

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Fifth Session — Fourteenth Legislature
26th Day

Thursday, March 21, 1963.

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

On the Orders of the day:

NEW TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

Hon. C.C. Williams (Minister of Telephones): — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to draw the attention of the house to our new telephone directory, particularly to the drab cover. It is an improvement over what we did have for many, many years when it had advertisements plastered all over the front, and all over the back.

The member from The Battlefords (Mr. Kramer) some time ago suggested to me that we should dress it up a little, get colored pictures of varied parts of the province on the cover and perhaps inside, or statistics of one kind and another. And at the February meeting of the board we decided to do exactly that. It was too late for this spring's directory but the one that comes out in the fall will have two rural scenes and two depicting industry.

Perhaps the one that comes out a year from now will have bridges. We will indicate various bridges in various parts of the province or perhaps buildings of one kind or another. So this is the last directory we will see with this uninteresting, drab cover.

COUNTY SYSTEM

Mr. W.R. Thatcher (Morse): — In the absence of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I should like to direct a question to the Premier. In view of the request by resolution of the Saskatchewan Association of Rural Municipalities that municipal and county acts be rescinded, has the government now decided to postpone further action at this time in introducing the county system?

Hon. W.S. Lloyd (Premier): — Mr. Speaker, the position of the government was made absolutely clear by the Minister of Municipal Affairs when he spoke in this house a few days ago.

SASKATCHEWAN SAVINGS BONDS

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank (Provincial Treasurer): — Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce to the house that after 12 days of sales of the Saskatchewan savings bonds, the total sales reported are almost \$7.9 million, and I also wish to announce that the sales will be cut off next Tuesday night. This will be the final day for sales of these bonds. I think the response has been very good, and quite satisfactory.

Mr. Thatcher: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, may I direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer? Does the government feel that the very disappointing slowness of these bond sales indicates that the people of Saskatchewan have lost confidence in this administration?

Hon. Mr. Brockelbank: — Mr. Speaker, by next Tuesday night I am sure this will be well over \$10 million. If my hon. friend wants to interpret that as a loss of confidence, I can't do anything for him.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Premier Lloyd: — Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have information from the secretary of the local government board, who draws attention to some inaccuracies which have been discovered in the report of the local government board. He consequently, then submits some changes, Appendix P, which I would like to lay on the table, and copies of the corrected appendix will be distributed.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Mr. A.T. Stone (Saskatoon City): — Before the orders of the day, I would like to draw the attention of the members to a very large group of students from the King Edward School in Saskatoon. There are approximately 80 of them, with their teachers, Mrs. Ross Thaden and Miss Hope. I am sure all members will join with me in saying how delighted we are to have them here. We hope their stay in the capital city will be a pleasant one and a very informative one.

PICTURES

Mr. Speaker: — Before I call the next item of business, I would like to again remind the members that this is the day, at 5:30, which was agreed on that certain pictures could be taken when we arrive at 5:30. You will see some of the cameras already in the gallery. For that occasion I would ask all members to try and be present at that time for these photographs because it will necessary after tomorrow for official photos, and these are being taken by the Department of Industry and Information photographic services.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution moved by Mr. Berezowsky:

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

Mrs. J.E. Cooper (Regina City): — Mr. Speaker, in resuming this debate I would like so spend some time in answering some of the statements made by the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). Now, when he was speaking in this debate on Friday last, he said this, “If Canada does not accept nuclear weapons we would render our loved ones helpless and deny protection to our children”. When I adjourned the debate I stated that we on this side of the house are just as concerned about the future welfare and safety of our loved ones and the protection of our children as is the member from Weyburn, or any of his friends; and that is precisely why we are supporting this resolution. And I will go further and say that I am not only concerned about the safety of our own children, but I am concerned about the future of the world’s children, and my concern in this matter is not only for Canadian and American children and British children, but it is also of in the children of Russia and China and even Cuba; and if this, Mr. Speaker, is to be construed by the hon. member that spoke the other day of loving our enemies and bowing to what the member described as the out-worn impractical injunction of the Prince of Peace when he told us to love our enemies, then I plead guilty, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — Now, the hon. member suggests in his speech, that the New Democratic Party is playing politics on this issue. Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, who is playing politics? We are the admittedly only

March 21, 1963

party whose stand has been consistent on this matter; our policy on nuclear arms has never wavered, and it hasn't wavered because it is born of a very deep conviction, and it hasn't been influenced by public opinion polls or by expediency, and win, lose or draw, Mr. Speaker, we stand by our principles.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. Cooper: — To prove that at least one party hasn't been consistent upon this, I have a book here called *The Liberal Party*. It is written by J.W. Pickersgill, with an introduction by L.B. Pearson, and I would like to read what he said, and now — this book is just hot off the press — I would like to read what he said.

Mr. F.E. Foley (Turtleford): — Tommy read it last night.

Mrs. Cooper: — Yes, and I'm going to read it again today.

The Liberal Party, therefore, supports the maintenance of the nuclear deterrent of the free world until effective disarmament, including nuclear disarmament on both sides, is agreed upon. We do not believe, however that it would strengthen the nuclear deterrent to equip the Canadian forces with nuclear weapons under national control. We hold this opinion not on moral grounds but because we do not believe that Canada, by becoming a nuclear power itself, should provide any other country with an excuse to equip itself or its satellites with nuclear weapons, thereby increasing the number of nuclear powers.

We believe that the fewer nations that are possessing nuclear arms, the more likely it is that disarmament can be achieved. Moreover, it is quite clear that the Canadian forces will never have nuclear weapons exclusively under Canadian control unless Canada manufactures her own weapons, which we cannot afford, and do not desire to do.

The Liberal Party believes that Canada can make a more appropriate and effective contribution to the joint defence of this continent, and to the military alliance of the free world by strengthening the so-called conventional

armaments of the Canadian forces, than by seeking to become a junior nuclear power, with a limited supply of nuclear weapons which, in present circumstances could not be under Canadian custody.

Now then, to go with some of the statements by the member from Weyburn. The hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) suggested that it is wrong even to discuss Canada's role in defence and the question of nuclear arms. And he stated this, "That this resolution should never have been brought into the house, it was a dreadful thing to do", and he said, "that any discussion will show division when we should show unity."

Now to me that is an amazing statement. It is a peculiar idea of democracy in my point of view. He is saying, in effect, Mr. Speaker, that we should blindly follow the wishes of certain elements of the United States whether we think it is right or whether we think it is wrong. We should follow it without examination and without discussion.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in a democracy it is not unity of opinion, but it is freedom of opinion and freedom of expression that we should strive for. And it is only by free expression and listening to opposing opinions and by examination of all the facts we can gather that any intelligent decision can be made, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we never see the day in Canada when we must be muzzled and when free and frank discussion of any question will be denied.

The hon. member said we should trust the experts, or trust Mr. Khrushchev. Well, what do the experts say, Mr. Speaker? Which of the so-called experts should we trust? Certainly among the experts there is no union of opinion but great division of opinion, and who are we to believe? Now the member from Rosetown (Mr. Stevens) cited a good many experts who said that Canada should not have nuclear weapons. You may have noticed that a 191 member of the faculty of the University of British Columbia are petitioning the federal government against nuclear weapons. You may not consider these experts, but they are learned people and they are people who are studying the situation.

I intend to cite many more experts who say that for Canada to obtain nuclear weapons would be perfectly useless and harmful. However, I think, Mr. Speaker, when we are discussing this question it is important to remember that since Canada started on the Bomarc program there has been a very radical change in thinking in the United States, in defence policy, and among the NATO allies.

March 21, 1963

This has been brought about by scientific discoveries and advances in the field of weaponry. In the fifties the manned bomber was considered to be a great threat, but this is no longer true. The real threat is the intercontinental ballistic missiles and missile-carrying submarines. And attacks, as we know, can now be launched with great accuracy directly from enemy soil, and there is no defence against this type of attack and this has been freely admitted by all the world's great military and great civilian leaders.

This, of course, is the tragedy and the futility of the theory of the deterrent and the cold war. Because no matter how much power one nation may have, they never feel it is quite enough and this is true even now when we know that we have enough atomic weapons to destroy our civilization. The break-through in a new type of weapon or a new delivery system spurs the opposing camp to more research, and the discoveries that result render obsolete existing weapons almost before they are off the assembly line. This, of course, is what has happened to the Avro Arrow, now to the Bomarc, and the Skybolt, and this is very well illustrated in an article in the March 9 issue of Macleans, the article is called "The Nuclear Mess" and I would like to read just a little bit from this article. It is written by Ken Lefolii

The Americans have changed their minds about the time and place and use of nuclear arms. The nuclear mess turns on an incredibly complex, technical technical consideration, but the great decisions of nuclear strategy have been made on grounds that ordinary men of good will can — and indeed must — understand and weigh.

Canada has — or should have — a fairly clear defence policy. The story that leads up to the nuclear mess really started in the beginning of the fifties when the NATO allies bet that the way to hold off the Russians in Europe was to threaten them with a "tactical" or small-bomb nuclear counter-attack against any armed force they sent into free territory. General Norstad, as military commander of NATO was in charge of making this bet stick. Canada's nuclear-arms carriers in Europe were ordered when Norstad was building up his tactical nuclear threat.

Then, towards the end of the fifties, the Americans started changing their minds. In 1959 one of Norstad's most prestigious colleagues, General Maxwell Taylor, wrote that to his mind the risks of this strategy were too high; one nuclear attack of any size, Taylor suggested, runs a high risk of leading to another. General

Taylor's book "The Uncertain Trumpet, he argued that a tactical bomb used against troops in Europe might very well lead in the end to the obliteration of Moscow, New York, and points between.

General Norstad no longer holds his command. The man responsible for the decision to approve his resignation was General Taylor. He is now the chairman of the US chiefs of staff, the ranking American military officer. His stand against using "tactical" nuclear weapons in Europe is built into speeches made recently by Defence Secretary Robert McNamara.

The same change in American policy is written into the joint communiqué issued by President Kennedy and Prime Minister MacMillan from Nassau in December. They turned inside out the "nuclear sword" and "non-nuclear shield" metaphor that Norstad used for years to describe his NATO strategy. Paragraph ten of the Kennedy-MacMillan communiqué speaks of a "nuclear shield" and a "non-nuclear sword". This means that you fight a conventional battle, by "sword", as long as you can, relying on your "shield" of big offshore nuclear missiles to discourage the enemy from using his nuclear weapons on you.

Maclean's Washington editor, Ian Sclanders, has made careful inquiries that bear out this evidence of a new American policy at the top. This new policy is set against the use of "tactical" nuclear weapons."

And then I would also like to give you Mr. McNamara's statement itself, and I have a copy of this statement taken from a news report in the Leader-Post on January 31 and here is what Mr. McNamara says, and certainly you will agree that he must be amongst the experts.

Defence Secretary McNamara suggested Wednesday that Bomarc missiles squadrons have only limited usefulness against manned bomber attack, but they will be continued in use for several years, largely because the United States government has already paid for them.

The Bomarc missiles, (McNamara told the Congressional Arms Services Committee) suffered from essentially the same defects as the manned interceptors. Nevertheless, we plan to continue the Bomarc force for several years since the large initial investment costs are behind us.

March 21, 1963

They cost, by the way, Mr. Speaker, \$2 billion.

Thus, says, Mr. McNamara, thus our principle concern in the years ahead must be the dangers of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine launched missile attacks, and the main thread of our efforts should be re-directed to meet these rising threats.

Now that is McNamara and, as you know, and I believe the member from Rosetown (Mr. Stevens) stated, the United States had intended to have 30 or 40 of these missile bases, now it is down to eight and only because the money has been spent.

And here are some other important experts and very important experts, and I would like to read what they say. I want to quote from Henry A. Kissinger who has for many years been chief proponent in the United States of the use of nuclear arms and nuclear strategy, and he wrote an article in Foreign Affairs in July, 1962, and here is what he says:

The present deployment of NATO's nuclear capacity represents an anomaly in terms of the current NATO doctrine. Nuclear weapons and delivery systems for technical use have been placed in Europe in considerable numbers, yet Deputy Secretary of Defence, Gilpatric, has rejected the notion of the tactical nuclear war."

Then he goes on and quotes Gilpatric as saying:

I for one, have never believed in the so-called limited nuclear way. I just don't know how you could build a limit into it, once you start any kind of a nuclear bang.

And then Kissinger goes on

And this view seems to have been reinforced by Secretary McNamara at the NATO administrative meeting at Athens. At the same time Secretary McNamara has insisted that in the case of a general war, our strategic forces are alone sufficient to perform any nuclear mission.

And then McNamara is quoted as saying

"There is no question but today our strategic retaliatory forces of bombers, missiles, and Polaris are fully capable of destroying Soviet targets, even after absorbing an initial nuclear surprise attack.

And Kissinger winds up his argument like this

In these terms the nuclear establishment on the continent is both dangerous and useless. It is dangerous because it makes inevitable a limited nuclear war. Both Mr. McNamara and Mr. Gilpatric have declared it is certain to escalate, and it is useless because it will merely duplicate attacks on targets already covered by our strategic forces.”

These then are the opinions of the authorities.

Now then, Mr. Speaker, in the light of these changed circumstances, should commitments made when one set of facts is before us, should they remain the same, or should they be changed as circumstances change? Apparently the United States, doesn't think commitments made before changes that come in should bind them, because the United States was committed to supply Britain with the Skybolt and to maintain the bases in Turkey, but, in the light of changing conditions, these commitments were changed. Now was this a breach of faith? Was it a matter of dishonor? Or was it, in the opinion of the United States, using just good plain common sense?

When circumstances change, policies must change to meet those circumstances, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, this applies to Canada just as well as to the United States.

Now, I believe the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) stated, and I read where the member from Moosomin (Mr. McDonald) stated in a meeting that Canadians should be armed with the best possible weapons. I would like to ask a question. What are the best possible weapons? Certainly nuclear weapons are the most powerful and the most devastating weapons, but are they necessarily the best weapons, or perhaps they are the very worst weapons because nuclear weapons cannot be used without the danger of escalating into all out nuclear war. And a nuclear attack means, of course nuclear retaliation, which would destroy and not protect our troops or our country or our civilization. And, Mr. Speaker, more and more, military authorities are veering towards the use of conventional weapons to provide a respite during which it will be possible to contain the forces and try to keep away from an atomic war, and if the time should come when atomic power was used, there is plenty of power without adding any more.

And even military authorities, Mr. Speaker, are becoming increasingly concerned about the difficulty of controlling tactical nuclear weapons when they get into the hands of a number of nations, and surely Canada doesn't want to increase this danger by accepting tactical nuclear weapons. Acceptance of nuclear weapons, it is pointed out by the member from Rosetown, is not a condition of membership in NATO.

March 21, 1963

Denmark, Norway they are NATO members and they have not accepted the nuclear role. There are many other ways, Mr. Speaker, we can assist our NATO partners without accepting nuclear weapons. Our only hope is to press for disarmament, and here Canada has a positive role to play. But we can't conscientiously press for disarmament and against the spread of nuclear weapons if Canada accepts nuclear weapons for its own forces.

There is another point I would like to mention. Present indications are that there is more hope in the world today for some agreement on nuclear arms than there ever has been. Russia has made concession and has accepted the principle of inspection and control, and the controversy now is on the number of inspections — I think Russia has said three and United States has said ten, but United States has also made a concession and reduced the number down to seven so that, while there is still a substantial disagreement, there at least is some sign of flexibility about the matter.

It was very interesting to note that President Kennedy recently stated that methods of detection, without on-site inspection, are greatly improved, and I have noticed that some scientists say they are almost fool proof now, and as these methods of inspection become more efficient it is possible the United States may further reduce the number of on-site inspections it asks for, and this would close the gap still a little closer.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, in the light of this, it is the wrong time to do anything that might increase world tension and further impair any chance that our opponents, or, even more important, that the uncommitted nations may have in the fact that we are sincere in advocating progressive disarmament?

And there is one more thing, Mr. Speaker, that I have thought a lot about. When Mr. Khrushchev backed down in Cuba — and thank God he did — remember, he had to go back to his own country and justify his position. Now I am sure that it must have looked to many of his people like a loss of face, a sign of weakness. We certainly know it did look that way to China, and like any other dictator, I think it is very probable that Mr. Khrushchev has powerful political enemies in his own country that would exploit this rift. There is an open rift right now between China and Russia. We know that. Now, if some more militant forces in Russia and China are driven together by anything that might increase world tension right now, and persuade people in these countries, and the small nations that look to Canada for guidance that we don't mean business, that we are not sincere in our disarmament negotiations or our opposition to this spread of

nuclear weapons, this will not help but will further jeopardize the chance for world peace and for progressive disarmament, which is the only hope for the return to sanity. And surely Canada wants no part in anything that might take us one step nearer to the precipice of a nuclear holocaust.

And then, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer once more to the speech by the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley). He made a rather cynical and sarcastic remark about Mr. Cecil Baily, the New Democrat Party candidate from Weyburn. And he made this because Mr. Baily said that the way to solve our international problems was by love and understanding, and he found this something for mirth. The Weyburn member thinks this is impractical, a naïve approach to today's world. Well, I agree that it may seem that way. As far as I know, this approach has never been tried, and I am not suggesting, and certainly Mr. Bailey wasn't suggesting, I am sure of that, that at this moment we could afford to throw away our arms and depend on love and understanding to protect us. Of course we couldn't, because there is no love and understanding between countries today.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is well to remind ourselves that this gospel of love and understanding was the doctrine preached by our Master when he walked this earth. He taught us that love was stronger than hate . . .

Mr. J.E. Snedker (Saltcoats): — No love as far as socialists are concerned.

Mr. Foley: — Tell us about Khrushchev. Why did Mr. Khrushchev back down?

Mrs. Cooper: — . . . and his followers were called Christians. This was a radical approach in his day, and it is a radical approach in our day.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that the tragedy of our world is that we are always too late in showing love and understanding and concern for our neighbors. We forget that the world is one neighborhood, and that all mankind is our neighbors. We have forgotten Christ's admonition when he said to Peter, "Peter, lovest thou me?" and Peter said "Yea, Master, though knowest I love thee" and Christ's answer was, "Feed my sheep".

We have forgotten to feed his sheep, and until we do recognize and accept the great teachings of our Christian faith, the great principle of love and understanding that Christ came to this world to preach, until we do accept this

March 21, 1963

and realize that it is not impractical but that it is the only practical, the only realistic answer for the world's problems, until we believe this and try to practice it we shall continue, Mr. Speaker, to live in a world armed to the teeth and with the ever present danger of annihilation.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. G.T. Snyder (Moose Jaw City): — Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take very many minutes of the time of the house this afternoon on this particular resolution. A great deal of what I would have liked to have said has already been expressed in a very adequate way by other members on this side of the house.

My main purpose in joining in this debate is to lend my voice to those who have already indicated a sincere desire to have Canada set the way in a sane approach in the question of survival in this atomic age of ours.

I believe that the very nature of our position today requires us to take a clear look at the entire picture and to face up to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that it is more important to be right than it is to be popular in all quarters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the opinion has been expressed, especially in the recent past, that the Diefenbaker government has had no coherent or consistent policy in respect to nuclear arms. It has been accused of being a bumbling government. Now if this appeared to be the case, Mr. Speaker, this was no doubt partly due to the fact that the Prime Minister has been leading a minority government that might be called upon to go to the polls at any time and under these circumstances he no doubt felt that he needed room to manoeuvre. The Diefenbaker government, however, Mr. Speaker, not only brought into Canada, but also provided for Canadian forces in Europe, carriers which are useless without nuclear warheads. So step by step, Mr. Speaker, the Diefenbaker administration has been drawing Canada closer and closer towards joining the nuclear club. Their problem was to do it at such a time and in such a way as to cause the least amount of resistance among Canadian people.

Now this cautious attitude, Mr. Speaker, caused a good deal of impatience in the United States State Department who wished to have Canada projected immediately into this military adventure. What the U.S. State Department failed to realize, Mr. Speaker, was the difficult position that a

Canadian prime Minister found himself in. They failed to realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Prime Minister of Canada intended all the time to accept nuclear weapons, but for political reasons he wished to appear flexible and have certain reservations and doubts until after a federal election and after the Ottawa NATO conference.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I, too, was especially disappointed in the remarks which were made by the hon. member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) on Friday last. Many of us in the past have come to regard the member for Weyburn as a rather able member and a rather analytical thinker. I think surely that his remarks that the NDP was using this issue for political advantage must have struck a very sour note with the other members who sit on his own side of the house. Until very recently, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal party, as the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) has already mentioned today, favored this particular issue on the abstinence of Canada from joining the nuclear club. Only a short while ago the leader of the national Liberal party said, in January of 1961; and I quote:

Canada must remain a non-nuclear power; by doing so Canada can lead the little powers in a struggle to abolish nuclear weapons and eventually all armaments. I don't believe we need the Bomarc, which is not an effective defence in any sense, and will probably be scrapped by the United States one of these days."

However, Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago the leader of the Liberal party, Mr. Pearson, after a trip to the United States, after a glimpse at a recent public opinion poll in Canada which indicated to him that the Canadian people are gradually becoming conditioned for this suicidal step, and after the accusing finger was pointed at Canada by General Norstad, then Mr. Pearson removed the mask that the Liberal party has been wearing for some time and came out openly in favor of nuclear weapons, under the pretence of honoring our commitments, Mr. Speaker.

Rarely, if ever, Mr. Speaker, have we seen the Liberal party so concerned about honoring their own promises and commitments, much less those of another political group. I would suggest once again, Mr. Speaker, that the position of the New Democratic Party has remained unchanged on this issue since the very beginning, and I think the Canadian people are competent to judge who it is that is playing politics with this important life and death issue.

The entire argument that was presented by the member for Weyburn on Friday last was based on the theory that a third world war would be fought with manned bombers. As time passes

March 21, 1963

on, we know that the possibility of manned bombers being used in the third world war becomes more and more remote. Those who believe otherwise are living in the comfortable but unrealistic past. So, with the recognition of this single fact, Mr. Speaker, the entire argument which was presented by the member for Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) on Friday last becomes null and void.

Now, Mr. Speaker, at the same time as the liberals are advocating that Canada must accept nuclear warheads for our Bomarc missiles, Mr. Pearson is attempting to mislead Canadian people claiming that after we accept these nuclear warheads from the United States, if he was called upon to form a government that he would immediately begin negotiations with the United States to take them all back again.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the Liberal party is at all sincere in their statements that they should demand that the nuclear weapons be not brought into Canada in the first place. Since World War II, Mr. Speaker, the military and the political leaders of the western world have devoted a good deal of time and effort, and vast sums of money to a defence program which has been subject to a good deal of criticism in many quarters.

In many cases, obsolescence has preceded the actual production of both offensive and defensive weapons. Canada has been a victim in the scheme of things. We found that the Avro Arrow was obsolete equipment before it left the production line. We find that many of our other offensive and defensive weapons are becoming more and more inadequate as the pattern changes and the intercontinental missile replaces the manned bomber.

In the defence of North America, Mr. Speaker, Canada has involved herself in the construction of three major radar lines from the east to the west. The most northerly, the Distant Early Warning line, or the DEW line as it is referred to, was built entirely by the United States and paid for by the United States. The second, the mid-Canada line was a Canadian project costing the taxpayers of Canada \$170 million. The third, the pine tree line, which is built at the Canadian United States border, was a joint project costing Canada \$80 million. Now this brings our total bill at the present time for trans-continental radar to \$250 million, but in spite of these extensive and elaborate protections, Mr. Speaker, informed sources indicate to us, Mr. Speaker, that this radar system is a far cry from being foolproof and that a definite margin for error exists in that a meteorite falling to earth, or a flock of wild geese flying over, may produce somewhat the same blip on the radar screen.

I think equally disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that these unarmed carriers, which I have spoken of previously, are ineffective against anything other than manned bombers which would not be used in a war of tomorrow.

So I submit most sincerely, Mr. Speaker, that the only contribution that our present defence system has made to date is to provide for Canadians a false sense of security, Canada's acquisition of nuclear weapons, Mr. Speaker, would only serve to compound an existing problem, and encourage other non-nuclear nations to become a party to the crime of which we would be obliged to plead "guilty" at least in part.

Canadian citizens, Mr. Speaker, in recent years have been encouraged to build fall-out shelters in order to provide themselves with some nebulous sort of protection in the event of nuclear attack. The general public has not responded very favorably to this suggestion, and I think this is a genuine indication of the fact that Canadians are unwilling to accept as inevitable the fact that Canada must become involved in this program of destruction and suicide.

Canadians are unwilling to accept the theory that man must turn back the clock and return to the cave like his prehistoric ancestors.

Now, I suppose at this point, Mr. Speaker, we can only speculate as to the impact which Canada might have had in the interests of world peace and the betterment of the human race, if the \$21 billion which has been spent on armaments since the end of World War II had been allocated for the distribution of all the foodstuffs which we are capable of producing here in Canada. A national organization, Care of Canada, indicates, I believe, that \$1.00 will send some 20 odd pounds of foodstuffs to people in some under-developed country of the world. However, with 27¢ of each tax dollar being earmarked for national defence, very little money has been left for this particular purpose and, to our perennial shame, Mr. Speaker, last year Canada was only able to muster \$4 million for our contribution to the United Nations in the interests of world peace and mutual understanding.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our failure to make a more meaningful contribution in the feeding of the hungry has been, in effect, a failure on our part to prevent the spread of communism in these under-developed countries. History indicates to us quite conclusively, Mr. Speaker, that communism flourishes only in the ferment of the system which has proven itself incapable of providing for its people a reasonable standard of living, a system that has been synonymous, to these people, with hunger and human suffering. I suggest to you that millions of Russian and Chinese people chose this road because we, the free people in the western world, offered them no practical alternative.

March 21, 1963

I suggest also that, but for the leadership of such men as Nehru, and Gandhi, it is very probable that India would also have chosen this road before this time. For these people any change represents an opportunity for them to improve their present desperate circumstances. So I believe that since World War II Canada could have made a contribution which would have made her a leader among nations. Instead, we have relegated to the status of a fourth-class military power with a Maginot line brand of military mentality that has provided no real security and has been so costly that we have been unable to honor our moral commitments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is being suggested that we involve ourselves further in a negative and outmoded defence program in order to justify a mistake which was made by the Diefenbaker government some time ago.

I would just suggest, before I close my remarks, Mr. Speaker, that we in Canada would be ill-advised to take any action as a member of NATO that would have a tendency to enlarge the nuclear club. History proves, Mr. Speaker, that armaments bring war and not peace. A glimpse of a picture of Hiroshima or Nagasaki the morning after these cities were destroyed by the atomic bomb of that day should convince any rational human who is at all familiar with new techniques of war, and our present capacity for mass annihilation that war has been rendered obsolete.

Commenting on the new military budget to the house armed services committee on January 30, 1963, the United States Secretary of defence McNamara, had a few words to say that I think are worthy of quoting in this house:

As the arms race continues and weapons multiply, become more swift and deadly, the possibility of global catastrophe, either by miscalculation or design becomes ever more real. More armaments, whether offensive or defensive, cannot solve this dilemma. We are approaching an era when it will become increasingly improbable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategical nuclear force, either by surprise or otherwise, to preclude a devastating retaliatory blow. This may result in mutual deterrent but it is still a grim prospect.

It underscores the need for renewed effort to find some way, if not to eliminate these deadly weapons, completely, then at least to slow down or halt their further accumulation, and to create institutional arrangements which would reduce the need for either side to resort to their immediate use in moments of acute international tension.

The United States and the Soviet Union as the two great nuclear powers are the nations most directly endangered by these weapons, and, therefore, have a great mutual interest in seeing to it that they are never used.

Now, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this warning coming from what might be considered by some to be a rather unexpected source deserves a good deal of thought and consideration by members of this house and I suggest in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that all members before they stand to be counted on this particular issue, consider the complexity of the problem and all the ramifications that are involved.

A few more nuclear warheads on Canada's soil would add very little to the present stockpile of such weapons. I think it was the member for Rosetown (Mr. Stevens) that pointed out that when Great Britain accepted nuclear weapons it added only two percent to the nuclear deterrent. Canada's acceptance of nuclear weapons would probably be a very minute fraction of one percent. But, Mr. Speaker, by accepting these nuclear weapons we could make it much easier for other presently uncommitted nations to become involved as a member of the nuclear club, and make it possible for them to plunge this planet into a third and a last world war.

On Easter of 1958 His Holiness Pope Pius XII said "Every day is a melancholy step in the tragic road to destruction and death, and the human race almost loses hope of being able to stop this suicidal madness."

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members have the opportunity today to indicate that we in this house, desire to bring to Canada, and to the rest of the world, a state of sanity and responsibility.

It will be my privilege, Mr. Speaker, and indeed my duty to support this resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Coderre (Gravelbourg): — Mr. Speaker, there is not much that I can add to the sound reasoning of the member for Weyburn (Staveley) this question of nuclear arms. I have never seen a more practical, more humane, more reasonable approach to this question, as brought out by the member from Weyburn, and only a member of his calibre, could ever bring out the sound discussions heard.

I think that the attacks on the integrity of the hon. member for Weyburn is a disgraceful show in this house by members of the government. He was not expressing, Mr. Speaker, at any time, opinions of some Joe in the United States or some Joe in Russia. It was his own honest personal opinion.

March 21, 1963

It has been mentioned a few moments ago that we are entering into an era of atomic weapons and that they become obsolete, and referring to the hon. member's speech in this house, the question of the Bomarc had become obsolete, and so on and so forth. Everyone of us will probably remember prior to the 1939 conflict when aircraft came into being, statements made that the war would not last long, it would be over in a matter of days because of the destruction involved. But the war did show that you had to go back to practical and the conventional weapons. Even today you find that the nations of the world are going back to conventional weapons. I'm not bringing arguments whether I am in favor or against war. I am probably more against war than any member of this house. I have said that every time that this resolution has come up. After spending eight months on my back in a hospital, I don't want to see war any more than others. I want to prevent war. As a company commander, commanding a group of soldiers in France, I can remember time and again when we did not have sufficient weapons to defend ourselves, where some of the men, probably some of your children, would be looking to me for help, advice, how we could defend ourselves with insufficient arms. Is it a question of defence we are looking at? We are not looking at a question of offense when you have to defend your home, your position, you have to look at it from a practical point of view.

How can you give guidance and assurance when you haven't got that proper defence, when you have but insufficient fire power? It has been mentioned time and again that we have been playing politics. If anyone has any idea of what tactics are and what strategy is, you have a different situation. The hon. member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) a moment ago mentioned this Liberal pamphlet that she had and that we have changed our opinions. This is the prerogative of military people in defence, to change their opinion because of the tactical situation, or the strategical situation.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many members on the government side of the house, the member for Kelsey (Mr. Brockelbank), the member for Last Mountain (Mr. Brown), Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder), Rosetown (Mr. Stevens) and Regina (Mr. Williams) those who have actually seen service, aren't altogether in agreement with what has been said in this house. They haven't got up and expressed themselves as to what is the true meaning of what is in their heart and soul. It was mentioned a moment ago that the Maginot line did not do what it was intended to do. That is true. It did what it was intended to do in that respect but the unguarded borders at the west end were left wide open for the aggressors to enter. That is what happened. We must defend ourselves.

And then the leader of the NDP says he believes in NATO and believes in NORAD, but he doesn't believe in defence.

An Hon. Member: — Who said that?

Mr. Coderre: — It has been said time and again. Mr. Douglas, the leader of the NDP said that we should meet our commitments with NATO, and to what extent: Can I send a man from my home town overseas, who is now in NATO forces, without the proper weapons to defend himself? I think I would be creating the most immoral injustice to that individual and to his family and his community if I would not permit him to defend himself properly, and to defend what he believes in and stands for — what I believe in and stand for. If we believe in NATO, if we believe in NORAD, let us do everything we can to properly defend our position in there; if we get out then we could become another Belgium, another Finland, Hungary, and many of these countries.

Some mention was made a while ago about Mr. Khrushchev having to withdraw from Cuba, and having to go back to the Russian people and tell them what the situation was. Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there was one soul in Russia knew what was going on. They haven't got a free press there. They didn't know what was going on; he had no explaining to do; he just had to face the world; but the people of Russia didn't know. In this country, thank God, we have a free press, that will present to the people the true facts as they see it, and as the people who are in the know will present it.

As I said, I have no speech on policies, or anything else, but I felt there was some questions that had to be answered. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) mentions in his speech that our only choice of survival is total disarmament. How did Belgium fare in the last war? They had no armament. What type of survival would it be if you would have atomic weapons and you were not prepared to defend yourself against them: You must defend yourselves against aggressor nations. United we will stand but divided we will fall. This is the opinion of the people of NATO and NORAD; that we must be united in our effort to defend ourselves against an aggressor. Then the hon. member said no man of good will can remain neutral. I'm quoting exactly the words he said "No man of good will can remain neutral"; the people of Canada are people of good will. We cannot remain neutral. We have commitments to make. We shall meet these commitments.

Then he went on and he said "Effective disarmament under effective control". The Liberal party of this country believes in effective disarmament and effective control. The people of the United States believe in effective disarmament and effective control. But an aggressor nation of the east does not believe in proper control. You have all heard in the press just recently, Khrushchev will not grant more than three inspections a year, they are seesawing for that. That nation has proved itself up to the present time to be an aggressor nation. If they are not prepared for proper inspections, we must be prepared for aggression on their part, because they have proven themselves aggressors so far and up to date.

March 21, 1963

Then some mention was made of the peace control or some such thing under the defence department. The defence department is there especially to defend the people of this country and whatever actions they take, and in my judgment and in the judgment of many people, they are trying to defend the country as best they can. And what they recommend to the country for defence, and they are the experts insofar as trying to defend the position of a country, I think that those of us who do not know too much about it should take their guidance. This is not a department of war, which you have in some countries, this is our defence department. They concern themselves with defence.

Then the hon. member said we will have no part to bring about total destruction. I will have no part either to bring about total destruction, but darn it all, I certainly want to defend myself, and whatever deterrent we may have, regardless of how small it is, it is one step forward in trying to prevent total destruction. That is what we are trying to do.

We could refer to the speech of the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), and what he had to say about these weapons that we have in the armed forces and what they are, their maximum range — they are defensive weapons.

He has shown you, because the danger of returning or going to conventional weapons is so new that these weapons can assist and prevent total destruction. Then the member for Cumberland (Mr. Berezowsky) brought out the wonderful argument — better be silent and accept our fate. I can't understand the member's thinking when he mentions such things. At all times he is popping up on his feet, time and again, to try and defend the actions of his government; surely to gosh he should and does believe in some form of defence. And then he condemns people who believe in defending their country.

Mr. I.H. McDougall (Souris-Estevan): — Bow and Arrow.

Mr. Coderre: — The people of Canada, Mr. Speaker, have always spoken for peace and always will seek peace. The Liberal party is a responsible party and as such will always seek peace in the world, but in the meantime we must defend ourselves.

He mentioned another thing — any kind of armament is evil and immoral. And still the Minister of Health in his capacity as the Minister of Health goes out with some form of armament which have been mentioned by the member from Weyburn: is that immoral? We find in Biblical quotations the question of arms has been brought up. Take for example last Sunday's gospel, Luke 11: 21-22, "When a strong man fully armed mounts guard over his home, his own palace, his goods are left in peace, but when a man comes who is stronger still, he will

take away all the honor that bred such confidence and divide amongst others the spoils of victory". It does mention some way that we must defend ourselves, both morally and physically.

And then some mention was made about the tremendous amount of money that we spent in defence. But no mention was made of what Khrushchev spends in defence and offensive weapons. Proportionately their budget is considerably higher than the budget of the free world in offensive weapons.

Let's look at both sides of the story.

And then he said, "If we could only rise in our morality." For nineteen hundred and some years we have tried to rise in that morality, and we are still trying to seek it. What are we trying to do, we are trying to establish a better world by defending our country. There was not mention at any time in the policies of the Liberal party whether we would have stock piles of "A" bombs and "H" bombs. It is a question of defending ourselves and our country. Is this an immoral thing to do? To defend ourselves? And then he mentions, lastly, something about a new moral order. I sometimes wonder what this new moral order that he mentions is. I thought that some nineteen hundred years ago the new moral order was Christian order, and now you have a new moral order. The new moral order, it seems to me, is to try and press its way upon this world, is to a totalitarian communist order. Was that the one he was referring to?

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, the attitude taken by members opposite, I'm sure that has been done for political motives only, particularly at this stage. If resolutions can be brought out, it should be said to everyone but it is directed to the political situation that has arisen in Canada today. Mention was made in all the speeches of the leader of the Liberal party getting his instructions from Washington; I wonder where they get their instructions. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I don't know where they get their instructions, I cannot support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mrs. G. Strum (Saskatoon City): — I do not wish to extend the debate, and the field has been so well covered by my colleagues that to repeat their arguments would be redundant. However, I wish to add my support to the resolution and I think perhaps at this point we should read the resolution again, and in passing I might say to the hon. member who has just taken his seat, when I took my seat in this house, I introduced this resolution, and every year since I have insisted that it be on the order paper. This year I got two new speakers to move and second it, but this is a resolution that I shall always support, in and out of this house. I am going to read it.

March 21, 1963

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.”

This has to do with the rejection of nuclear weapons. That is all this resolution says. It doesn't mention defensive weapons of conventional design, it just says that we do not want nuclear weapons on land, water or air, in the hands of Canadian forces.

In rising to support the motion, I do so with the feeling that there is a better chance today that the world may still find the road back to the rule of law, based upon justice, and that, when the history of this period is written, it will be said that the unleashing of atomic power marked the beginning of a serious search for peace, and a rejection of wars as a means of settling disputes.

That is — it is now becoming clear that because the bases are loaded and the forces ready to strike, and the results known ahead of time, atomic weapons cannot be used. Now, this is new in world policy. War has never been glorious, except for commanders. It has always been undertaken with some reluctance. Wars of the past were tests of power. There was the aggressor who was willing to gamble and the victim of aggression who was forced into a war of self-defence. But this is a new kind of world we live in today. Someone could win a war before the advent of the atomic bomb. To the victor went the right to impose penalties and reparations. The defeated country could be dismembered, occupied and policed, but this is a new age. The Cuban crisis showed this up. The world waited with bated breath when two great atomically armed nations faced each other over a narrow strip of water, and the Cuban situation proved what the scientists had said and what ordinary people of all nations have passionately protested — you dare not start an atomic war. You cannot win an atomic war. You cannot convincingly anymore even use the threat of atomic war. And insofar as the use of missiles will bring down on the head of the user the like missiles of the enemy, it is clear that they cannot be considered as weapons of defence, they are not a source of protection, but a means of deception, to obscure the issue and delay the time when the world will reject the rule of the bully and accept the rule of law, reinforced by a court of world opinion.

World opinion heard in the United Nations and echoed around the world is a new force in a world that is continually being reinforced by the emergence of new nations as the traditional colonial powers divest themselves of colonies and these colonies in return become independent states. These new states

now act as an ever increasing force, as a referee between the two great giants who are competing for friends and allies in the world, and they can only function through an organization like the United Nations which acts in a double capacity as an instrument of justice and as a sounding board to express the will, the voice, and the aspirations of people who are at last casting off the chains of colonial exploitation, and claiming the dignity and stature of political freedom.

These people like us, reject atomic weapons, and they want us to reject them too. If political freedom were all they had to strive for, their future would be more certain. They have the age old problems of superstition and custom and taboo. They lack tools and power.

The World Health Organization, under the United Nations has intensified the battle for food by removing some of the pestilence that has acted from time immemorial as a control on population. The same can be said about local sporadic warfare. From time immemorial, plagues, pestilence, famine and war have designated the number of primitive peoples and to some extent these have been brought under control. As a result, population growth has outstripped any gains made in producing more and better foods.

This present week has been proclaimed the "Freedom from Hunger" week on the request of the United Nations. The United Nations has named the sixties as the decade of development, in an attempt to accelerate the rate of growth in the world's food supplies. We have sold wheat to countries beyond the iron curtain, and no one can say that our motives were without self interest. To refuse to accept nuclear weapons, either on our own soil or in the international organizations like NATO or NORAD is still in self-interest, but, Mr. Speaker, I submit it is intelligent self-interest. To reject nuclear weapons is not the mark of cowardice, it is the mark of realism. To join the nuclear weapons club releases the brake; it will justify, yes, it will even force other countries to match us in striking power. The evidence of Rev. Floyd Holwett, a missionary returned from Japan and writing from Toronto, bears this out. He says, and I quote:

With respect to whether Canada should accept nuclear armaments, let me say a few words as a missionary who has been serving the church in Japan. I was in Japan several years ago when Japan was persuaded to accept the Honest John missile launcher and the 104 Starfighter, with the argument that Canada was also accepting these weapons without nuclear warheads. These were accepted by the government in spite of tremendous protest by the Japanese church and many Japanese people. As the one country which

March 21, 1963

experienced atomic warfare, they want no nuclear weapons of any kind. If Canada should accept nuclear arms, the pressure would immediately be put on Japan to do the same, and if Japan accepts them, immediately China would bring tremendous pressure to bear on Russia to give her atomic weapons for defence. And I hope that I'm not alive the day that China takes on atomic weapons.

Our acceptance of atomic weapons would only add to a force already super-charged with death and danger for friend and foe alike, but would help to undermine the growing urge to peace and law on the part of those nations taking their place for the first time on the stage of world history.

We can take a stand like Norway and Denmark. Countries that lie beside the "Great Bear" and in the shadow of the atomic bomb. Countries that were occupied during the last war. This stand will only inspire confidence. It is a stand appropriate to the new age of nuclear energy; a position that will stand the test of history.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Foley: — Mr. Speaker, I could not allow this motion on nuclear weapons to go unchallenged and, especially, the remarks of the hon. lady member from Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) in this regard.

As a member of the opposition I was very proud a few moments ago to be associated with the remarks of a man who has served his country so well as the hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) and I can think of no one in this legislature or in this province who can speak with more authority on the events in Europe during the second world war than the man who, on behalf of his country and on behalf of freedom, was grievously wounded in Holland and who spent many days recuperating from that wound. We are very happy he is here today and, once again may I say I am very proud to be associated with him in opposing a motion such as this.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper), the other day when she was speaking to explain to us why the leader of the communists in Russia, Mr. Khrushchev, backed down in Cuba. She didn't choose to answer. Why do we still have peace in the world today after that crisis? The answer, I think, is very elementary and very simple — because of the tremendous deterrent possessed by our neighbors to the south.

Certainly as a deterrent to war and while we are waiting for the day when Mr. Khrushchev and the other eastern leaders are prepared to sit down around a table and bargain with us sensibly and in a trustworthy fashion, I see no other course. Even as recently as a week ago, a former member of the CCF party in this legislature, in a letter to the Leader-Post, agreed that nuclear weapons for Canada and for the allied were the only practical and sensible deterrent to war, and I refer to Mr. Kemper, a former member of the CCF party in this legislature. I think that other hon. members to your right, Mr. Speaker, might do well to consult with one of the pioneers of their party in this province. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, remarks such as those made by speakers on your right in support of this motion can give no comfort to anyone in the western world today.

There is only one other political party, Mr. Speaker, who takes the attitude that this party takes; one other political party that is prepared to sacrifice practicability and principles for an ideal such as this, and I don't need to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the party that I refer to does not seek support in the western world.

Just a day or two ago in this legislature, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province, and the leader of the New Democratic Party in Saskatchewan held in his hand a book, the Book of Remembrance for the 100,000 young men who gave their lives during the Korean crisis and he stated, on behalf of the people of the province, his acceptance of this Book in Remembrance that it would be placed on display in the legislative library.

Mr. Speaker, when, on the one hand, the Hon. Premier can hold in his hand the Book of Remembrance of 100,000 young men who gave their lives in Korea, and yet, on the other, be a party to a motion from the party that he represents such as this is, in my opinion, sheer hypocrisy.

And as my colleague, the hon. member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), has stated, how those in this house who are members of the Canadian legion, an organization formed to dedicate itself to the future of those who have served in two world wars, can at the same time be a party to a motion such as this, again is beyond my understanding.

Certainly, those of us who have any regard or any appreciation for the contributions that have been made to our democratic way of life, to our freedom in our western world, in two world wars and the Korean crisis, cannot support a motion which suggests that we lower our barriers and expose Canada to whatever forces from without wish to come in.

In speaking to a gentleman of the political ideology of those on your right the other day, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman explained his stand in this way. He shrugs his shoulders

March 21, 1963

and he said "Well, I would rather be a communist than a cinder". This is the remark he used. Mr. Speaker, I find this to be a very disturbing idea indeed. These hon. members across the way, Mr. Speaker, think they can bargain with Mr. Khrushchev. This gentleman to whom I refer said, "Oh well, he is not so bad, a great improvement over Stalin." Mr. Speaker, Stalin was a piker compared to Mr. Khrushchev. We have only to look at what has happened to the people in Hungary and in those other parts of the world where we have communist domination to answer that question.

So, I say, Mr. Speaker, the reason that the lady member for Regina (Mrs. Cooper) and again the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) could not answer the question, Why did Mr. Khrushchev back down in Cuba? was simply because it struck at the very root of the argument they tried to present to this legislature.

So, I say, Mr. Speaker, if the government of this province, the party who sit to your right, are going to continue to maintain on display in our library, books of remembrance for the many thousands of young men who died for our freedom, how then can they be a party to a motion which purports to send our young men over on a front line to be on defence in Europe armed with slingshots. This is a suggestion, Mr. Speaker. This is the purport of this type of motion. I believe if we are going to properly support NORAD and the Atlantic alliance; if we are going to do our share in co-operation with our neighbors to the south with whom we have had peaceful relations for many years, then I think it is our responsibility to make available such strategic positions and to place at the disposal of the defence of North America those portions of our economy which are necessary, and above all to use whatever technical, diplomatic and moral weapons that we may have at our disposal to protect this soil for our children and our children's children against those would-be aggressors from the eastern world.

I believe that Canada is fortunate today to have a leader in the person of Lester Pearson, who has had the courage to come forward in Canada's time of need with a firm, articulate and courageous defence policy. At the time when Canada's morale has sagged in other dominions, in other nations, Lester Pearson has shone like a new star in Canada, and I predict, Mr. Speaker, that for his actions in this regard alone that he will become the next Prime Minister of Canada make no mistake about that.

For those reasons, Mr. Speaker, and on behalf of the members of the Canadian Legion from this side of the house and all those who died in two world wars for our freedom, I must oppose this motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.R. Barrie (Pelly): — It was not my intention to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, but being both disappointed and very surprised at the attitudes of the people opposite in connection with this particular regard, I wish to add a little to the debate before the vote is taken.

I'm surprised, first, at the lack of realism by the parties opposite. I'm sure they are not so naïve, Mr. Speaker, as to not realize the threat there is to our way of life by a power in this world whose ideologies are quite different to ours, by a power who has as an objective the forcing of, if necessary, on all the people in the world, Canadians included, their political philosophies and their particular way of life. And I am surprised too at the people on the opposite side of the house, Mr. Speaker, should rise up in this house and set themselves up as experts and authorities on defence and military matters.

I certainly know nothing about it. I certainly know nothing about that kind of thing. I don't propose to make any suggestions that I do.

I also have to refer to the references made by members opposite about love and charity. I think they should practice a little of what they preach, particularly in connection with their references to members on this side of the house when someone has the courage, or dares to stand up and differ with their opinions. The sarcasm and bitter barbs that they have directed, particularly to the member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley), in this particular debate. I think they should practice something of what they preach.

I think back in very recent history, something that is well known to every member of this house, about a people who were indoctrinated for years by their leaders in another part of the world with similar attitudes to those expressed by the members opposite, where pacifism and turn the other cheek was the theory, more or less, which was propounded by their leaders for years. I refer to India. Very recently we know that their enemy, and our enemy too, realized the weakness of India due to the policies they had carried out — and India had even gone so far as leaders, Krishna Menon, Nehru and those before him, to criticize the other nations in the world who saw fit to proceed and protect themselves in the case of attack, and these people, of course, carried out a program, carried out their theories to a very large extent, with the result that their neighbor seeing their weakness, proceeded to take advantage of that weakness and started to invade the territory belonging to that particular country. What happened then? These pacifists, they didn't turn the other cheek. They began to scream to high heaven, to the United States of America, to Great Britain, and other countries in the western

March 21, 1963

world, to come to their protection and assistance. And if it hadn't been for the assurances that were willingly given to Nehru and his government, and the people of India, then I am afraid that the maps would be a lot different today than if that assistance had been withheld.

Now, I turn to my friends from the opposite side. Apparently their attitude with regard to the defence of this country is something very similar. If we are going to defend ourselves in the event of attack by anyone from the outside, then I think that we should have the most modern and up-to-date weapons that we possibly can obtain. The modern and up-to-date weapons today are nuclear weapons, whether they be large or whether they be small. I am wondering just what would happen if the policies of defence in this country were left in the hands of people such as I see opposite, with their particular attitude.

And what would be the result if we were attacked? These same people would be the very first people to be out screaming as did Nehru and his associates in India, screaming to NATO, to United States, and to every other country in the western world to come to our defence and to come and help us protect ourselves.

Certainly this would be a most embarrassing position to be in. Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not one who advocates war, for I abhor anything that is really militaristic and of a nature that would cause any international or continental trouble in any part of the world. But I certainly believe in this, that we as Canadians, loyal to this country and believing in the principles and the institutions of this country and what they stand for, certainly should take and recognize the fact that we are being observed, not only observed as to what stand we take but we are one of the plums left in the world today. We would be one of the first territories probably that an attempt would be made in order to occupy. And in that particular connection, if such a thing happened, I hope that every Canadian, young and old, would have the courage to stand up and fight for what our fathers and our forefathers before us, left us as a heritage in this country. I hope that we wouldn't have people burying their heads in the sand at that time. If that time ever arrives, and it may arrive sooner than most of us expect, if that time arrives, I hope that we will have something to fight with.

Mr. Speaker, just before I resume my seat, I would like to point out to my friends opposite, the responsibility they have assumed in their particular attitude expressed in this.

Mr. Speaker, I will oppose the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. R.A. Walker (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I think that I would like to comment on just one or two of the remarks in the beginning that were made from the other side.

First of all, the member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre), said that in the thirties we were assured that war, any war would be very brief because of the preponderance of air power and modern military. . .

Mr. Coderre: — On a point of privilege. I did not say what you quoted just now, I said it was the opinion of many people — you can check the records — I said it was the opinion of many people.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — That is what I thought I said, Mr. Speaker — and perhaps I did not make myself very clear — that because of the large air armadas that were thought to be in existence, war would only be a matter of days. Well, I don't know who propagated that notion, Mr. Speaker, but as I recall it that was a notion that was propagated by the exponents of air power themselves. The people who were arguing for a larger air force were putting it out that this would make war very brief, very short. These are the very same people, Mr. Speaker — General Norstad and others like him — who are telling us today that it is possible for America to win an atomic war. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought be as chary of accepting their theories today as the member for Gravelbourg is about accepting the view that they expressed in the thirties.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg, I think it was, said that in this changing technology of war, military experts are entitled to change their minds, that these changes of mind come about very rapidly, very suddenly.

Well, I have here a clipping from the Leader-Post of January 14, and the heading is “Policy surprises Manitoba Party”, and the opinion paragraph of the story reads as follows:

Liberal leader Pearson's support of nuclear arms for Canadian forces caught Manitoba Liberals by surprise.

They were having a convention in Winnipeg that day, Mr. Speaker, and an hour before Mr. Pearson's announcement in Toronto on Saturday, the Manitoba party tabled their resolution which said substantially the same thing.

After luncheon as the news of the Pearson announcement spread, the resolution was brought up again, and passed with an amendment supporting the federal leader's stand.

March 21, 1963

We suggest, Mr. Speaker, it isn't just military men who are capable of changing their mind about military questions.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that we must be prepared to defend ourselves, that we must have the most modern and up-to-date weapons. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that defending ourselves doesn't consist of just shouting Rah-Rah-Rah for anything a general says. If we are going to have the most modern, up-to-date weapons, then I suppose we should remember that 50 megaton bombs are more modern and up-to-date than 10 megaton bombs. I'll say a little more about that a little later.

But to have members complaining, as one member did, that we ought not to call our military establishment a war department, that it should be called a defence department — well, Mr. Speaker, we can call it what we will, more euphemisms do not change the substance any, and it is traditional for us to call our defence department in peace time a Defence Department, and in war time, the Department of War.

Calling names, or trying to change the meaning of words, the so-called “double-think” doesn't really change the reality of the facts. Calling Mr. Khrushchev a “piker”. Well, Mr. Khrushchev may be one of the most evil men in the world today for all I know, and certainly those who brandish his nuclear arms are in that category.

We are asked why did Khrushchev back down during the Cuban crisis, and the answer is, of course, that he backed down because he either didn't have the courage to launch a nuclear war or he had more sense than to launch a nuclear war, and whichever it was, I suggest that it isn't quite my idea of a sound state of affairs for this world to be in when that decision of Mr. Khrushchev had to decide whether I and my children were going to live.

I suggest that it is a sad state of affairs if my hon. friends opposite are prepared to tolerate the continuance of this kind of situation, where our very lives depend upon the choice which some mad man in the Kremlin might make, and this is the kind of choice apparently which the member for Turtleford (Mr. Foley) is willing to accept. He is prepared to accept the continuance of this kind of situation.

Mr. Coderre: — On a point of order. The choice that was made was made by the western world in providing a deterrent.

Mr. Speaker: — Order!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not going to indulge in the kind of belittling effort that was being done here today by suggesting that anyone in this house is deriving his opinion

on these matters from source outside this house. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members opposite will find that it does them little credit to suggest, as some of them have done here today, that there is something sinister or mysterious about the view that this party takes on nuclear disarmament.

This party's view has been well known. This party has run in elections and faced defeat rather than to compromise this principle, and the hon. members needn't look to us and say that we are taking our thinking from outside. Surely this clipping suggests that those who live in glass houses had better not throw stones. Mr. Speaker, this is not only belittling to this legislature that that kind of argument should be used, it is belittling to the person who uses it.

I think that there isn't anyone who will question, Mr. Speaker — who is honest and conscientious with himself — that will question the assertion that there is just as much loyalty and just as much patriotism on this side of the house as there is on the other side. Mr. Speaker, I think it was Sir John A. Macdonald, who once said that patriotism is the last resort of a scoundrel.

We are considering here the very important question of whether or not we should accept nuclear arms in Canada and in the hands of Canada's NATO forces. We should, I think, concede that this is a debatable subject. It is perfectly possible for a loyal and a patriotic Canadian to debate on either side of this question. I believe that differences of opinion on this question, if they are honestly held, must be based upon a confused or an incomplete understanding of the facts of nuclear war and of Canada's role in such a war. I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that any sane Canadian, truly aware of the gravity of this issue before us now, would indulge in petty or partisan attacks on the integrity and loyalty of members on the other side of the argument. This question is such a grave one, and the consequences of this decision are so great to every Canadian and his family, that I don't think anyone, any sane Canadian would deliberately follow a party line which throws their survival into jeopardy.

I don't accept the proposition, Mr. Speaker, that only scientists and generals have a right to debate this question. It is true that defence is not one of the matters "coming within the classes of subjects assigned to the provincial legislature" under the British North American Act. That is perfectly true, I believe, nevertheless, that this is a proper subject for debate in any forum where intelligent human beings may meet. It is a proper subject for contemplation at every hearth, and a proper subject for prayerful thought in every place of worship.

The member from Moose Jaw (Mr. Snyder) has quoted what His Holiness said on this subject "the suicidal madness". Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is a natural law of every

March 21, 1963

living organism to struggle to survive and to perpetuate its species, and I believe that no political party, no government, no human institution, no “ism” — capitalism, communism, patriotism, or any other ism — can deprive us of the right as individuals to exercise our own judgment as to how we can best survive and pass this world on to our successors.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Walker: — The state has always been vested with the power to punish the traditional crimes. Our generation for the first time had to define the crime of genocide — a crime which was more monstrous than all the murders in human history. Our generation had to establish a court and to endow it with the power to punish that crime. Although the law had not been defined at the time that the acts were committed, those acts constituted such a grave offense against the conscience of all mankind that the law was taken to have existed even before it was promulgated, and the court was taken to have ex post facto jurisdiction.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is not too much to say that any person today who aids or abets in any way the mass extermination of mankind is guilty of the ultimate crime. As with Eichmann, we will not be able to plead that we were acting in obedience to some secular law, or that we did not directly participate in tying up the last thread in the fabric of the crime. Unlike the minions of Nazi Germany, we profess to be free. We are now going through an electoral process which we proudly claim is an exercise of freedom of choice. Nuclear arms for Canada, Mr. Speaker, is the principle issue in that election.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to act rationally when confronted with this choice that faces us as electors, we must clearly understand the reality of the choice before us. We must admit to ourselves the fundamental fact of the 1960's that a war between the United States and the Soviet Union will destroy us. It means that you and I, and everyone we know, may die of blast, of fire, of radiation, of starvation, or exposure.

Needless to say, no one can demonstrate conclusively that these statements are true, but I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that many people are blissfully unaware of the consensus of scientific fact on this subject. Scientists and military men have expressed their opinion on this subject. Let me refer first to the testimony of Dr. William Kellogg, a physicist of the Rand Corporation — no communist, he — who testified before the special sub committee on radiation, of the joint congressional committee on atomic energy in 1957, as follows and I quote this summary of his evidence on page 135 of Dr. Linus Pauling's book “No More War”.

They, Dr. Kellogg and Mr. Charles Schaffer, described in some detail the predicted effects of a hypothetical attack on the United States. This was in 1957, Mr. Speaker.

It was assumed that 250 bombs would be dropped on 144 areas of attack; 53 of the areas were basically population and industrial centres, 59 areas were basically military installations, and the remaining 32 areas contained both military and population objectives. The bombs were assumed to be super bombs averaging 10 megatons. Now, the average is 20, and totalling 2,500 megatons. If the air defence command were effective in knocking down 50 percent of the invading bomber aircraft, this would imply that there were 500 in the original attack, a number well within the capability of that time. (On this basis, Mr. Speaker, it should be remembered that this estimate is now six years old.) It was estimated that on the day of the war there would be 42 million people die and another 40 million would die within the next two months from injuries received from blasts, fire and radiation. These are our American cousins who will be in this number of 82 million people.

Dr. Pauling quotes Dr. Joseph Rutblat, professor of physics in the medical college, St. Bartholomew's Hospital at London, as suggesting in an article in the January, 1958 issue, a year later, of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, that by 1965 an attack on the United States of ten times the intensity referred to by Dr. Kellogg would be possible. Next year will be 1965.

Two years later General John Maderis was testifying before the U.S. congressional committee, the same committee, and he estimated that the nuclear stockpile in the United States at that time was in excess of 25,000 megatons. A megaton is the equivalent of a million tons of T.N.T. Twenty-five million tons of T.N.T. Divide it out by the world's population — about one ton for every man, woman and child.

Since the Soviet's were the first to perfect the hydrogen bomb, it is fair to say that their stockpile was probably as great as that. Both of these figures will be out of date today. If we assume that General Maderis knew what he was talking about, it means that the Soviet Union and the United States each had in a nuclear stockpile the equivalent in explosive power to 8,000 tons or 16 million pounds of T.N.T. for each square mile of the area in the other's territory. It should be remembered that that number has increased vastly since that time. The number of hydrogen bombs has at least doubled since that time.

March 21, 1963

The statement, Mr. Speaker, that each side has the explosive capability sufficient to land or to spread 8,000 tons of T.N.T. on each square mile of the other's territory comes into focus when we remember that less than half that tonnage of T.N.T. was involved in the Halifax explosion. The Halifax explosion occurred two miles out from the docks and it devastated the city of Halifax, as you will remember. Twice that much for every square mile in our continent's area. This, presuming it could be distributed uniformly over the continent, which of course it can't be with precision, but this would result in the burning of every inflammable thing on North America, including the humus in the soil.

Well, Mr. Speaker, any talk about being strong and having the best weapons available, is pure rubbish in the light of those facts. I have here the United States News and World Report. They did a review in 1961, November, of the nuclear capability of the Soviet Union and of the United States. While it is true that it is expected that the capability of the United States is greater than that of the Soviet Union, the significant thing about these two reviews made just one year apart is that the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles in the Soviet Union has increased by 25 in that year from 75 to 100.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a hundred of these missiles with a 20 megaton warhead amounts to something like 670 tons of T.N.T. for every square mile in the United States. This is what was acknowledged by the American Defence Department to be in the hands of the Russians in August of 1962. The number continues to grow. Why, I can't imagine. I can't imagine why any more are needed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is no mystery about this. One doesn't need to be in any doubt about the effectiveness of these weapons. No defence has been perfected against intercontinental ballistic missiles. There is no defence, there is no answer to this. If war breaks out, there is no answer to it.

The United States secretary of Defence has testified as recently as this winter that the rapid growth in the nuclear stockpile in the United States is sufficient to kill all the people of the Soviet Union six times over, if evenly distributed over that country. Undoubtedly the same thing can be said for the nuclear stockpile of the Soviet Union — they have only about half as much area to cover.

A study recently released by the U.S. Defence Department published in the journal "Operation Research" is reported in the book of Dr. Ralph Labb — the book entitled "Kill and Overkill". I think I will read three paragraphs. The report explains that the formulas used by the authors, that is the authors of the journal "Operations

Research” to estimate the fall-out effects — and this has nothing to do with blast or fire — were based on information from the Rand Corporation. It goes on to say

A method of optimally distributing weapons among large areas in order to maximize radiation casualties is deduced on the basis of the formulas and curves are exhibited expressing the casualties produced as a function of total yield delivered.

The author’s highly complex mathematical analysis is couched in Greek symbols and complex formulas but one does not have to be a mathematician or a weapons expert to understand their curves. These curves tell a story of life and death for the populations of the United States and the Soviet Union in nuclear war.

They plot the proportion of the population which would die from fall-out radiation within 60 days after megaton attacks of various severities. A 50,000 megaton attack would kill virtually the entire population of the United States or the U.S.S.R. regardless of how it was distributed over the country. Even a 10,000 megaton strike would leave comparatively few survivors.”

The analysts point out that the figures they have given are not the total toll for that would not take into account the longer term radiation casualties after sixty days from such delayed effects as the disorganization of society, extinction of livestock, genetic damage and the slow development of radiation poisoning from ingestion of radioactive materials.

Since the 10 thousand megaton strike, Mr. Speaker, is well within the limits and capabilities of both the United States and the Soviet Union, and since it would leave very few survivors, and from an examination of the graph it would appear to be less than ten percent of the population on either side, most would probably die from such delayed effects — that is most of the ten per cent of the survivors would probably die from such delayed effects as the poisoning of the livestock and freezing and starvation and so on.

Only a fool would be under any illusions about winning a nuclear war, Mr. Speaker. All hon. members may have referred to the Toronto Star issue of this week. While

March 21, 1963

it is an editorial it does cite authorities for the statements which it makes. It may not have been read by all hon. members and I would like to put three or four paragraphs on the record.

Some facts are no longer debatable. The foremost of these is if a nuclear war breaks out the world as we know it will cease to exist. As Mr. Green proclaimed to Parliament, if there is a nuclear war we are in for it. By Premier Khrushchev's reckoning 700 to 800 million men, women and children would die. No one has quarrelled with this frightening estimate. Not even the most imaginative mind can truly envisage the enormity of such a catastrophe. Multiply the horrors of Hiroshima almost endlessly and a faint picture of the reality of nuclear war begins to appear. Once such a war started there would be no place to hide. There would be no defence against hydrogen bombs flung across continents by ballistic missiles. In the words of the U.S. Secretary of Defence, Robert McNamara, and I quote, 'No amount of money can make possible an absolute defence of this country against inter continental ballistic missiles.' The awesome truth is that each of the world's two great thermo-nuclear powers possesses the capacity to destroy the other and lacks the means of preventing its own destruction. The threat this poses to our survival was recently described by Mr. McNamara in these words. 'The expanding arsenals of nuclear weapons on both sides of the Iron Curtain have created an extremely dangerous situation not only for their possessors but also for the entire world. As the great arms race continues and the weapons multiply and become more swift and deadly, the possibility of global catastrophe by miscalculation or design becomes ever more real.'

And I ask that you mark these words carefully, Mr. Speaker. More armaments he warned cannot solve this dilemma. Mr. Speaker, I call the United States Secretary of Defence in testimony in support of this resolution.

In this situation, Mr. Speaker, war is as fruitful a means of settling our disagreements with the Soviet Union as if two men were sitting on a powder keg, each with a push button wired to the same detonator, and arguing about the relative merits of the political philosophy which each adheres to.

Lest it be thought, Mr. Speaker, that the authorities which I have read were selected with the object of being frightening, with the objective of presenting a lop-sided picture of the situation, I can only invite hon. members to produce any credible and reputable party who challenges the statement which is made by the well-known biologist, Dr. Bentley Glass, who is a member of the Atomic Energy Advisory Committee on Biology and Medicine, when he said, in an address at a Congress of Scientists on Survival held in New York. And this is reported in Dr. Lapp's book 'Kill and Overkill' at page 102. And I quote from Dr. Glass.

In the absence of fall-out shelters for animals, all wild and domestic animals in the combatant countries would be exposed to lethal doses of radiation. Not only would the milk and meat supply go with the cattle, but an even greater disaster would be the destruction of the birds. Without birds to feed on them, the insects would multiply catastrophically. The insects, not man or other proud species, they are the only ones really fitted for survival in the nuclear age. They and bacteria are enormously radiation-resistant. Let a man absorb 600 roenygens and he perishes soon and miserably, but 100,000 roentgens may not discomfort an insect in the least. The cockroach, a venerable and hardy species, will take over the habitations of the foolish humans and compete only with other insects and bacteria."

In the light of this speech, Mr. Speaker, surely the advantages which the Russians claim for communism and the advantages which we claim for free enterprise become about as irrelevant as the competing claims of the Plantagenets and the Lancastrians for the throne of England. Their wars lasted more than a generation and devastated the ruling classes of England.

The conflict between ideologies, Mr. Speaker, is, I submit, secondary to the question, Can man regain control of the juggernaut he has released?

You ask, Mr. Speaker, if we have not created some stability and some peace through the massive deterrent. And of course we have to concede that the Americans and the Russians, undoubtedly, in the past ten years have pressed their influence beyond the point which the other was willing to tolerate has it not been for this massive deterrent. Indeed, it is quite likely that the expansionist tendencies of Russia were curtailed by the deterrent, but can this uneasy stalemate of terror be described as peace? Experts now tell us that the chance of an accidental launching of nuclear war are about one in ten every year.

March 21, 1963

Well, Mr. Speaker, sage and wise thinkers have told us that ten years at this rate is just about all you can expect. A chance of accidental nuclear war or nuclear war released by the uninstructed, unauthorized act of some mad man with access to a trigger is too great a risk I think for the world to endure.

President Kennedy aptly described the situation when he addressed the United Nations on September 25, 1961, as follows. He said:

Every man, woman and child lives under a nuclear sword, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident, miscalculation or madness.”

Such a condition I submit does not provide any possibility for the flowering of human civilization or of peace and happiness for the family of man.

We must ask ourselves quite candidly and frankly — brutally — whether nuclear arms for Canada would make Canada any more secure in case of a nuclear war. Everyone will remember that in the battle of Britain anti-aircraft batteries were capable of bringing down five to ten per cent of the marauding Luftwaffe. As the war went on the aircraft improved and the anti-aircraft artillery improved, but the percentage remained roughly the same. Indeed, the high-speed jet bomber enjoyed just about the same balance in relation to modern anti-aircraft rockets that the Luftwaffe enjoyed over British anti-aircraft artillery.

Low-level bombers today, it is conceded by the military experts, come in over a target at low levels without even being detected by radar with comparative freedom. But when guided missiles, such as the Bomarc, came on the scene five or six years ago, it was already conceded by the military experts that the aircraft against which they were designed were already rendered obsolescent by the intercontinental ballistic missile. As defence against intercontinental ballistic missiles, the most that we have is the Nike Zeus — an anti-missile missile — and it is said that it may intercept and destroy a percentage of intercontinental ballistic missiles. We are told that there are three large radar stations in the Arctic screening the western hemisphere and designed to give 15 or 20 minutes warning of a missile attack launched by the Soviet Union. But it is not alleged that there is any such similar warning of missiles fired at the United States from nuclear armed submarines in the Pacific or the Atlantic.

The very nature of the problem, Mr. Speaker, is such that the most one could expect is that a certain percentage of these ICBM's could be brought down or intercepted. It is

acknowledged that many of the counter-measures that the other side is capable of taking are almost unlimited measures to confuse the radar warning screens as to just what is coming; capable of circumventing the warning system entirely. But even assuming that we were successful in intercepting half of these ICBM's no one is bold enough to make the claim, but assuming that it is possible, this may be counteracted by simply doubling the number that are launched, and if the percentage of interception rises to 75 percent, this can be remedied by the other side by simply quadrupling the number that are launched.

Mr. Foley: — We keep our self-respect trying, anyway.

Hon. Mr. Walker: — There is no practical limit, Mr. Speaker. Well, there will be nobody around to see if my friend has got his self-respect intact or not.

I think the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that there is no known limit to the number of these missiles that any potential war-making nation can have. The number is unlimited and if we have the device for bringing down three out of every four, all they have to do is send four times as many over. The fact that President Kennedy is able to say we now are able to overkill the Soviet Union six times over, and the Soviet Union say that even with a third of theirs getting through they can wipe us out.

There is no defence then against intercontinental ballistic missiles. Unless someone can devise an airtight shield then there is no defence, and no one has devised such a shield and the obvious military planning is not based on any expectation that any such shield is likely to be produced. We have the word of the military experts that there is no solution — Secretary McNamara says that you can spend any amount of money and you can't provide this shield.

Then we have to face the problem of bombs launched from orbiting satellites. This is an even more challenging menace.

In view of this situation, Mr. Speaker — I think I have described the situation objectively — what should be Canada's defence policy? It is argued that no one has ever proposed that Canada should adopt offensive nuclear weapons. We heard that argument this afternoon again. This, Mr. Speaker, is mere hair-splitting. These nuclear warheads, if they are to be used, will add to the radiation level in the event of nuclear war. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Starfighter, nuclear-armed, is a tactical defence weapon of the nuclear deterrent, and it is capable of flying from European bases deep into the heart of Russia and unloading Hiroshima-size atomic

March 21, 1963

bombs. It is, therefore, not correct to say that there is no suggestion that we give nuclear weapons to offensive forces under Canada's control. Nor can it be said that these weapons in the hands of Canadian forces would add to the effectiveness or the credibility of the deterrent, because we are told that we have the maximum deterrent, we have the power now to completely and mutually annihilate one another. There can be no greater deterrent I should think.

On the other hand, if we accept these nuclear warheads on the Bomarc missiles and on the Honest John and the Starfighter, the CF104G Starfighter in Europe, then there is no logical reason why we should refuse to accept the Nike Zeus anti-missile missile, there is no logical reason why we should refuse to allow it to be installed in Canada's northern territory and, if we do that, there is no logical reason why we should not allow the Americans to install all kinds of ICBM's in northern Canada. This, I submit, would gravely disturb the balance of terror if, as it was claimed by President Kennedy during the Cuban crisis, the nuclear stalemate depends upon preserving the razor's edge of balance between the nuclear powers. If it can be said that the United States was justified in threatening an atomic war in response to the installation of nuclear missile bases in Cuba, then precisely the same logic applies on the other side against ceding to the United States nuclear launching sites on Canadian soil, Mr. Speaker.

Most of the smaller nations of the world have refused to acquire nuclear weapons on the grounds that they do not wish to see the possession of nuclear weapons becoming widespread. It takes no imagination at all to see the added risk of accidental or calculated aggression from enlarging the number of members in the nuclear club.

It is true that the present proposal is that the weapons should remain under the control of the American forces. This can hardly be regarded as reassuring by most of the nations of the world, I believe, for most of them I am sure would prefer, if they are to be here, that they be under the control of the Canadian forces; most people, I think rightly, place more confidence in the restraint of Canadians in situations of international tension. In any event, by accepting them on any basis, we would be depriving ourselves of the anti-nuclear stance which we have been able to maintain in the peace councils of the world.

I suggest a further reason, Mr. Speaker, why we ought not to accept nuclear weapons upon our soil. And it is the reason put forth by James N. Minifie, no communist he, in his book "Peacemaker or Powder Monkey". He says that all nations might well profit from the advice which George Washington gave in his farewell address to the United States on his retirement from office, and this is a quotation from that farewell message:

It is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more.

Or, unarmed Bomarc. Those are my words.

There can be no greater error, Washington said, than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.”

If Washington’s sage advice is to be heeded, then Canada must choose her policy on the basis of national self-interest alone.

We are entitled to analyze the reasons for the U.S. attempt to place nuclear weapons in Canada, to involve us in the nuclear partnership, and to analyze whether those reasons coincide with Canada’s national self-interest.

Mr. Minifee tells us at page 123 about the German scientist Von Braun, brilliant rocket scientist who was captured by the U.S. army after World War II, and was brought home to the United States to work on missiles for America. He said that Von Braun told a senate committee in 1957 of his hope to build a series of underground launching pads where the rockets on the English Channel could be launched with laboratory precision and then wheeled out to the launching pad for firing under ideal conditions. The German army, however, overruled the scientist, claiming that the R.A.F. would simply bomb these launching pads out of existence. In a spirit of compromise some of them were placed in concrete pens on the shore of the English Channel and others were placed on portable, movable launching platforms in the interior. He said that the R.A.F. bombed every one of the fixed launching sites on the English Channel and every one of the mobile launching units paid off. And he goes on to say, and I quote:

This is a small facet hitherto ignored of World War II but it is also the answer to NATO’s plan for establishing six rocket bases. Missiles will be zeroed in on them from the start. No matter how sturdy they have no chance of surviving uranium bombs of kiloton magnitude, much less hydrogen bombs of megaton size. Von Braun’s testimony revealed that the NATO plan or rather the American plan rammed down NATO’s

March 21, 1963

reluctant throat, was to dilute the attack on the continental United States at the cost of the complete destruction, the extermination, the obliteration of its allies. This is readily enough admitted in private by military men, Miniffee says. For obvious reasons, this murderous arithmetic is not paraded in public. The American plan is the simple military concept that every effort should be made to induce or force the enemy to expend his strength on secondary objectives, leaving the primary target relatively free from attack, and the primary target in this case is U.S. territory and U.S. industrial capacity; it is the old military principle that it is always a good idea to do your fighting on other people's real estate. If the Russians are forced to use many warheads to take out U.S. missile bases scattered all over creation, they will have fewer for use against the U.S. heartland.

He goes on and says,

While the fixed launchers in Europe are designed to deflect enemy missiles from the U.S. heartland, the DEW line and its ancillary lines across Canada are designed to bring down bombers coming over the Pole before they reach the heartland. The same logic applies to the Bomarc missile bases being constructed near North Bay and Ottawa — areas to avoid in cases of hostility.

He says,

It does not matter that a stick of nuclear bombs released from a bomber under attack in the Canadian northland could wipe out the population of Saskatchewan and make its farm lands unusable for years. The American point of view is that better Saskatchewan than North Dakota, better Winnipeg than Chicago. Powder monkeys are expendable.

Western Europeans do not need a letter from Khrushchev to acquaint them with these facts, hence their reluctance to receive American protection, but the Canadian public is less aware of the unnecessary dangers to which the NATO alliance exposes it. For one thing Canadian views and opinions are largely based on United States magazines, newspapers, books and radio, and these have naturally been

stressing the protective function of NATO rather than its exterminative, distribute-the-target function. Consequently the average American and the average Canadian along with him thinks the NATO alliance is essentially for the protection of Western Europe, and regards it as a rather altruistic provision of money, men and weapons for the defence of those ungrateful fellows. There is rather a tendency in these days of tight money and unbalanced budgets to say, Oh, let them go then if they don't want to play ball. To counter this tendency, American arguments come as close to telling the real story as you can get without really putting it in unacceptable terms.

Wilbur Brucker, for instance, the Secretary of the U.S. Army and a tough-minded man, told a Senate committee that it would be national suicide for the United States to retract its forces to the confines of the North American continent for they, together with the American people in industries, would constitute an extremely vulnerable target.

Although Mr. Minifiee was aiming his arguments at the proposition that Canada should get out of NATO, his argument I think Mr. Speaker, applies even more cogently to the question of whether Canada should accept nuclear warheads and the establishment of nuclear launching sites in this country.

It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to argue against the adoption of nuclear weapons in Canada unless Canadians are prepared to see for Canada a positive role in the achievement of world peace, and the survival of mankind.

What can Canada do to preserve peace? I don't pretend to have any exhaustive list of the answers, Mr. Speaker, but there are some things that I can think of. I know that there are thousands of Canadians who occupy battle stations in remote parts of the world where they service in policing actions for the United Nations. Canada has never owned a colony; Canada has never overturned a banana republic for the greater profits of Canadian investors; and for these reasons I suggest that Canadian forces are extraordinarily well-qualified for United Nations police action.

Canada is a country which educates enormous numbers of engineers and doctors, architects and scientists of all kinds who migrate annually to the United States. I suggest that we could do much more for the cause of peace if we enlarged our educational institutions, our training facilities instead of supplying personnel for the hungry maw of capitalism; if we would use a larger portion of the training facilities we have, together with the increased student output, to provide scientific and technical missions to aid the restless and

March 21, 1963

hungry people of the world to aid in some measure of industrial development. This would be a far greater contribution to world peace than anything else that I have heard proposed recently.

Canada is endowed with tremendous agricultural resources, probably the productive capacity of our agricultural industry is greater per capita than is to be found anywhere else in the world. These food resources, I suggest, must be mobilized to win the battle against hunger and want and to nourish these feeble, industrial economies of under-developed parts of the world.

Thousands of skilled Canadians are without work. Those who are not needed and cannot be used in a revitalized Canadian economy should be invited to go on missions to serve as temporary foremen and instructors in the infant industries which somehow must be established in the less well-developed parts of the world.

There are many other constructive roles which Canada can play and this is what we should be doing with our time, with our money and with our energy — devising ways and means, not of throwing out our chests and bragging that we will have the best weapons in the world; not by cheering on the militarists who say that in this atomic graveyard, Canada will be first.

Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis, the position of the unilateral disarmers is the only one which accords with the precepts of the Christian faith. I think every member of the house must agree to that, but I think that we can escape from the tangled web into which we have now got ourselves and reach disarmament and peace only by progressing by one logical step at a time. The rejection of nuclear arms for Canada, I suggest, is the first step in that sequence. The alternative policies which I have mentioned could be added to over and over again. We must give Canadians the opportunity which they seek to play a positive role in halting the suicidal march referred to by His Holiness, and building a world where our people, where our children will flourish and prosper.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we can't reach that goal in a single week, we must earn our way as we go. We can commence to earn our way if we are prepared to renounce emotional and passionate judgment on these important questions. We can earn our way only if we honestly and objectively examine our motives. We must ask ourselves on every policy question, is it a step away from war and toward disarmament? Is it a step away from selfishness toward generosity and charity? Is it a step away from domination toward equality? Is it a step away from fear and hatred toward love and trust? Only, Mr. Speaker, if we

can thus reform our national objectives and our national conduct and bring them into accord with the spirit of the brotherhood of man can we hope to survive this generation.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.W. Gardiner (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one or two words with regard to the question that is before the house at this time.

We have listened not too closely I don't think to the remarks of the last speaker who read a lot into the records of the house, but I am certain any of us can read from day to day if we pick up the same periodicals and want to read. I am quite certain that most of us are here to express our own opinions, give our own ideas and that the time of this house should not be wasted with nonsense and with time-killing, with reading into the records of the house statements from people all over the world for which anyone on this side of the house could find another expert who could give another opinion on the very same matter.

However, I would like to get back to the original purpose for which I think this motion was moved — the arguments of the original mover that I think have been forgotten about almost entirely since the discussion has begun, and that is the moralistic argument that was used by the mover of this motion as the reason why we should support the motion that is now before us.

We have heard a great deal this afternoon about a difference of opinion among military people as to whether or not the Bomarc missile will be useful or useless if a war were to come. We have heard many opinions from military experts read into the records of the house as to whether or not Canada should get into the field of nuclear weapons with certain other nations in the world at the present time. But there have been very few that have stated that if there is a difference of opinion in the military field with regard to nuclear weapons, there is certainly also a very great difference of opinion on moral grounds as to whether this question is one that can be settled on the moral basis. To my knowledge there has been none of the major churches in our country today that have come out and stated that Canada should not accept defensive nuclear weapons at the present time. And I doubt whether my friend who moved this motion can find any of the larger churches in the country that have stated this fact. Surely if his grounds that this is a moral issue were strong ones, surely one of the major churches in this country would have come forward and made this an argument at this time in Canada, but the truth of the matter is that this has not

March 21, 1963

happened. So I think that when the original mover of this motion stated that we should support it on moral grounds he did not very much support from the people that should know in Canada something about the moral grounds of the question — he has not much support from those people to back up the resolution which he has presented to this house.

And so I say that when it comes to the question of the moral opinions of the members of this house, I think again, as well as on the military viewpoints, that we must make our own decision as to the rights and wrongs of the case that has been presented to us this afternoon.

As well I would just like to remark about one of the statements made by the lady member for Saskatoon (Mrs. Strum) when she said that this resolution had been presented by herself in most of the sessions since she has been in this house. This motion is not the same motion that was presented to us a year ago. I believe that most of us in this house would be quite prepared to support a motion of the type that has been presented in this house before, which would promote the working towards peace by the government of Canada, which would promote the work of trying to see to it that the nations of the world do away with nuclear arms and, if possible, do away entirely with armaments and bring about world peace in our time. I don't think that there is anyone in this house, or any place in Canada that would not be prepared to support a program which would lead towards the promotion of world peace. But I have failed to see any argument that has been presented in this house under this resolution which would indicate to me that the passage of this motion would promote in any way, shape or form the work of Canada or the Canadian government towards the promotion of world peace at the present time. And so for that reason I could not support this motion as well.

Then, of course, we come down to the question as to what is the main job, one of the main jobs, of our Canadian government. I truthfully believe that one of the main jobs of the Canadian government, our national government in this country, is the defence of the people of Canada, the defence of our men, women and children in the dominion of Canada. That is one of the main jobs of the government in this country. And I for one feel that any government which provides any less than the best possible defence for the people of this country is shirking its duty as a government of Canada. And so I say here again that I don't think it would be fitting for us, as members of this legislative assembly, to ask the government of Canada to reject any type of weapons that might possibly be used to fight a war sometime in the future. It is a problem that you and I cannot answer. We do not know what type of weapons are going to be used. I might use as an example the question of the use of gas in warfare. After the first world war one of the greatest threats that hung over the peoples of the world with regard to war was the threat of gas warfare, but

when the second world war came, gas was not used. And I think that to a large extent at the present time if the major countries of the world, and possibly all the countries — I don't think that if we are going to have nuclear weapons that the extension will bring us any closer to war, it might prove a deterrent to war, and of course there are many in the world today that will agree that they think possibly the more nuclear weapons that there are, the greater deterrent it will be to war at the present time.

Personally I think there are other methods as well that are better for the prevention of war at the present time, and possibly some of those that my friend, the Attorney General, mentioned in his remarks this afternoon could well be used in the future in order to promote world peace. I think some of those items all of us have agreed with in the past and agree with today can help towards the promotion of world peace. But at the present time, I don't think any one of us in this house should place ourselves in the position of saying to the government of Canada that under no consideration can a certain weapon be placed in the hands of Canadian forces for the defence of the people of Canada. I don't think any legislator in the dominion of Canada in any province should make such a statement to the government of this country of ours which has the responsibility of providing the best possible defence for the people of Canada.

And so I say with regard to this resolution, on all three grounds that I have mentioned, that I for one could not support this motion as it has been presented in this house and still consider myself a responsible citizen of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: — Is the house ready for the question? It is my duty to inform the house that the mover is about to exercise his right to close the debate. If anyone wishes to speak they must do so now.

Mr. Berezowsky: — Mr. Speaker, I will not take too much time in closing the debate because I feel that the members with whom I am associated on this side of the house have honored this legislature with their presentations and have covered the subject of this resolution perfectly well.

I can only say this, that I cannot say as much for the members of the opposition who spoke because I cannot think of one single argument that they put up that would indicate that we should not vote for this resolution.

Mr. Coderre: — You closed your ears.

March 21, 1963

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: — You will recall, Sir, that when the motion was first moved and after I had spoken I was followed by the hon. member from Weyburn (Mr. Staveley) and it was he who during his presentation was, if we can use the term, abusive. He was the one that referred to the resolution as being deceptive and deceiving. I was very much disappointed in him taking that stand because I recall that only a few weeks ago he was a member of the same party that Mr. Pearson was and must have agreed entirely, entirely, with the principles that are enunciated in the resolution. As a matter of fact, one could go further. In listening to the hon. members opposite, it seems to me that had not Mr. Pearson gone to New York, then he could have obtained his recent opinions from the members opposite because I find that as far back as 1961, while Mr. Pearson was propagating peace, and he was against nuclear weapons in Canada, the members of the opposition when they had the privilege of voting on a peace resolution — one section being refusal of all nuclear weapons on Canadian soil and Canadian forces anywhere — the hon. members on the other side voted against that resolution. This was at a time when Mr. Pearson was in favor of this same kind of resolution.

The member who just spoke said that in my original presentation I only brought up the moral issue. That is not true because I pointed out the economics insofar as Canada is concerned. I pointed out how the safety factor — how dangerous it would be for Canada to involve itself in such a policy of having nuclear armaments in Canada as a defence of this country and I think he falls far short in trying to argue that I only presented the case on the basis of morality.

At this time I would point out again, and would refer back to Mr. Pearson by pointing out that even at the present time, in reading the speech that Lester B. Pearson made not so very long ago — I have it contained here in “Vital Speeches of the Day” of March 1, 1963 — he at no place says that he is in favor of nuclear weapons for Canada except to keep the commitments, only to keep a commitment that the Conservative government has made. I repeat again that the hon. members opposite are entirely out of line and far beyond Mr. Pearson’s thinking and I just can’t understand it. They had better get together on this point.

Yes, I think I should read a section or two . . .

Mr. D.T. McFarlane (Qu’Appelle-Wolseley): — On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is introducing new . . .

Mr. W.J. Berezowsky: — I am refuting the arguments . . .

Mr. Speaker: — I don't think the hon. member wants to introduce any new material. He can only answer arguments which have been raised.

Mr. Berezowsky: — I think I am trying to answer the arguments and I have to refer to a paragraph or two here. If the hon. members don't want me to, I can by-pass it.

Now, two or three of the hon. members, instead of arguing against the resolution with some facts used an appeal to patriotism. Now I don't think that it can be said that hon. members on this side are any less patriotic than the members on the opposite side. And I don't think it is fair to say that the scientists and other who have been referred to from time to time by various speakers are any less patriotic than any member of this house or anywhere. I think we are all patriotic; we all love our country and we love our children, but for one reason, if no other, if there is any veterans here that have fought in the wars, and there are, then each must remember that these wars were fought to end wars, and that is exactly why we are bringing this resolution in — to see that this generation doesn't have to go through the same kind of holocaust that was experienced in the past.

The hon. member for Gravelbourg (Mr. Coderre) unfortunately did not read my speech. He took little bits out of it, here and there, and as I listened to him I could only feel sorry for his hodge-podge of thinking. I think it would have been much better if he had read my speech and then he would have seen how wrong he was in trying to make a case out of a phrase here and a phrase there so there is very little I can comment for him.

Insofar as the expert from Turtleford (Mr. Foley), I too am very much surprised because the kind of speech that he made, which he wanted us to treat as an argument against this motion was that kind of speech that I would expect Khrushchev to make in the Soviet Union to try to rouse the people . . .

An Hon. Member: — While on the Soviet Union, how about Mr. Coldwell . . .

Mr. Berezowsky: — Once again, Mr. Speaker, he did not refute a single argument favoring this resolution.

Now, I will not have anything more to say in closing, except to say this, that I am quite certain that according to the history of the past the members of the opposition have refused to vote for the welfare of the people of Canada before and I suppose they will vote against this resolution again.

March 21, 1963

YEAS — 28
Messieurs

Lloyd
Johnson
Williams
Brown
Blakeney
Brockelbank
Walker
Kuziak
Cooper (Mrs.)
Kramer

Willis
Meakes
Thurston
Davies
Nicholson
Turnbull
Stone
Whelan
Berezowsky

Michayluk
Semchuk
Perkins
Snyder
Stevens
Dahlman
Kluzak
Peterson
Brotten

NAYS — 12
Messieurs

Batten (Mrs.)
Barrie
Danielson
McFarlane

Gardiner
Foley
Guy
Coderre

MacDougall
Snedker
Gallagher
Erb

The Assembly adjourned at 10:02 o'clock p.m.