

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Gordon—the type of man the C.B.C. needs. He would lay down the law. We need a businessman and a factual man.

In completing my remarks I just wish to say that no one blames the Secretary of State for these things. It is only through that department, under her jurisdiction, that we as backbenchers can bring these matters to the attention of the C.B.C. I hope the minister is sincere enough to make a special effort to see that this does not happen again. If it does happen again, I can assure hon. members of this house that Jack Roxburgh will be up on his feet every day in this house, protesting.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the concern and feelings of the hon. member for Norfolk. The last sentence spoken by Stanley Burke on the television newscast on Wednesday, February 22, 1967, was a little bit confusing. According to the information I have Mr. Burke's actual words were: "and finally the average Canadian smoker had 14 cigarettes today and across the nation 32 people died of respiratory diseases."

The figures in respect of deaths were taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the year ending December 31, 1965. The statistics relating to the average cigarette smoker were also taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics information respecting the estimated number of smokers. The breakdown is 26 deaths from respiratory diseases and six from cancer in relation to respiratory diseases. However, deaths from respiratory diseases are not necessarily related to the smoking of tobacco. However, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the remarks televised by the C.B.C. gave that indication.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—NATO—POSSIBLE
CHANGE IN CANADIAN MILITARY
CONTRIBUTION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the United Kingdom white paper, which is more officially known as the statement on defence estimates, 1967, was issued recently and contained at page 5, paragraph 18, the following statement:

The government hopes—

That is the United Kingdom government.

The government hopes, that by the end of June, 1967, allied discussions on the revision of NATO strategy will have produced broad agreement on the size, composition, deployment and

[Mr. Roxburgh.]

military role of the forces required and on a fairer sharing of the economic burdens they impose.

This statement has very important implications for the whole of Canadian defence and international policy. On Wednesday last I addressed a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of National Defence as to whether the government of Canada had made any proposals to the other NATO governments with regard to the size, composition and military role of the Canadian contribution to NATO forces in the future.

Members of the house will know that Canadian defence efforts at the present time, and for a good many years past, have been concentrated on certain roles in NATO and NORAD. We are maintaining as a brigade group in Germany an air division, and the major task of our navy is an anti-submarine role in NATO. The brigade group and the air division are a relatively small but doubtless efficient contribution to the current NATO strategy of reliance on a massive tactical nuclear response to any active aggression in central Europe.

On January 13, 1963 the Prime Minister, in a famous speech at Scarborough, before his administration was elected to office and when he was leader of the opposition, said the following:

The government should re-examine at once the whole basis of Canadian defence policy. In particular it should discuss with the United States and with NATO a role for Canada in continental and collective defence which would be more realistic and effective than the present one. Our financial resources are limited. Therefore we should be careful to see that our defence dollars are spent sensibly and economically avoiding commitments which require expensive equipment that is or soon will be obsolete, and the activities that are or soon will be meaningless.

Notwithstanding these words, more than four years later with the Liberal administration headed by the present Prime Minister in office for nearly all of these four years, there has been no change in the role. Despite diligent inquiry it has been impossible to discover whether the government has made any suggestions whatsoever as to a change in the role. Indeed if anything has emerged from the mist of obscurity in which these vital matters are generally enshrouded in this country, it would seem to have been Canadian policy to hold fast to the continuation of precisely these same roles. This indeed has been indicated by the famous defence white paper of 1964 which seems to be the sheet anchor of government defence policy. The policy was