

*Abandonment of Defence Projects*

During the campaign, I took a position by saying that I was against nuclear arms.

That is what the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche said on May 23, 1963, as reported in *Hansard* at page 187, right hand column.

**Mr. Jean Chretien (St. Maurice-Lafleche):** Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I would like the hon. member for Lapointe to read in full the sentence he has just begun to read, in order to report exactly the remarks made by the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche, according to the record of that day.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, I must admit frankly that the text from the member for St. Maurice-Lafleche is four pages long and I do not think it is important enough to deserve a full reading.

Mr. Speaker, it means one thing, and it is that the members from the province of Quebec themselves—since the member for St. Maurice-Lafleche said it repeatedly—have stated they are opposed to the storing of nuclear weapons on the territory of the country, and especially on the soil of the state of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, the Liberal members will have the opportunity, tonight, by their vote on the subamendment proposed by the Ralliement Creditistes, to express their opinion flatly, categorically and clearly against the storing of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil.

The Minister of National Defence told us yesterday we had made commitments, and he added: However, to be useful to us, they—that is, the Americans—furnished what they believed at the time was a semblance of protection. Therefore, the Minister of National Defence himself thought that the Bomarc and the Voodoos were a semblance of protection. It is thus for a mere semblance of protection that we would jeopardize the role that Canada could play for world peace, and nuclear disarmament.

Mr. Speaker, the commitments were referred to on both sides of the house here. When the Liberals were in the opposition they requested the party in power to table the commitments of the Conservative party, but as soon as the Liberals assumed office, they, in turn, were requested by the Conservatives to table, to make public the same commitments.

If the Liberals refuse or object and contend that it is not the way to promote public security, there is a continuing contradiction on both sides of the house.

Those commitments were never produced, because they do not exist. As we said yester-

[Mr. Gregoire.]

day and continue to state today, Canada's part is a peace role through a disarmament program at home—

**Mr. Chretien:** Mr. Speaker—

**Mr. Gregoire:** This is the second time he stands up.

**Mr. Chretien:** The hon. member for Lapointe has quoted words I said in this house. His quotation was as follows:

During the campaign, I took a position by saying that I was against nuclear arms but that if Canada had been committed to acquire them by the Conservative government, I did not want the Liberal government to fail to respect those commitments, or to do in public life what we do not do in private life.

It is a question of privilege and honesty. The hon. member for Lapointe should at least read the whole paragraph, and not only two parts of a sentence. I demand that the hon. member for Lapointe retract by reading the whole sentence.

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, there is one point that the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche has forgotten, and it is that this government never proved that Canada had committed itself under the preceding administration. The hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche—

**Mr. Chretien:** It is a question of privilege.

**Mr. Gregoire:** How do you expect me to answer your question of privilege? If Canada had been committed by the Conservative government, has it been proved that there had been a commitment? No evidence has ever been submitted in that respect. There has never been any evidence submitted to the house that commitments had been made by the Conservative government of the time with regard to the storage of nuclear weapons in the country.

If the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche wants to be honest, he will admit that these commitments have never been proven and that the sentence—

**Mr. Chretien:** The hon. member for Lapointe gives me the opportunity to ask for explanations—

[Text]

**Mr. Speaker:** Order. I think that is quite enough argumentation between two hon. members, and I suggest we get on with the subject at hand.

[Translation]

**Mr. Gregoire:** Mr. Speaker, I am very, very conscious, indeed, that the motion which is being discussed today cuts to the quick certain hon. members from the province of Quebec.