

### Illustrations of Defence Change

When we say there has been a change, let me point out this fact. Only today, in a dispatch from Washington, it is reported that President Kennedy called Livingston Merchant, a veteran diplomat, out of retirement to lead a government team which will prepare United States proposals for a nuclear force in Europe. This was announced yesterday in a statement read to the press by the President's Press Secretary. The report says that although United States and British efforts to create a nuclear striking force under NATO have run into stiff resistance from the French, Mr. Salinger ... said: "Mr. Merchant and his group will talk with French officials as well as with officials from other NATO countries." All of us know the kind of man Mr. Merchant is -- one of those dedicated servants who, in his period of office, did so much to increase the good relations between our country and the United States.

Concepts are changing. I do not intend to go now into many particulars but I ask Hon. Members who say there is no new strategy to read the article in one of the December issues of the Saturday Evening Post. The heading is "Our New Strategy -- the Alternatives to Total War", and the viewpoint given is that of Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defence of the United States.

Only on Wednesday, the Turkish Government is reported to have announced that "Jupiter" missiles were being removed from Turkey and "Polaris" weapons substituted. A similar announcement was made yesterday, I think, by Premier Fanfani of Italy. As far as these missiles are concerned, the reported proposal to replace the present missiles in Italy and Turkey by submarines mounted with "Polaris" missiles is an example of the rapid changes of these times. Obsolete missiles in vulnerable positions are being replaced by a relatively invulnerable weapon. ... Since they are mobile, these "Polaris" missiles can be put in position or removed as the situation requires. They can be centrally controlled by NATO or another agency. By having the weapons stationed at sea, the provocation of having them mounted on the territory of close U.S.S.R. neighbours is removed. Because they are relatively invulnerable, their effectiveness as a deterrent is all the greater.

I propose to review some of the views expressed by this Government on the question of defence and to go back over some of the various statements which have been made.

I said (Hansard, February 20, 1959, Page 1223) that, in keeping with the determination that Canada should carry out its task in a balanced, collective defence:

"In keeping with that determination, careful thought is being given to the principles which in our opinion are applicable to the acquisition and control of nuclear weapons. The Government's decisions of last autumn to acquire "Bomarc" missiles for air defence and "Lacrosse" missiles for the Canadian Army".

(One doesn't hear anything more about "Lacrosse" missiles).

"...were based on the best expert advice available on the need to strengthen Canada's air defence against the threat to this continent and on its determination to continue an effective contribution to the NATO shield.