

*Labour Crisis in Aircraft Industry*

bad enough in this world to have three countries manufacturing nuclear weapons of mass destruction; it would be infinitely worse if this were to be extended. There is no reason I know why Canada should get into the field of manufacturing nuclear warheads or nuclear weapons of any kind.

The Prime Minister told us in his statement that questions connected with the acquisition of nuclear warheads were being studied but that no agreement had yet been reached with the United States. I wonder why it has not yet been possible to reach an agreement with the United States? Any search for such an agreement, according to the Prime Minister's statement, should reflect certain basic considerations. The first of these—and I am paraphrasing the statement—was that we should continue the international effort to ban nuclear weapons within an acceptable disarmament agreement. I would say that with regard to this we are entirely in agreement.

The Prime Minister also said that under any such agreement with the United States, or, I assume, with any other country the necessity of Canadian forces having the most modern and effective weapons must be recognized. We also agree with that. Then the Prime Minister's statement went on to say that because of the importance of limiting the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries—and I am paraphrasing the statement, not quoting it—the ownership and the custody of nuclear warheads should remain in United States hands and the requirements of United States legislation would apply.

I think perhaps I should quote that particular paragraph because it seems to me to be of very great importance indeed. The statement reads:

Believing that the number of nuclear weapons at the independent disposal of individual nations should be limited, we consider it is expedient that the ownership and custody of nuclear warheads should remain with the United States.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, we do not agree. We think on this side of the house that if nuclear warheads for defence weapons such as the Bomarc or for missiles which could not be used for anything but defensive purposes are supplied to Canadian squadrons or to Canadian formations they should be under Canadian control, and that arrangements to this end should at least be attempted with the United States authorities.

This does not involve the manufacture of such weapons. It does not involve the installation of manufacturing capacity for such weapons. But surely, as I have said before, it is an intolerable position to say in respect of a Canadian squadron on a

Canadian establishment using Canadian weapons that nuclear warheads, if they are to be made available, should be under other than Canadian control while perhaps on the same airfield the same weapons, used by a United States squadron, would be under United States control.

That seems to me to be a position which is not acceptable and I hope that arrangements can be made by which the United States legislation can be altered to make this aspect of continental defence as well as some others truly continental. Surely that is possible. I know the difficulties and I know the arguments that will be advanced against it to the effect that if the United States makes this kind of arrangement for Canada she may have to make it for other countries but I suggest there is no country in the world which is being asked to work so closely with the United States in defence matters as Canada, and quite rightly, and that that co-operation in defence which is recognized by NORAD under the joint command should also be recognized by this change in the United States legislation.

Those are some of the things that have been worrying us about the decision that the government has taken, about the way that decision was taken, about the length of time it took the government to reach this decision and about the way it has been announced.

I repeat that it seems to us almost impossible to understand that 20 months after the government has taken office it has come to the conclusion that this Canadian development should cease and that having come to that conclusion after 20 months it should have announced it in the way it did last Friday without warning to those concerned.

Earlier this afternoon when I suggested that hon. gentlemen opposite when in opposition did not seem to have taken exception to this, worried too much about it or asked questions about it, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Churchill) indicated that at that time he had shown some uneasiness about it and would be able to quote from *Hansard* to that effect. If the minister felt that way at the time and if other members of the present government shared his feeling about the development of the CF-105 it is all the more difficult to understand why, having come into office, they did not at once take this matter under consideration. It took this government only two or three weeks to put Canadian air defence squadrons under NORAD but it has taken it 20 months to decide to cancel this Canadian air development.

The matter has been expressed very effectively indeed in an editorial I have in my