

*Abandonment of Defence Projects*

maintain, through NORAD, an answer to the bomber threat, and nuclear weapons to back it up.

I should like to read now a paragraph from page 2683 of *Hansard* and I ask the minister to consider it. This is the present Minister of Defence Production speaking. He had set out five tests of what Canada's military role should be. In my opinion he set them out very admirably and I suggest they deserve consideration now. Then he went on to say:

I would suggest that perhaps consideration of the criteria I have suggested, when applied to our apparent dilemma in North America, might shed some light on this problem.

In respect of NORAD we perform two functions. One of them corresponds to all the tests I have outlined and the other does not. The military task of identification and warning which is NORAD's main task does correspond to the criteria I have just outlined. The function of aircraft interception and destruction—more particularly aircraft destruction—with nuclear weapons, does not correspond—

He goes on to express his disapproval of that function. I hope the various words we have heard from time to time from the minister, the Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson), the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Martin) and other persons to the effect that this government is generally reconsidering the role that Canada should play, really mean what they say. I hope the government will not go on tying us up with agreements that will make it difficult for us to adopt an intelligent role.

It may be apparent to hon. members that my voice is not in the best condition today. I should like to go on and deal at this stage with the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Villeneuve (Mr. Caouette). We in this party would certainly not have worded the amendment in the way in which the hon. member for Villeneuve has. We very much regret that the terms of the amendment refer to Quebec alone, and to the introduction of nuclear weapons in the territory of Quebec. So far as we are concerned, for the purpose of defence as well as for many other purposes, there is no distinction to be drawn between the province of Quebec and the rest of Canada. I suggest we are concerned, in our party and in this house, with the defence and security of Canada as a whole. What makes sense for Quebec, makes sense for Canada. We in this party have made it clear from time to time that we do not think nuclear defence makes sense for Canada, and therefore it makes no sense for any part of Canada.

Our view in the matter has been powerfully reinforced by the evidence given before the committee, and particularly the evidence of General Simonds. He pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the nuclear tipped Bomarc missiles are designed to shoot down manned

bombers that might come over from Russia. He said that this was not a real threat at all. The Russians, he said, would be crazy to send manned bombers to attack North America and, he added, they are not crazy. Our warning system spread around the North American continent would enable the targets of the manned bombers, namely the nuclear retaliatory forces of the United States to be off the ground and out of harm long before the bombers arrived. Any all-out nuclear attack, if it could happen at all, and if the Russians are not crazy, would necessarily be an attack by I.C.B.M.'s, against which we have as yet devised no defence. If the Russians contemplated a second blow with bombers, they would knock out the Bomarc bases first, cooking them, as the technical term goes and as General Simonds has said.

In any event, the Bomarc would knock out only a proportion of the bombers, and the small proportion that came over would be armed with megaton bombs which would wreak universal havoc in our country and in the United States. General Simonds concluded by saying that the idea we should involve ourselves in heavy expenditures directed against a bomber threat that was non-existent at this particular time did not make sense. It is in the name of common sense that I suggest, Mr. Speaker, this role should be abandoned and that the amendment, which objects to nuclear weapons in Quebec, should be extended to the whole of Canada. I say if it makes good sense there, it makes good sense in the rest of Canada.

The minister disagreed with General Simonds. Apparently he still sees some useful role for the Bomarc. If I did not misinterpret him, the minister suggested that we must continue with this role to satisfy our United States allies and live up to our commitment. I am sure he is familiar with the words of secretary for defence McNamara who says that the Bomarc is virtually obsolete; it is only being continued because there has already been a large expenditure of \$2 billion on that particular system, and maintenance does not cost very much, so we might as well keep it going for a little while longer. Are we required by any treaty or engagement to keep in effect a weapons system which the United States secretary for defence has described as obsolete? This is the prime question, Mr. Speaker. Has any effort been made to ascertain whether or not the United States government is insisting upon the maintenance of this particular effort? I must say it appears to me that the adoption of this role and the conclusion of an agreement to bring these nuclear weapons under United States custody on Canadian soil arises far less from any need of our allies or any sensible