

Considerable concern has been expressed in western Canada about the effects of radioactive fall out from nuclear warheads of A.B.M. system missiles intercepting in-coming I.C.B.Ms. Naturally, I share this concern with the other people from Ontario, especially if an A.B.M. site is to be located in upper Michigan. I am aware that our defence department has had secret consultations and briefings with the United States department. My question is, where is the A.B.M. site for the Michigan-Ohio area to be located?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster), perhaps it might be well to read to him some words President Nixon spoke when he asked Congress on March 14 to deploy a modified ballistic missile defence system. In reviewing the various options open to him he said, in part:

To begin a measured construction of an active defence of our retaliatory forces.

He went on to say:

We will provide for local defence of selected Minuteman missile sites and an area defence designed to protect our bomber bases and our command and control authorities.

So far as the Department of National Defence is aware, the United States authorities intend to proceed with two Safeguard sites: one at Great Falls, Montana and the other at Grand Forks, North Dakota.

In announcing this Safeguard system President Nixon said:

The modified system has been designed so that its defensive intent is unmistakable. It will be implemented not according to some fixed, theoretical schedule, but in a manner clearly related to our periodic analysis of the threat. The first deployment covers two missile sites; the first of these will not be completed before 1973.

SECURITY GUARDS—NATIONAL HARBOURS BOARD—VANCOUVER

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, my question this evening is based on the question I asked earlier during the oral question period. May I repeat the question? I asked:

—In view of the decision of the National Harbours Board in Vancouver to appoint a special force to police the Port of Vancouver consisting of 15 or 20 trained peace officers under a retired mounties as chief, replacing the existing National Harbours Board force of non-professional security guards, will the minister inform the house as to the position of employment of the present security guards, most of whom are war veterans of 17 years' service?

29180—529½

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

I thought the question was urgent when I asked it and I think it still is. It is for this reason I am raising it now.

May I draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that Captain Johnson, the Manager of the Vancouver Harbour Commission, stated that the Vancouver port has a reputation for a low pilferage and damage rate. This reputation is the result of the security guard system of the Vancouver Harbour Board. Someone has now decided to get rid of the security guard system and establish a special police force to be headed by a recently retired R.C.M.P. officer. There is no need for a special police force because, the security guards have built up a wonderful reputation. However, a policy decision has been made which I understand will involve the employment of between 15 and 20 trained police officers. They will replace an existing N.H.B. force of approximately 14 non-professional security guards. I am interested in knowing why this policy change is necessary in Vancouver. I am particularly concerned with the position of the security guards to be replaced.

It is my understanding that not one of the security guards can meet the age requirement for re-employment on the new police force. The majority of the security guards are war veterans, some having up to 17 years service with the Vancouver N.H.B. security force. I hope there is some degree of sentimentality, in the Liberal government. I insist on having an answer from the minister and may I say how proud I am to see him here personally to answer a question on his first day as Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). I insist on having an answer concerning the provision being made for the employment or security of those employed as security guards. They have served their country in war and peace and are now being displaced as a result of a change in government policy.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I can well understand and appreciate the concern of the hon. member. I want to assure him at the outset that I will make a thorough investigation. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that there has not been time since he raised this matter this afternoon for me to get a full briefing. I have had an opportunity to discuss it in a general way with officials of the department.

The information I received is that this is not a change of policy that is confined to the port of Vancouver. It is a part of a national