mentioned? But the minister said this morning—this was something new, and I venture to bring it to the attention of the committee—that while the CF-100 squadrons would be maintained—I have not his exact words before me—facilities would be provided or provision might be made for United States interceptor squadrons to fly from Canadian air fields.

I think this is something the minister will undoubtedly want to deal with when he replies to these questions. Would this mean that men from perhaps the same Canadian bases with Canadian CF-100 planes would be asked to do the same job that the United States squadrons would be expected to do with more modern and more effective machines for that particular kind of work? Having given up the Arrow, and if the CF-100 is obsolete, is our only effective protection in the field of manned interceptors now to be United States interceptor squadrons, some of which will be flying from Canadian air fields?

Certainly I agree with the minister when he says that manned interceptor squadrons are still a necessary element in the mix of defence which the Americans talk about. Certainly the United States at the present time is apparently not giving up its development of the F-108 which is a supersonic long-range fighter; and in startling contrast to the CF-100. It shows how amazing has been the development over the last two or three years. The F-108 is a supersonic long-range fighter with a speed in excess of 2,000 miles per hour designed to police the early warning line and to begin the destruction of attacking aircraft long before they reach our shores; that is to say, to begin the destruction of attacking aircraft over Canada.

That is from the testimony of a deputy chief of staff of the United States air force, namely Colonel Andrews, before the house subcommittee on April 10, 1959. This F-108 which is now in the process of development, and according to one of the senior officers of the air force, General Irvine, is as good as the Bomarc. Also he said that present bombers will be replaced in years ahead by air to surface missiles from bombers, which means

[Mr. Pearson.]