

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
22nd Day

March 15, 1963

The House met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

On the Orders of the Day:

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mrs. J.E. Cooper: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to call the attention of the members of the legislature to a very nice group of young students up in the west gallery. They come from Highland Park school in Regina and they have with them their teacher, Mr. Lyons. I am sure all members wish to welcome them and hope they enjoy their visit with us.

CONGRATULATIONS TO TURTLEFORD TIGERS

Mr. F.E. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to sincerely congratulate the Turtleford Tigers of the Bantam league in my constituency who have just won the provincial Bantam C title in a two-game, 5-4 total score victory over Craik.

I would also like to congratulate their manager, Jimmy Nelson, and their coaches, Bill Atkins and Lawrence Bonneville. I know all hon. members will join me in congratulating a very fine community effort on behalf of this team.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have learned that tomorrow is the birthday of his Honour the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan. I am sure that all members of the house would join with me in asking you, Sir, to extend to His Honour the best wishes of the legislature and our congratulations on his birthday.

March 15, 1963

Mr. Berezowsky (Cumberland) moved:

That this Assembly urges the Government of Canada to reject nuclear weapons on land, water, or air under Canadian jurisdiction and in the hands of Canadian forces.

He said: Mr. Speaker, permit me, before I speak to the motion, to congratulate all those people who are in this house and will be celebrating St. Patrick's Day on Sunday. I think that we can all be proud because I think the Irish originated somewhere in the Caucasus and by the time they landed up in the Emerald Isle they left a little bit of themselves in every country of Europe, so probably we Ukrainians have a little bit of Irish too.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the Ukrainian people in Canada here are very proud when sometimes they are referred to as the Canadian Irish because the Irish and the Ukrainians have very much similarity in temperament. In any event, Mr. Speaker, my best wishes go out to all the good people that have connections with the Emerald Isle for a lovely festival and celebration this coming Sunday.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in sponsoring this resolution, I would first of all like to refer to a well-known quotation which says, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free". And the truth is that there is no safety or security in nuclear armament or deterrents. Our only safety is in adapting ourselves to the times and to adapt means that we must convince ourselves and convince our neighbors that the only chance for survival is total disarmament. It means that we must spend our time, our energy and our money in building for peace. We must be open-minded, Sir, and do some clear, hard thinking, and those of us who are in government must have the necessary courage, I would say, to speak for peace and for disarmament at all times. We must face a society — many of us realize this — which has been poisoned with prejudices and false values, yet we must discuss peace as compared to war, life as it is opposed to death, hope against despair, and talk about the great future for humanity as compared to humanity's possible oblivion.

Now, firstly, Sir, I think we must diagnose ourselves. Then we must try to find the cure for our international ailment. We must cure the cancer that eats away at the souls of nations preparing for war and leading us to war. And I may say, Mr. Speaker, that if we cannot find the cure, then we shall surely die.

Today there is a great need for understanding and education all over the world. Everybody must be acquainted with the problem because on the question of peace no man of good will can remain neutral. It is imperative that we try and correct distorted images about foreign countries. We have a task of eradicating ignorance, and misunderstanding about other people. Finally, we have the task of learning and teaching morality in its broadest sense so that a basis for peace may be established. But we cannot build a durable peace, Sir, unless we are prepared to give leadership in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, common sense would indicate that some departure from our materialistic philosophy and way of life in exchange for survival would be a worthwhile attempt. I believe we can recover from the sickness that affects the world and that fears and suspicion among the world's nations may disappear.

And, Mr. Speaker, we are not alone in this kind of thinking and this situation. This world situation has been discussed quite extensively in the United Nations Assembly. At this time I would like to refer to an address made to the Assembly by the President of the Republic of Chile on December 14 last. And amongst other things, the President, Alessandri Rodriguez, said:

In the name of the men, the women and children of my country, notwithstanding any ideological differences which may separate us, but which cannot alter the unyielding unity of our citizens and our common destiny, I repeat that we will continue working fervently and with full conviction that the principles underlying the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights may become a personal reality.

And further, in the report I have here from the United Nations, the President says this:

I confirm here the determined purpose of Chile to contribute to the achievement of a stable peace which will protect individual rights and liberties throughout the world, guarantee rapid economic and social progress, especially in the less privileged areas, and turn the fear which man now feels with regard to his own technological discoveries into something positive and confident.

March 15, 1963

Mr. Rodriguez said further that the threats to world peace and security was the lack of food, of housing, of schools, of hospitals and internal pressure by people for better living standards. He said that national or international discord threatened world peace and security and I, Sir, agree with him.

Mr. Speaker, Chile is only one of the nearly two dozen countries that has looked to Canada for leadership along the road to peace. And, Mr. Speaker, a great number of other people and the press here in Canada have indicated their feelings on this particular subject, and I would like to just offer a few quotes. Concerning I.C.B.M., the Toronto Star of February 19, 1960, said this:

Military scientists know of no way to stop the missiles. It makes no sense to spend \$125 million on Bomarcs which are about as useful as carnival fireworks.

And in Hansard, August 5, 1960, on NATO, Mr. Lester B. Pearson said this:

I say that Canada should categorically reject the proposition that her NATO forces should be equipped with nuclear weapons of any kind.

Also, in his view, the Bomarc program should be jacked, and by so doing, he says,

We would be rejecting the use by us of any form of nuclear weapons for what is mistakenly called the defence of our territory.

Mr. L.P. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Would the hon. member permit a question before he gets on the air? When did Mr. . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I gave you the date — this is from Hansard and I quote it, Mr. Speaker, it is from Hansard, and if the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) is interested he can go to the library and get a copy of Hansard and read it for himself, and much more.

Mr. Coderre: — I just asked you what date . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — I don't know what you asked. I am making a speech right now and you had better listen and I'll answer any questions after I am through.

Mr. L.P. Coderre: — Are you scared to say the truth, if there is any?

Mr. Speaker: — Order! Order!

Mr. Berezowsky: — At the CCF National Convention, Mr. Speaker, in 1960, the consensus was that since NATO had become purely a military organization, Canada should immediately withdraw from NATO in favor of promoting peaceful economic and cultural activities through the agencies of the United Nations.

Macleans Magazine, September 10, 1960, asks, "Should Canadian Forces be armed with Nuclear Weapons?" and they say this:

'Our own answer is a flat, unqualified 'No, not in any circumstances whatsoever'. We believe that though some things justify war, nothing can justify nuclear war; that nuclear can and must be prevented and that the first step towards preventing it is to stop planning to wage it.'

And they say:

We know our opinion is shared by many Canadians. The new Liberal defence policy is a near approach to this decisions and the CCF's are even a nearer one. It seems likely that before the next election both opposition parties will have adopted it completely.

But, Mr. Speaker, I may add my own words — has not happened. James N. Minifee, whom everybody knows, of T.V. fame, said this:

NATO's military role was conceived to meet a situation which has long ceased to exist. NATO, in fact, so far from safeguarding peace, imperils it by its military policy.

And then the London Spectator said:

NATO today has become a meaningless symbol. It is time it was decently interred.

An Hon. Member: — . . . that in its place?

Mr. Berezowsky: — Now, the question that can be asked, Mr. Speaker, is where does Canada stand on this vital issue of peace at the present

time? Until very recently we know where Canada stood because it joined the United Kingdom, France, Italy and the United States in preparing a text for comprehensive disarmament as late as March, 1960. And at that time Canada, with other nations, agreed that the ultimate goal of the world should be a free and peaceful world in which there shall be general disarmament under effective international control and agreed procedures for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter, as quoted in a pamphlet that I have here, Mr. Speaker.

At that time Canada agreed that there should be a reduction of armed forces and armaments by progressive, safeguarded steps. Canada agreed further that there should be a reduction of existing stocks of nuclear, chemical, biological and other weapons of mass destruction. And, as a result of this conference, the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs for the United Kingdom delivered a speech to the Assembly of the United Nations on September 17, 1959, at which time he said, and I quote

Our aim is to move forward by balanced stages toward the abolition of all nuclear weapons of mass destruction and toward the reduction of other weapons and armed forces to levels which will rule out the possibility of aggressive war.

Obviously progress must be made by stages.

Mr. Speaker, just a short time before, I quoted a very prominent Canadian who indicated, until recently, the thinking of the Canadian people. I will have more to say in reference to the Hon. L.B. Pearson who was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in December, 1957. And here is what Mr. Pearson had to say. I have it here in a "Short History of Canada" and I quote from this Peace Prize lecture:

The choice, however, is as clear now for nations as it was once for the individual. Peace or extinction. The life of state cannot, anymore than the lives of individuals, be conditioned by the force and the will of a unit, however powerful, but the consensus of the group which must one day include all states. Today the predatory state or the predatory group of states with power of total destruction is no more to be tolerated than a predatory individual.

Again I quote:

We know now that in modern warfare, fought on any considerable scale, there can be no possible economic gain for any side, win or lose, said Mr. Pearson. There is nothing but waste and destruction.

And Mr. Pearson goes on to say:

The stark and inescapable fact is that today we cannot defend our society by war since total war is total destruction, and if war is used as an instrument of policy, eventually we will have total war.

Note this, Sir:

“Therefore, the best defence of peace is not power, but the removal of the causes of war and international agreements which will put peace on a stronger foundation than the terror of destruction.

Now, what about the United States? Well, that country until very recently was just as concerned about the dangers of a third world war as we are in Canada. And in order to do something about it there was an arms control and disarmament agency set up to study the consequences of arms control and disarmament, including the problems of readjustment, arising in industry, and the reallocation of national resources. And I am sure that President Kennedy has envisaged this as a peace agency or a disarmament agency but, unfortunately, this agency came under the control of the defence department. And so instead of developing peace strategy it is providing the technical information on arms control and thus the American dilemma. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that everybody wants peace, but they are all doing the wrong things in trying to achieve peace.

I think it is the Cuban crisis which has brought about a change in the thinking of the Americans and Canadians in the last year or so. And probably as a result of fears and apprehensions. And yet to me it seems ridiculous that we should have to fear Cuba, and even more ridiculous that as peace loving nations we should have departed from the straight path towards building peace. In Canada, as hon. members know, the question of nuclear arms is now a vital issue in this federal election. It has shaken our country's foundation and has indirectly precipitated an election which will be held in a few weeks.

March 15, 1963

Our people are confused because, knowing that our aim has been to go forward towards the abolition of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, we now find many people in government taking the opposite course. Thus it can be seen that the nuclear arms issue is becoming exceedingly complicated in the high levels of national government and in the minds of Canadian citizens who desire nothing more than peaceful existence.

Humanity of course has become accustomed to armaments and wars; we have survived two major wars at least, and we feel a false security in so-called defence. Much of the world still feels that by being better armed and supposedly stronger than one's neighbors, it gives it peace and security from aggression.

Now in my opinion, this is completely false. Many people who fear a third world war, as I do, think they can survive such a war by installing nuclear armaments and warheads, say here in Canada. Now this has been proven to be untrue because the road to security and peace is entirely in a different direction, as I hope to show today.

I am going to try to prove what I have said and what I will say to this house why we should unanimously support the resolution before us if we desire to avoid such a third world war, a war no nation on earth can possibly afford.

Now we've been told that by arming ourselves it only costs us \$12 billion to install these kind of armaments and the Canadian share will be about one tenth, or in other words about \$1.2 billion. And this was by Paul Hellyer, a Liberal. William Woodside has estimated a cost of between three-quarters to one billion.

Now, a lot of people have been telling me that this is going to cost us, the Canadian people, a lot of money, and I have been saying to them, and I think rightly so, that it is going to cost us a lot more because it may cost us our lives, Mr. Speaker.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we all want peace and, surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be positive virtues in our people so that we may work to bring about peace, and just as certain as I am about the inherent goodness of our people am I certain that they will bind themselves together to let it be known to the governments and to the world that we will have no part of bringing about global destruction and annihilation of the human species.

And were this not so, Sir, then we would need not faith or understanding of the great religions of this earth or the philosophies of our wise men, or the teachings of genius and the work of statesmen whose contributions to mankind have brought amenities, faith, love and understanding to this world.

I think there is much good in the world and I cannot for a moment believe that our destiny must be death, annihilation or genocide. Surely we do not intend to take the place of God. We must not bring mankind to judgment as was done at Hiroshima and Nagasaki some few years ago. I think we are entering upon an age of moral thinking and of reason where freedom from wars, poverty and ignorance could become a way of life. This may yet be, Sir, an age where mind rules matter and law commands force — a positive future, Sir.

And, according to this kind of destiny which I envisage if our way of life is to be peace, then we cannot condone the acquisition of armaments or the kind of preparation for war. War is the opposite of peace and this is the most logical argument against war. However, the transition to this kind of thinking of a new way of life may be difficult, seeing that we are creatures of habit and because old habits are not easy to change. Even if we accept the need for change we may feel that it is better to be silent and accept our fate, and I think this is cowardice.

But the greatest danger of all, Mr. Speaker, is the false notion that brute strength and armed might is the road to peace. And those who can't change, think this is the only way. Such frozen immobility is peculiar to some politicians and to some military minds, and this is the greatest danger to Canada and the world today. This is our millennium's greatest folly, as a matter of fact I know some people who are still fighting the last war. They can't think otherwise. They have not grasped the essential nature or danger of atomic war.

Why do I say this? Well, currently, take Mr. Pearson who leads the Liberal party — the 1957 Nobel Peace Prize winner, as I have mentioned. Until a few weeks ago he was against nuclear armaments as I have pointed out, both for Canadian forces and using Bomarc warheads in Canada. His political supporters all across the country, including the hon. members in his house, agreed with him. Then one day, after a trip to New York, he made a complete flip — some of his supporters somersaulted with him, some stuck to their convictions. And I consider that this is a great tragedy because many Canadians, including myself, have looked up to Mr. Pearson for leadership and his turnabout is disappointing to say the least.

Some Hon. Members: — Oh! Oh!

March 15, 1963

Mr. Berezowsky: — They don't like this, Mr. Speaker, and I am very sorry for them, but I am telling the truth and they don't like it.

Now, Mr. Pearson is trying to claim that his party, if elected in Canada, would carry out the commitments made by the Conservative government to the United States of America. Then he hastens to add that when that is done he will begin to work for world peace. Canada needs decision, not indecision, Sir, in times like these and it is no wonder that a number of prominent Liberals have joined the New Democratic Party where they can find an opportunity to continue working the positive way for world peace.

And I have clippings here . . .

Mr. R.A. McCarthy (Cannington): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: — What is your point of order?

Mr. McCarthy: — I suggest that the hon. member is making a political speech for the federal election. He isn't talking to the resolution.

Mr. Speaker: — That is not a point of order.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I know they don't like the truth.

Now let us take a look at the Conservatives. We've seen resignations in the Diefenbaker cabinet and I am sure that these were due to pressures from Bay Street and the millionaires at Toronto and Montreal — even the Tory daily papers, as you well know, have gone ahead and started supporting the Liberal party because they feel that the Liberal party will go along with nuclear armaments for this country.

As we know, Sir, the prime minister, three years to take a definite stand on nuclear arms and he was challenged by first Mr. Harkness and later on by Mr. Hees and others, and regardless I say of what has been said or what we may hear, the fact is that the Liberals, the Conservatives, the Thompson Socreds are committed to arming this country with the latest terrifying nuclear warheads, missiles and what-nots. I am glad, Sir, that I support the party led by Tommy Douglas of the New Democratic Party which has never wavered from a clear decisive and positive policy for peace and no nuclear arms for Canadian forces.

And our idealism, Sir, the idealism of this party is today's realism, is today's safety, and the faith that we have is the world's only hope and by supporting this resolution, this assembly will add its voice to save this and future generations from irrevocable disaster.

An Hon. Member: — Hammer and sickle!

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think that is stupid.

Mr. Speaker, these kind of remarks from the opposition, always referring to communism, the hammer and sickle, are disgusting. My folks in the Ukraine, the ones we left behind, were murdered by the communists because they were social democrats and I have said this before and I am going to say it again if it would do any good.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry for the short flare of temper but the truth must be told.

I would like to remind you, Sir, that the brains of the world have conceded that to embark on a nuclear war would be complete annihilation of the aggressor as well as the victim of attack, and these politicians I have mentioned agree with this. Then I would like to say that any kind of armaments are immoral and against religious teachings. To kill or murder is evil and wrong. Otherwise our religion is wrong. The Christian Judaic faith says, "Thou shalt not kill", yet there are those who think that mass murder does not contravene the Lord's commandments. Now, I cannot understand this kind of thinking and rationalization of people who should know better, profess to be God-fearing Christians.

Mr. Speaker, nuclear arms are very costly and their acquisition is worse than destroying our hard-earned wealth by dumping it in the ocean or on a dump-heap. Think of the billions of dollars which have been spent on weapons of destruction, only to find that in this crazy armament race these Arrows and Bomarcs and missiles were out-dated as soon as production got under way. And since the last war we have yearly spent as high as 40 percent of the Canadian budget for so-called defence. The Americans, I am told, have spent up to \$50 million a year. I submit that had some of this money been used for social and educational purposes Canada and America would have been models for other nations to follow. Its trained people and standards of living would be something to see and our military personnel, if we are worrying about them, could have been diverted to peaceful purposes. We could use this manpower, in spite of what my hon. friend says. We could use the money and the nuclear energy to build canals, divert streams, and here in Saskatchewan, for example, levelling prairie lands Palliser triangle for irrigation; we could blast roadways through rocks and bogs of the north. Some say that we could use nuclear energy to change and improve the climate by warming the water, say of Hudson Bay. Maybe some of these things are visionary.

March 15, 1963

But the fact is that there are millions of things that we could do, as a nation, if we had that kind of a budget for these purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the world has progressed in technology, in automation, and our world is holding forth a promise of heaven on earth, if only we could rise in our morality and understanding. The good opportunities for a good life are open to us, if only there could be peace on earth. Research in all fields of science has made us realize, Sir, what these discoveries are; what they mean; and how we could get rid of drudgery — our machines could do the work of men; how we could make the deserts blossom like the rose, a land fit for human brotherhood, and I am sure that we could stop thinking in terms of wars and defence and begin to think more about peace and progress.

For some time, now, Sir, as you have realized, such opportunities have been wasted by psychopathic, hyper-sensitive, sick governments, who are advised by just as sick financial and military personnel.

Mr. I.H. MacDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Tell us about Russia.

Mr. Berezowsky: — You go there and find out. I'm not interested in Russia. You go to Russia and find out. I'm interested in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, supposing we did arm ourselves. What would we gain? How would it help Canada to have stock piles of "A" bombs, 20 megaton super bombs? Well, General Lauris Norstead has said that the U.S.A. has the power to inflict absolute destruction on the Soviet Union and if it is to be assumed that this is the country to be destroyed with its millions of people, it can be said that the statement is true. It can be destroyed, but it is just as true, Sir, that the U.S.S.R. has equally as much power in 20 megaton bombs and other nuclear armaments that can be used to wipe out the U.S.A. and Canada many times over.

As a matter of fact, in recent days we have been told through the press that the U.S.S.R. has space weapons that can even wipe out the Polaris missiles that are being installed in the Mediterranean. And thus it is clear, Sir, that the only result in Canada arming its forces is to prove that if war did come about between these two giants, then it would be fought on Canadian soil . . .

Mr. Foley: — You are divulging classified information.

Mr. Berezowsky: — The hon. member says I am divulging classified information. I wish that every Canadian knew this, and there wouldn't be a single one of them that would vote for the free enterprise parties who are ready to go ahead and involve this country in this kind of tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, Washington knows this. So does Moscow. And every knowledgeable person in Canada, particularly hon. members in governments, know this to be true, and I'm going to say this — I don't blame President Kennedy's administration being peeved at Canada for not arming itself with nuclear warheads, they are just trying to save their country. Washington no doubt feels that if war did break out, that peace would have to be negotiated within a few hours. This is true. From the first big blast, all of us in Canada, probably 50 or 60 million people in the United States would be wiped off the earth. Yet in the opinion of the military, and you can read this too, they say that mass murder would be preferable to the destruction of the total American population, and, of course, all its cities and industries.

Clearly then, there is no safety in armaments for Canada. I think it is the ultimate folly which can stop or resolve nothing. Some people think that bombs are very difficult to make. Well, let me assure you, Sir, it is general knowledge that nuclear fission bombs only require about ten pounds of uranium, 235, being exploded by a sufficient amount of T.N.T. in a suitable encasement which could produce sufficient heat and pressure. There is your bomb. And once these bombs are made, then the next step is towards fusion, in which heavy hydrogen, heavy water as we call it, known as deuterium is used.

And the most destructive kind of bomb is the fission-fusion-fission, which is easy to produce again, and has the equivalent blasting power of 20 million tons of T.N.T. — one bomb — and this is known as the 20 megaton bomb, and we are very fortunate today, Sir, that only the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., France, England and, possibly, China are today producing these machines of destruction today, and no other nation. Certainly, let's not have Canada get involved in this nuclear club. I would say that most nations have agreed not to manufacture these devilish weapons.

Scientists, yes, scientists, learned men, have been telling us about these bombs; about fallout, radiation and disease. The Soviet Union and the U.S.A. are trying to produce a clean bomb, but there is no clean bomb and there may never be, and there is not much hope for one. The bombs we have completely destroy everything in their wake, and thermo-nuclear tests that were made the past few years, have taken many thousands of victims, Sir, already. Cancer of the blood, which is known as leukemia, and other radiation

March 15, 1963

and fallout diseases which the doctors are beginning to discover in our country. These radiation diseases are rampant across our country and especially, Sir, in our children.

In 1958, Mr. Speaker, over 9000 scientists, not politicians, scientists, learned men, men who are conscious of the inherent dangers of nuclear armaments, petitioned the United Nations, pleading for the use of good sense, of reason, and disarmament, and they were vitally interested and concerned that a catastrophe should not come to the world and destroy humanity, and many of these scientists were Nobel Laureates, like Mr. Pearson, in the fields of physics, literature, medicine and chemistry — men like Frederick Joliet Curie, Linus Pauling, Albert Schweitzer, Lord Boyd-Orr, among others, 9000 of them. And I say, Sir, we would be wise to pay heed to these thousands of learned men who know much more about these things than any politicians, economists, financiers, or military men. We must believe them when they tell us that the safe road which humanity must follow is disarmament, and not armament.

There is a certainty, Sir, that if Canada enters the nuclear club, she will have lost the leadership and respect among many nations, as, for example, Chile, which have associated themselves in the past with Canada in the work for peace. This is not a laughing matter, Mr. Speaker, and it upsets me very much to see hon. members opposite taking this as a joke. Mr. Speaker, this loss of leadership can never be offset against the acquisition of rockets, of warheads, of missiles, or ballistic weapons. Never!

I will appeal to the religious. St. Paul warns us, if we read, that we must adapt. He says:

Adapt yourself no longer to the pattern of this present world, but let your minds be remade and your whole nature thus transformed, then you will be able to discern the will of God, and know what is good, acceptable, and perfect.

And I suggest that along this line we could work towards a new moral order, so that wars would be past history.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, let this nation, and other nations accelerate the research for peace. Let us take no chances whatsoever to make possible the struggle in the air, or on land, or on the water controlled by Canada. I think this is the least we can do to keep faith with the rest of the world. Let us instead release our resources of manpower, of industry, and money, to promote man's welfare instead of wasting the same resources in useless armaments, because they can do no one any good.

Mr. Speaker, let us do those things politically, nationally and internationally, which will ease world tension. Those things which will build for better understanding along the positive road, to build for permanent disarmament and peace. And the new quality should be, and I quote, because I agree with what Fred J. Cook, said on February 16, 1963, in the issue of The Nation:

The first hard fact favoring the new politics is that the billions spent on arms do not build up the domestic economy. In the long run they debilitate it. Of course, military expenditures have provided millions of jobs, and still do, but the end products of these jobs are mostly waste. Minuteman, once finished, is sunk in its silo and there it sits waiting for doomsday. The billions spent to produce it and it's kindred flock are dead. They have not created useful goods, they have not opened up new lines of endeavor, they have not stimulated and regenerated the economy.

Economists analyzing the prosperity of western Europe, where the growth rate outstrips ours, where employment runs far lower, have been struck by the fact this prosperity seems to bear a direct ratio to the proportion of the national income that is plowed back into the domestic economy, instead of being buried in the silos of modern war."

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by summarizing that today there is no defence against war, except going underground for a short while, and maybe crawling out later to die a miserable death from radio-active diseases and dispersed poisons. Arming our nation with deterrents is no safer than hiding in caves and shelters, which we have been asked to find or to build.

Mr. Speaker, atomic bombs killed cities, missiles destroy nations, and the only defence that is possible today is the international rule of law and order. And the road to such rule of law, order and peace, Sir, must be Canada's rejection of thermo-nuclear weapons and Canada's continuing leadership for complete world disarmament, and if this kind of reasoning is not enough for those who do not wish to listen, then I appeal to every member of this house and to every Canadian to fall back upon orthodox Christian faith and ideology.

I urge that everyone courageously stand up for the rights of all humans, and particularly for the right to die a natural death. Mr. Speaker, if this is not enough, then I want to remind you of a day last October, when this world waited with bated breath. It was a day when the communist forces faced an American fleet. That day the spectre of

March 15, 1963

death was very, very close to this globe. It threatened the end of everything, of life, of beauty, of purpose. All over the world there was silence as we waited for the blast and the end. Thank God, reason prevailed over ambition and the mighty forces of aggression turned their ships back.

After all, everyone desires to live, including our enemies, if we have them, and when these ships turned back, eternity was gone and once again time and life began. Now, Sir, six months later, can we, the people of Canada, who have no love of war, or aggression, do any less than turn away from the ghost of death for all mankind.

The deadly sin will be to interfere with the rights and purpose for humanity to exist and to go on to its destiny according to the will of God.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by Mr. Stevens, the hon. member from Rosetown:

That this assembly urges the government of Canada to reject nuclear weapons on land, water, or air under Canadian jurisdiction and in the hands of Canadian forces.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. A.L. Stevens (Rosetown): — It is quite obvious that there can be no more important resolution than the one introduced today in this house by the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) for no nuclear weapons for Canada.

Self-preservation is the strongest motivation known to man and this is the question we are discussing this afternoon. This is a question about our survival and on the outcome of our actions in the next few months will determine how much we will be contributing to world peace or to World War III.

I want to commend the member for Cumberland for two reasons. First, for bringing to the attention of this house this important resolution and, secondly, for the straightforward and objective address he has just delivered.

He has always enjoyed a reputation for speaking out courageously, and on this occasion I feel that he has not only spoken on the behalf of his own constituents but has faithfully represented the feelings of a vast majority of Canadians as well.

As he has dealt effectively, I think, with the moral issues involved in a non-nuclear role for Canada, I propose to show that from a political, economic or a military point of view, Canada can contribute more to world peace and, therefore, our own well being by other means than she could ever do by accepting nuclear weapons. In doing so, I do not wish to imply that because of my four and a half years in the Canadian army, part of which was spent in Holland and Belgium, I am much better qualified to discuss the subject. But I must say this, that because of this service I have far deeper feelings in this regard for the prevention of a third world war, than I otherwise would have, for there is no substitute for first-hand experience in the tragedy of war to impress upon a person the need for a positive approach towards prevention. I, therefore, welcome very much, the opportunity given to me this afternoon to speak out in favor of a sane policy for world peace.

One common belief that is encountered in discussing the nuclear question is the statement that this type of warfare is so inhumane, so terrifying, and the damage so great that no country would ever use these weapons in an all-out attack on another country and its people, and that we are just building up an arsenal to be used as deterrent force against an enemy. This is not true, as history has so often proved. And when nuclear weapons are available there is always the possibility that someone will decide that the time is right for to use them to their own advantage.

Let me illustrate by an incident from World War II, to show whether or not they will be used. On August 6, 1945, President Truman gave the order to drop the first atomic bomb on the last surviving member of the Axis powers. Japan at that time was virtually defeated. All her allies had surrendered, and Russia and the United States, and the rest of the western world, were ranged against her. Her defeat was only a matter of time. And yet, in spite of this, Hiroshima, a defenseless civilian city, of no military strategic value, was chosen to receive this terrible new weapon, and in a matter of seconds 18 square miles in the centre of this thriving metropolis was blasted to rubble, and 73,000 men, women and children killed in the first attack. A total of 200,000 eventually died from the after-effects of radiation and leukemia.

Now Hiroshima has not become famous for the number who were wiped out or because of the damage done with a single bomb, because in comparison with the total killed in World War I or World War II, it was actually very small. What it has become famous for, it proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that if advantage could be had from using this type of weapon, it would be used, regardless of its moral consequences, or the inhumanity of its after effects.

No one could say after this that because this type of warfare was so terrible it would never be used. It has been used against a defenseless civilian target at a time when survival for the attacker was never in doubt. Therefore, when we are discussing this question of nuclear arms, we must squarely face up to the fact that they will be used by any nation if it is thought necessary by them to do so.

The second point I want to make before discussing Canada's role in the nuclear age, is the apparent common belief by many that the destructive power of nuclear arms has been exaggerated and there isn't really much to fear because for every weapon developed there is always a counter-weapon, and a defensive weapon.

This is simply not true any more. Scientists the world over will testify that there is no defense against a modern nuclear attack, and that it will be many years before any can be perfected, if at all. Since 1945, and the birth of the nuclear age warfare at Hiroshima, science has progressed a long way, if perfecting still greater means of destroying one another quicker can be called progress. The atomic bomb has been superseded by the hydrogen bomb, and it has increased in size until it now has become of little military value to increase it still further.

From the comparatively puny force of the first atomic bomb at Hiroshima, which had the destructive power of 20,000 tons of T.N.T., the latest bombs have a force equal to many megatons, which are the equivalent of a million tons of T.N.T., a force quite beyond the ordinary comprehension entirely.

But if one considers the vast destruction wrought by all the bombs dropped during the five years of World War II and find that they have been estimated to have the force equivalent to two megatons, or two million tons of T.N.T., one just cannot visualize what an ordinary H bomb between 10 and 20 megatons would do. And Russia's last series of tests included one that was estimated to be between 40 and 50 megatons, which are the world's largest so far. But hundred megaton bombs are quite within the realm of possibility.

Now as to the size of the world's nuclear stockpiles, Khrushchev, in lecturing the Chinese, credited the United States with 40,000 such warheads as I have mentioned. The Americans say they haven't that many, but they do admit to more than 20,000. And for the Russia stockpile, the Institute of Analysis in Washington credited the Soviet Union with just 5,000 warheads but they concede that they may be a little larger in average than their own. It has been estimated that these stock-piles are large enough in Russia to destroy all the land area in the United States three times over, and the

American pile is big enough to destroy the Soviet Union six times over, and each day they are constantly producing more. Now, having progressed as far as advantage can be had in destructive power, military minds are now concentrating on the most effective means of their delivery.

The old B29 propeller driven planes have given way to much faster to B52 Jets, which have in turn been superseded by intercontinental ballistic missiles, and now the latest things, the nuclear-powered submarine with polaris rockets. These have the great advantage now of being mobile, concealed and can be deployed anywhere in the oceans around the world. These have changed the concepts of nuclear-warfare entirely. It is now no longer possible to win a war by striking first with a surprise attack. There is no premium to be had in striking first if you cannot completely destroy your enemy and his fire power, and this you cannot do because the enemy's submarine launched rockets will still be available to destroy the attacker, even if the land area of their own country has been destroyed.

We have now arrived at the stage in the weapons race, called by the militarists, of mutual vulnerability. For the first time in man's long history, during the whole of which up to now his greatest fears have been hunger, disease and old age, he now has one fear even far greater — himself and his own capacity to destroy the earth.

In this situation, as I have outlined it, we can now study more effectively the question of whether nuclear weapons for Canada could contribute anything to the defence of the free world or to that objective of all of us — world peace.

Another common belief, believed honestly by many, subscribed to by many others that have their own selfish interest in the forefront is that somehow or other it is possible to have defensive nuclear weapons, while at the same time avoiding offensive nuclear weapons such as bombs and rockets. This is hypocrisy of the worst sort, as even a little careful thinking would demonstrate. The military authorities of most nations are quite convinced that should a real shooting war start, in which nuclear tactical weapons were being used, it would be impossible to contain it to this type of warfare.

Any nation in trouble, would immediately increase its fire power if it had it available and would retaliate with nuclear bombs and rockets. This is the action known in military terms as escalation, and this rules out the possibility of a limited nuclear action.

There is absolutely no difference between defensive weapons and offensive weapons, in nuclear warfare, because of their very nature in this type of warfare where, in the main,

the only defence is to destroy the attacker's bases from whence the bombs or missiles came. Any engagement using nuclear tactical weapons will almost certainly end by full scale nuclear war.

Defence, however, is the main reason usually given to justify the acquisition of nuclear weapons. When it is, the question should be asked, "Where is the defence against an all-out nuclear attack?" And on this point we have almost unanimous agreement from those who are in the best position to know, the military authorities, and from those who are best qualified to judge, the scientists. And they are in complete agreement that there is simply no known defence against an all out attack — and is there liable to be one for many years to come.

Major-General Charles Foulkes, retired Canadian Chief-of-Staff, in an address to the Empire Club, and reported in the Financial Post of March 9, 1963, had this to say, and I quote:

The ballistic missile, which can be fired with astonishing accuracy from outer space, under the sea, or in aircraft in flight, while carrying a multi-megaton warhead, defies a military solution. It is doubtful if devices to provide defence against mass destruction weapons will ever catch up with the innovations for their delivery.

And this statement has never been seriously challenged by anyone of authority. The only possible valid excuse any nation can have for the possession of nuclear weapons is as a deterrent to the attacking nation who would know that they themselves would suffer annihilation in return for an attack. But surely, Mr. Speaker, the deterrent force of the United States, who have enough now to destroy the Soviet Union six times over, must be large enough for all useful purposes. If it is not, certainly the small amount that Canada could finance or manufacture would not be enough to make any difference.

Great Britain, a much larger nation than Canada, and one that, therefore, spends vastly larger amounts on defence, has a nuclear stock-pile equal to two percent of the west's nuclear force. Canada's efforts would, therefore, be considerably smaller than that and would have no appreciable effect as a supplement to the present western stock-pile of nuclear weapons.

The rejection of nuclear weapons by Canada, Mr. Speaker, would not mean that we would accept the policy of pacifism, and leave defence as a burden for our friendly nations to bear. Far from it, for we realize quite readily that a refusal to fight is no guarantee of an immunity against attack. We wish to share the burden of defence in

an effective way and also to contribute to the cause of peace, not delay it. What we are asking for is a conventional weapons role for Canada, negotiated under NATO, and under which we could fulfil our commitments. NATO would be an organization used as a police force, to maintain law and order in the world until such time as a world authority, such as the United Nations, clothed with the necessary power to act, becomes available to keep the peace. In such an organization, in its development and in its recognition and in its enlargement lies our only hope for a permanent world peace.

We have been told that not to accept nuclear weapons would mean our withdrawal from NATO and NORAD, and that we should honor our commitments. Acceptance of nuclear weapons is not a condition of NATO membership. Norway and Denmark have not accepted them, and they are members of NATO, and there is strong evidence to support the claim that none of NATO's 14 members are concerned at all whether Canada accepts or rejects nuclear weapons.

A Canadian Free Press dispatch from Ottawa in the Star-Phoenix of January 23, 1963, has this to say, and I quote:

Ottawa. Canadian Press.

Available evidence here indicates that none of Canada's 14 NATO allies cares two pins whether Canada acquires nuclear weapons or not. Newspapers in other NATO countries have all but ignored the Canadian nuclear issue, so have NATO publications such as the monthly NATO Letter. As an example, Norway at one time had a great nuclear debate somewhat similar to Canada's current one and rejected atomic weapons, but the Norwegian newspapers had paid no attention whatsoever to the Canadian nuclear debate.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, there is little doubt that Canada would have little difficulty in negotiating a conventional weapons role within the framework of NATO for Canada. Conventional weapons are being considered of increasing importance in the role NATO has in our defence. President Kennedy has been discussing the fact that the use of conventional forces would provide a pause during which it might be possible to contain the conflict before resorting to the ultimate strategic nuclear deterrent. And because of this concept of defence, the United States is now removing its missile bases in Turkey and Italy, and relying on Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean for its defence of Europe, rather than the vulnerable bases on the mainland where the conflict is most likely to occur.

Concepts of defence are constantly changing and Canada cannot be expected to keep up in the race with the United States and the Soviet Union. To spend millions and millions of dollars only to find that the weapons are obsolete before completely installed is folly and no defence at all. As an example, the original commitments by the United States were to instal six Bomarc missile bases, only two have been constructed because later thinking has been that they were not of sufficient value because of changes in the concepts of defence. This will happen again, no matter what program in the nuclear race is decided upon. And this has been demonstrated by Great Britain's experience with the Skybolt. Any policy should be changed when it is clearly seen that it is out of date, and this should apply more rigidly to such important matters as defence than any other. Our course is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. We should reject nuclear weapons and avoid expanding the nuclear club which increases the risk of war by design or action, and which makes it more difficult to reach an agreement for disarmament.

We should renegotiate our role in NATO to conventional weapons to be used for the preservation of law and order. We should retain our warning systems under NORAD as long as they have any military value, which is expected to be but a short period of time. Then we can fulfil our commitments for defence and contribute something to it, and at the same time work for peace through the United Nations by increasing our support both financially and otherwise.

In spite of criticism and little support, the United Nations has been most successful in putting out the brush fires of Suez, the Egyptian-Israeli war and the Congo, and if given solid support it would be much more effective in many other areas.

Our one and only hope for peace lies in the task of persuading the two great nuclear powers to reach some agreement on the cessation of nuclear tests. The nuclear club must not be enlarged and the way will then be clear to negotiate a treaty for nuclear disarmament under international control and inspection. Everyone knows that this will be a difficult task, but how much more difficult, perhaps impossible, when every nation will have nuclear weapons, the power to destroy the earth, and every one of them will have to agree to such a treaty before it can be effective.

Canada can lead the way to such an agreement by courageous action at this time. Let us not pursue actions that have failed since man's existence to produce peace, because we cannot afford to fail now that we have such tremendous destructive power. We are tired of living in a world with a balance of terror, the threat of a nuclear bomb hanging over our heads. Let us lead with a positive program for world peace, that of collective security, not of collective annihilation.

In this resolution this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, we in Saskatchewan may take the first step towards such a program. Surely in such an important issue we cannot allow partisan politics to mar our efforts and, therefore, I ask for unanimous agreement in this resolution to promote world peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in seconding this resolution for no nuclear weapons for Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mr. J.H. Staveley (Weyburn): — Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and astounded on listening to the hon. members of the government speaking to this motion that they had so little regard for themselves or their loved ones or those whom they represent that they would attempt to render them defenceless and helpless in the event of a nuclear attack on this country. I cannot understand this.

Our attitude today toward defending ourselves and our country from a nuclear attack may be partly based on our personal self-respect and our national self-respect, but tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, it may well be based entirely on the need for survival. In the meantime, as free men in a free country, must we hang our heads in shame and ask our neighbors to take our responsibilities from our shoulders and protect us when we refuse to protect ourselves?

I agree with some of the things which my hon. friends said, but, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime the peoples of the world must be kept alive until this Utopian condition can be brought about.

This situation of nuclear warheads must be considered from three standpoints: the financial standpoint, the moral standpoint and the technical standpoint. I am going to discuss these briefly for the next few minutes, and I am going to speak of the financial end first because this is the least important and actually there is very little to say about it.

I am only going to make one very brief remark in this connection. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is the height of folly to spend between \$700 and \$800 million for equipment, possibly obsolete and certainly ineffective in its present state, when with an additional expenditure this equipment could be an effective weapon of defence and could be the means of our survival. Certainly, if we are to be in a position to defend ourselves, we must have effective weapons and these cost money. And in this case I am sure that any additional expenditures would be considered as a necessity.

The moral attitude is a little more difficult to deal with because here there is a great scope for thinking and talking in platitudes and intangibles. But, before talking about the moral attitude, I want just to take a quick look at the result of this nuclear warhead controversy.

There could be only two results, Mr. Speaker. First, division of our own people when we must be united for our self protection and our self preservation. Second, giving comfort to the Kremlin at our weakness of purpose and our division. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution aggravates both of these conditions.

The people of the world are sick of war and they are horrified at the thought of nuclear war with its inevitable devastation and the destruction of our civilization. Surely everyone understands this. So it is not surprising that so many people are ready to grasp at anything which may appear to offer a reasonable solution. But I say that it is only political expediency, the hope for votes, that makes the NDP'ers advocate no nuclear defensive weapons. Socialists, Mr. Speaker, have always tried to make political capital out of every misfortune that has ever befallen mankind. And man cannot be sick or poor or unemployed, criminally inclined, injured or unhappy without it being the fault of the capitalistic system. No western nation can take steps to defend itself or to defend its way of life without being accused by the socialists of warmongering.

Now how can we prevent a possible nuclear war. Some say by love. Others say by having the strongest possible preventative — adequate defence protection.

Cecil Bailey, the NDP federal candidate for the Assiniboia constituency said that loving our enemies and giving them understanding and sympathy is the weapon which will stop war. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that to have waved the olive branch would have stopped the Russian armies from over-running Poland or Hungary? Do you think that love and understanding would have stopped Hitler or Mussolini or Stalin? Do you honestly think that love and understanding will ever stop the Kremlin from its avowed purpose of world domination and the destruction of our capitalistic system? Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the love and understanding of your Liberal opposition will stop this government from carrying out the terms of the Regina Manifesto, which has the same objective?

To lay down our weapons now, or to have no defence, and to hold out our arms in love would only be an invitation to Russia or possibly Communist China to take us over here and now, to reduce us to equality in squalor, in ignorance and disease, to wipe out our way of life and our institutions as completely as though they had never existed.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members on your right must stop playing politics with this thing. It seems to me that they must make up their minds to trust either the most highly skilled technicians of this country who are dedicated to our survival or to trust Mr. Khrushchev who is dedicated to our destruction. I do not have to make up my mind, Mr. Speaker. I made it up a long time ago.

Now my hon. friends this afternoon said that it is immoral for this country to provide nuclear weapons to our armed services to prevent nuclear war. Does this government think it is immoral to provide vaccine to the people of this province to prevent the ravages of polio? Does this government think it is immoral for the Saskatchewan Anti-Tuberculosis League to send its van all over the province to detect and prevent the curse of T.B.? And I think it is just about time that the hon. members of this government take a realistic look at the situation of nuclear warheads for our defence.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the attitude of those opposing the use of nuclear weapons for our defence is based on ignorance of our part in the defence of our country. It is the responsibility of every elected member, either federal or provincial, to fully investigate any vital question before making statements of policy that could be disastrous to our country and our people. And I am sure that no member of this government has taken the time or the trouble to investigate the purpose or the scope of NORAD. And I would like to point out to the hon. members of this house our role in defence and give them some up-to-date information on NORAD. There have been many changes made, Mr. Speaker, since 1957 and 1960, and apparently my hon. friends have not kept up with these changes.

I would like to point out first that on the shoulders of NORAD and SAC preponderantly rests the fate of the world as we know it. Everything that brains, training, creative imagination and money can accomplish has been done to defend this North American continent, because the United States are determined never to have another Pearl Harbor, atomic style.

NORAD is only defensive and its weapons are completely defensive in nature, and I am sure that my hon. friends really know this. These weapons are designed exclusively to protect this continent through the use of the first two multi-service — that is to say airforce, army, and navy — the first two multi-service ever to operate on this continent.

NORAD, Mr. Speaker, has only four basic functions — detection, identification, interception and destruction — and NORAD has the tools and equipment to perform these four basic steps.

There is the DEW line in the far north, the Mid-Canada line and its system of radar networks in southern Canada and the United States to detect bombers and missiles, and all of the radar coverage is tied into NORAD headquarters through the ballistic missile early warning system. And did you know, Mr. Speaker, that screens the size of a football field constantly scan the Russian land mass and feed the information to NORAD headquarters through the BEMWS which has a range of 3,000 miles? And did you know that NORAD has 2,500 interceptors on the North American continent, and that these interceptors are capable only of defensive action because this is the only action for which they are equipped or for which they can be equipped? And I just want to give this house, Mr. Speaker, an illustration of how the defence mechanism of NORAD works.

Let us suppose that a Russian bomber manages to penetrate the Canadian airspace and gets across as far as Camp Borden, about 40 miles from Toronto. This bomber would be located by an interceptor and would be locked on by radar. The air crew would push just two buttons — one for a computer to figure the range, relative speed and position of the two planes, the second to set up the air to air or ground to air missile and fire it. The missile is highly effective. The bomber would be hit and would fall to the earth carrying a multi-megaton bomb, as has been mentioned by my hon. friends, equivalent to many millions of tons of T.N.T. Toronto is saved from immediate destruction. Yet this bomber is knocked down by a conventional, non-nuclear warhead. But the nuclear bomb, armed with a “dead man’s fuse” explodes at the preset height and, thanks to prevailing winds, a million and a half people in Toronto begin to die from radiation fall-out within a very few hours.

But just change one thing, Mr. Speaker, and see what happens. Put a small atomic warhead on the defence missile designed to carry such nuclear devices. The blast is small, possibly only one-millionth the power of the big bomb and with its proximity fuse the defence warhead does not even have to hit the bomber in order to bring it down. But, far more important, Mr. Speaker, that little defensive warhead with its nuclear action “cooks” the atomic bomb and renders it completely ineffective and completely harmless, except as debris. There is no big nuclear explosion, there is no deadly fall-out, no one in Toronto probably even knows that there has been a battle, unless they read it in the morning paper. And this was the most carefully kept secret in the United States until within the past year.

Mr. Speaker, the maximum range of our weapons is only 400 miles and so it is impossible for them to be used for offence. You could take all the Bomarcs, the Genies, the Honest Johns and the Falcons — you could put them all together in Canada and you could fire them all at one time

and not one enemy would be hurt, unless he was on Canadian or American soil, Mr. Speaker. You have all heard the statement that a nuclear war could be started by someone getting excited or panicky and pressing the wrong button. Mr. Speaker, NORAD has no button to start a war. But it does claim that no hostile plane or planes can approach the North American continent from the east, the west or the north undetected or unchallenged. The south is relatively unprotected and this is why Cuba is so important and why the United States has taken such a firm stand on the Cuban situation. However, Mr. Speaker, both Mr. Douglas and my hon. friends to your right seem quite content to allow Russia to take over Cuba and point its daggers at the very vitals of this continent.

Canada and the United States are inter-dependent and we all realize this, they are inter-dependent insofar as the defence of this continent is concerned. And both countries have learned a lesson from two world wars, a lesson which says stay strong, not weak; be determined to prevent war if possible but if necessary to do so, fight and win. And so, in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, let us use the best possible weapons for our defence to prevent war.

It has always been the responsibility of parents to protect their children. Would the members of this government deny the children of this country that protection now by denying the use of nuclear weapons for defence? By so doing the government is just as surely giving to an enemy a deadly weapon for our destruction. I think that this is the most deceitful and the most deceptive resolution ever brought into this legislature, and I would beg every hon. member of the government to examine his or her conscience before voting on this resolution. Because, if this resolution is passed it will bring a shame on this house which will not be lived down for many, many years.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution would be defeated unanimously and on a recorded vote. I could never support this resolution any more than I could condone the premeditated and callous annihilation of my own children. I will most certainly vote against the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear! Hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — Mr. Speaker, there are many things that I want to say on this resolution. I would like, in answer to the previous speaker, to say this. He says, will we deny this protection to our children. It is precisely because I want to protect my children, because I want to protect my grandchildren, this is precisely the reason why I am supporting this motion.

Before I make more comments on the remarks of the previous speaker, there are one or two comments I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, on the demeanor of the opposition during the speech of the member from Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky). The member from Cumberland was obviously very sincere; he was discussing a very crucial question; he was discussing one of the most important questions that Canada is going to have to decide in a short time; he was discussing a question upon which the survival of the world may depend. But what was the demeanor of some of the members, and I am not going to say all of them, what was the demeanor and what were the comments coming from the members of the opposition? They were laughing, they were treating serious arguments with scorn. Now, we don't expect you necessarily must agree with our arguments but surely the subject deserved a more serious and a more honest appraisal than you were trying to give to this speaker.

The kind of comments that were coming from across the floor, what were they? Talking about hammer and sickle, saying our policy is decided in Moscow. This is a disgraceful performance. I make my decisions . . .

An Hon. Member: — What . . .

Mrs. Cooper: — I am speaking at the moment, Sir . . .

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Mrs. Cooper: — Order, please. I make my decisions, Mr. Speaker, not on what is the desire of Khrushchev nor on what is the desire of the Pentagon, my decisions are based on the facts that I see before me. I try to assess these facts honestly and sincerely and without fear. I try to assess these facts and I make my decisions on those facts. And to say that we on this side must make our decisions on the basis of what Russia thinks is completely ridiculous, or on the basis of what anyone else thinks.

I presume on this kind of argument that if Russia wants war, I must speak for peace; if Russia wants peace, I must speak for war; if Russia believes in universal education I must be against it. How ridiculous can you get?

I would like to add further to this by saying that I realize and recognize that there are sincere divisions of opinion on this issue and it is on that basis, and that basis alone, that this issue should be approached. Surely we ought to be able to debate this issue, this terribly important issue, as adults in an objective manner, respecting each other's opinions whether or not we agree. You add absolutely nothing by resorting to the kind of smear tactics that were

coming from across the house today. This brand of John Birch intimidation utterly disgusts me. It is reminiscent of the McCarthy days when the action of McCarthy and his followers discredited the prestige of the United States all over the world and made intelligent American people cringe with embarrassment and shame that such a thing could take place in their country. And this type of attack, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is a disservice to democracy, it is a disservice to our country, it tends to discourage intelligent discussion because many timid people are afraid to express their honest opinion for fear of being smeared, and to resort to tactics like this, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is a sign of weakness and it is more than a sign of weakness, it is a sign of a sort of sickness of the mind and a sickness of the spirit. And it lowers the prestige of every one who indulges in that kind of tactics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot more I want to say on this subject so, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

Debate adjourned.

SECOND READINGS

Hon. Mr. Turnbull moved second reading of Bill No. 30 — An Act to amend the University Act.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 30, an act to amend the University Act, in the main is designed to provide means by which a university may finance capital improvement by the method of selling bonds and I think that the house should know that the university requests this legislation and we are quite happy to propose the amendments to the house.

It appears that there are certain investors and we don't know quite the extent of this market but it appears that there are certain investors who would like to invest monies in a very particular way for a very particular bond issue, such as the type of bond issue that might be issued by the university for capital development.

It also appears, Mr. Speaker, that this procedure will be used in other parts of Canada because there is a heavy capital road ahead of us. I think with the general explanation I would now move second reading.

March 15, 1963

Mr. Speaker: — It has been moved by the Hon. Mr. Turnbull that Bill No. 30, an act to amend the University Act be now read a second time. Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the motion.? Carried.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet before the motion was put but I guess . . . May I proceed on this second reading with the consent of the house?

Mr. Speaker: — I am very sorry I didn't notice you but I will permit you as maybe I put the motion a little too fast.

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I just have a very few comments to make on the Bill. I note that the purpose of the bill is to make it possible for the university to acquire real property to assist in the erecting and the repairing and adding to of buildings and for other matters which are related in part to the project which I had the opportunity of supporting yesterday. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would like on second reading of the bill to give my support to it in the hope that among other things property will soon be acquired for a dental college on one of the university campuses.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Walker moved second reading of Bill No. 37 — An Act respecting Certain Officers of the Court -

He said: Mr. Speaker, there is really nothing about this bill that involves any important principle. It has to do really only with changes in hours during which the offices must remain open and, as for the rest, it is really consolidation.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I move that the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Turnbull moved second reading of Bill No. 38 — An Act to amend the School Act

He said: Mr. Speaker, these amendments are offered to accomplish three different things in the main. The first one rises as a result of the reorganization of some parts of the Department of Education

where we propose to take adult education and physical fitness and recreation and put them under one director and create a new division called the division of continuing education. Because of this we are proposing amendments which will allow us to appoint a Saskatchewan Council on Continuing Education, and the members will notice that the amendment relates directly to the advisory council and indicates that membership to the council will be taken from the University of Saskatchewan, S.T.F., S.S.T.A., voluntary organizations and the public.

Another part of the bill deals with the election of school boards in town districts where there are separate schools in the main being brought in for the first time. This is a matter of changing the amendment so that during the first election, if there is sufficient number of people within the town the number of trustees can be three, five or seven, rather than be limited to three on first election as the law now stands.

Another section of the act deals with the appointment of a vice-chairman in town districts where the population exceeds 10,000. There are situations now sometimes rising where town districts are less than 10,000, and for some particular reason the chairman is unable to act and the business of the school board is held up, and this would allow the appointment of a vice-chairman.

The last section is of some importance. It allows the school board to enter into formal agreement between the provincial government and federal government for the providing of services. Now, there are informal arrangements now entered into, such as between the Moose Jaw school unit and the federal government in respect to the Department of Defence and the RCAF station that is there. Another situation would be at the radar site that is going in north of Saskatoon. Another one is Dundurn, and it has been brought to our attention that, while these arrangements are now in effect, they are informal and formal, and this change in the law simply clears up this matter so it is beyond challenge.

I would move second reading.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Williams moved second reading of Bill No. 39 — An Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, 1958.

He said: Mr. Speaker, there are five points in this bill and I understand that all superannuation acts in various departments and boards are having the same amendments made.

The first point is that a person to whom a deferred superannuation allowance has been granted may, if he requests, have his deferred superannuation cancelled and all the contributions returned to him.

The second point, where such a person dies before reaching the age of 65, the amount of contributions paid, plus interest, shall be paid to his widow or, if none, to his children, or if he has no children to whoever the board may decide.

The third point, where a similar person dies before the age of 65 but before he has received an amount up to one year of his pension, an amount equal to the difference between his contributions, together with interest, and the amount received by him in that year shall be paid to the widow or children and so forth, in the same manner as the previous one.

Section 25 being repealed removes a restriction which formerly prevented both an employee and spouse from receiving pensions. That is quite possible now, and two persons, man and wife, could receive pension from the Workmen's Superannuation Board.

And the last point refers to a widow of a superannuate who may be employed, or become employed, by the Workmen's Compensation Board can also receive her full salary in addition to any pension she may receive on account of her husband's death.

With that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move second reading of Bill No. 39, an act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Board Superannuation Act, 1958.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

Hon. Mr. Wood moved second reading of Bill No. 41 — An Act to amend the Tax Enforcement Act

He said: Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this Bill has to deal with the changes that are necessary to this act due to the repeal of the acts which we dealt with the other day — the Arrears of Taxes Act, the Tax Arrears Consolidation Act and the Tax Consolidation and Adjustment Act. The repeal of these Acts makes necessary some revisions in the Tax Enforcement Act.

There has also been some revision of the Provincial Mediation Board Act which makes it necessary to make some revisions in this Tax Enforcement Act.

There are a few things that have to do with tax enforcement themselves, such as the amount that may be charged to a person who is redeeming a parcel of land. Also having to do with the land titles registrar having to issue notices to people who are interested in property upon first application under a lien, but both parts are minor things which I think could be better discussed in the committee of the whole.

I would thus move second reading of this bill.

Motion agreed to and bill read the second time.

The Assembly adjourned at 5:29 o'clock p.m.