

Supply—National Defence

the Canadian forces in Canada, and the storage of warheads in Canada...

We are confident that we shall be able to reach formal agreement with the United States on appropriate means to serve the common objective.

The question, Mr. Chairman, is whether these are still the common objectives or not? If they are, why is there such a delay in achieving them?

Then on March 10, 1959, as reported at page 1775 of *Hansard*, Mr. Diefenbaker answered a question about a *New York Times* story which stated that Canada and the United States had reached agreement in principle on the formula for joint control of nuclear weapons. On that occasion he said:

—The article appearing in the *New York Times* is inaccurate in a number of details... I would draw the attention of the house to the statement I made in this regard on February 20. I indicated then that it would be some time before nuclear weapons would and indeed could be available for use by Canadian forces.

Then on April 30, 1959, as reported at page 3180 of *Hansard* Mr. Diefenbaker again replied to a question as to whether agreement had been reached. The question had been asked by the Leader of the Opposition and in his reply the Prime Minister said:

I assure him that the whole subject will be dealt with very shortly—

I emphasize the Prime Minister's words "very shortly". That was in 1959. On July 2, 1959—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I am again apologetic for interrupting the hon. member for Trinity, but I am trying to hold the committee very closely to the item under discussion this evening. I think we got off to a very good start and I do not want to be considered unfair to other hon. members who might want to get into more general policy and into international agreements and things of that nature. For that reason I feel I should rise and ask the co-operation of the hon. member.

Mr. Hellyer: Not at all, Mr. Chairman. I am sure that as you have done in the past when you were occupying the chair very fairly and forthrightly, you would agree when we are voting money for the acquisition of supersonic interceptors to be used for the defence of North America and the defence of this country, it is relevant to discuss whether or not they should be armed with nuclear devices, particularly when we have been told by members of the government that it was necessary for this to be done in order that they would reach their maximum potential, and when we have been told by the commander in chief of the North American air defence command that it was necessary. Indeed the minister in days gone by said

[Mr. Hellyer.]

he agreed with the commander in chief of the North American air defence command.

On July 22, 1959, the former minister of defence said with reference to the Prime Minister's statement of February 20, about—

—entering into a series of negotiations with the U.S. in order to arrange the details of the storing of and equipping our forces—

Some hon. Members: Order.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I am sorry to rise again as I feel I made it clear without being too arbitrary in making a ruling—I do not want to necessarily have to do that—but I feel that matters of international agreement and so on come within the very broad scope of defence policy generally and indeed move into the area of external affairs. For that reason I feel out of fairness to other hon. members of the committee that unless I hold the hon. gentleman from Trinity closely to the item under consideration, the whole debate might reach into very broad areas of discussion and my job would be made all the more difficult if I allowed that to happen.

Mr. Hellyer: With the greatest deference, Mr. Chairman, surely it is not inappropriate nor can it be considered a matter of foreign affairs to discuss how aircraft to be stationed on Canadian soil, flown by Canadian airmen, are to be equipped. If this is not relevant, nothing is relevant.

An hon. Member: Not even you.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the minister advise the committee if the common objectives referred to by the Prime Minister in February, 1959 remain the common objectives of the two countries.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, the common objectives of the two countries and of all the countries of the NATO alliance are to preserve peace and prevent aggression on the part of the communist world. Those remain the common objectives of all of us in the west.

Mr. Hellyer: Would the minister explain to the committee, then, why the United States would entertain an agreement under which it would supply Bomarc missiles to Canada, at what the government has described as a negligible cost, if they were merely to be stationed at North Bay on their launching pads without any warheads of any kind.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident that the hon. member for Trinity and the Leader of the Opposition have been trying to get me to make a statement yes or no—and these are the words they put the question in—on whether or not we are