

Alleged Lack of Government Leadership

defensive weapons for deterrent and protection purposes. They have discussed how to do that ever since. At Nassau the United Kingdom and the United States leaders brought forward a positive plan by which one aspect of this nuclear deterrent could be transferred from intermediate ballistic missiles to submarines with Polaris missiles. That was the extent of their contribution to this discussion of a NATO nuclear deterrent, and this has nothing whatever to do with any Canadian contribution to NATO. The Prime Minister himself must know that if he knows anything about these matters.

Mr. Green: May I ask the Leader of the Opposition a question?

Mr. Pearson: Yes.

Mr. Green: Does he place no importance at all on this question of a multilateral nuclear force which, as he knows, is practically a brand new subject for discussion in NATO?

Mr. Pearson: Indeed, I place the greatest possible importance on it and I shall be glad to discuss that matter in a moment. However, I also know that this question of a multilateral nuclear deterrent force in NATO, as the minister knows, has been under discussion for quite a long time.

Mr. Green: No; this is a brand new scheme.

Mr. Pearson: As the minister should know, the alteration in some of the earlier plans takes the form of building up a NATO nuclear deterrent on the sea with Polaris missiles in submarines under NATO control.

Mr. Green: Plus tactical weapons.

Mr. Pearson: Yes, plus nuclear tactical weapons. But what has this to do with the Bomarc in Canada, the CF-101 in Canada or the CF-104 in our NATO air division which has the role of strike reconnaissance which will not be effected at all by this change?

Mr. Green: The Leader of the Opposition would not wish to misinform the house. The question of the CF-104 comes primarily under that multilateral nuclear control and is under discussion in the NATO council.

Mr. Pearson: Of course that is so. There is no doubt about that. Every part of the NATO force in Europe is under NATO control in that sense. Every contribution from every NATO member which is part of SACEUR comes under the NATO command. However, the minister knows that no proposal has been made to remove the function of strike reconnaissance from NATO and that no proposal has been made to take that function away from the Canadian air division. That is the point at issue. These changes which are

[Mr. Pearson.]

taking place now are not changes which are going to affect the role which the government has accepted for the Canadian forces overseas.

Mr. Green: They may do so.

Mr. Pearson: I think the Secretary of State for External Affairs will agree with me in this regard, if that change were recommended by the NATO authorities, and they may in time be recommended. In view of the fact that it took us four years from the time we agreed to take on this role until the planes were being delivered, does the Secretary of State for External Affairs think these changes could be made overnight? If it takes a long time to make these changes—and I am thinking of a year or two years—is the Secretary of State for External Affairs satisfied to leave this air division in Europe without any effective weapons at all during that time?

The Prime Minister said the other day "We are continuing to negotiate with the United States". This was the first mention of negotiations. This mention of negotiations was criticized, and quite rightly, by the United States secretary of state as making public the fact of such confidential negotiations without letting them know in advance. It is something we had no right to do, any more than they had a right to issue that note of theirs. However, I have not heard any indication of regret on the part of the Prime Minister that he let this information out in his speech, about these negotiations. We were not told in this House of Commons even what department of government was taking part in them. We have not yet been told that.

Mr. Fleming (Eglinton): You were told that yesterday.

Mr. Green: Yes, you were told that yesterday.

Mr. Pearson: Read your *Hansard*.

Mr. McIlraith: You refused to answer.

Mr. Pearson: In these negotiations the Prime Minister said we will continue to hope to make arrangements so that nuclear warheads will be readily available. What a farcical position to take in the light of the experience of last October over Cuba: we will continue to negotiate so that these nuclear warheads will be readily available after the emergency develops. It would be of great comfort to the air defence command of this continent to know this if there should be—and I pray God there never will be—a bomber attack on this continent. These things are no good against missiles; we all agree on that matter. If there should be, supplementary to a missile attack, a bomber attack on this continent it