

between the United States, Britain, France and Australia. *Hansard* reported him as saying:

If the hon. member is referring to the specific treaty called UKUSA, the answer is that we are not party to such a treaty.

On March 24, in the committee on miscellaneous estimates, I asked the Minister of State for Science and Technology the following question—the committee report reads as follows:

Is there to the best of your knowledge, Mr. Minister, an agreement referred to as the UK-USA agreement which would affect the activities of the CBNRC.

MR. DRURY: There is an agreement, a security agreement, involving a number of countries including Canada and the U.S.A., but it is not a bilateral agreement solely.

MR. BEATTY: Would it include the United Kingdom as well? Is that what the U.K. in UK-USA is from?

MR. DRURY: You are correct.

And now I should like to ask the hon. gentleman this question: does Canada participate in an agreement with other countries with respect to the former CBNRC, which has been referred to as the UK-USA treaty? I am asking whether we are party to such an agreement.

Mr. Sharp: This is a matter which does not refer to the activities of the Privy Council office. Perhaps it is a question which could be addressed to a minister who does have some responsibility. I did not come prepared, and I have no officials here who would have this information.

Mr. Beatty: I would remind the minister that it was the Prime Minister who was asked the question respecting UK-USA and who gave an answer. Was it the Prime Minister or the Minister of Science and Technology who gave the correct answer? I hardly need point out to the Acting Prime Minister that ultimately as far as national defence is concerned the buck stops at the desk of the Prime Minister.

Mr. Sharp: I must agree that the Prime Minister does bear general responsibility as the head of the government. Nevertheless we are now dealing with the estimates of the Privy Council office, and the hon. member's question does not relate to his responsibilities as being in charge of that office. If the hon. member is addressing a question to me as Acting Prime Minister, as one who for the time being is head of the government, that is a different matter. I have to take the question as notice. I am advised by my colleague who sits beside me that both answers given are correct—that they are not mutually inconsistent. There is perhaps some confusion in the mind of the hon. member. But the question here is one which might well be put on the Order Paper and answered fully and accurately, and not on the spur of the moment during an occasion such as this.

Mr. Beatty: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether he or the Prime Minister would be prepared to make available a list of figures showing in percentage terms the growth or decline, on an annual basis, of Canada's security budget since the Prime Minister took office? I am not asking that the figures be disclosed.

Mr. Sharp: I will take that request as notice. I think I would need a somewhat better definition of security. After all there are officials concerned with security in each of

Business of Supply

the departments—they look after the security of their documents, of their personnel and so on. If the hon. member can give me a clear definition of the information he is seeking to obtain I would be happy to try to get it for him.

May I take this opportunity to answer a question which was asked a little earlier as to the costs of certain activities in the Privy Council office. The cost for this year in respect of officers in the security and intelligence secretariat is \$135,000, and for the emergency planning secretariat the cost is \$91,000.

● (2050)

Mr. Abbott: Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity tonight of taking a few moments of the committee's time during this debate. Like many others I was greatly impressed by the Prime Minister's contribution this afternoon. Day after day we sit in this House and listen to the inane submissions of hon. members such as those of the hon. member for Leeds, with his persistent questioning of the facilities of the Prime Minister's residence.

The Prime Minister came to the House today and openly, at a justifiable length of time, gave a resumé of the facilities placed at his disposal by the taxpayers, along with some of the improvements he has been making, many of them as a result of the generosity of Canadians who are anxious to honour him and future Prime Ministers with the gift of a swimming pool.

An hon. Member: They want to join him in the pool.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Abbott: We hear some loud interjections, Mr. Chairman, but on balance I think everyone on this side agrees that seldom has Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition put up a more lame response than we heard this afternoon after the Prime Minister sat down.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Abbott: The Prime Minister was accused earlier of not daring to come to the House and submit himself to questioning, and that he did not dare answer any of the questions. After he had made a fulsome speech, one that almost everyone was interested in hearing, he listened to the leaders of the opposition parties, as per his undertaking, and then left the House only to have the hon. member for Rocky Mountain say he had fled the Chamber. Anyone who knows the Prime Minister will know that it would take a better man than the hon. member for Rocky Mountain to make him flee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Abbott: It is important to recognize that the Prime Minister gave a resumé of the areas that were necessary in order that he could deal with several comments by the hon. member for Leeds. Unfortunately he felt compelled to give that resumé, partly because of that hon. member's persistent interventions, but mainly and quite rightly in order to deal with that famous speech of not so long ago by the right hon. member for Prince Albert in which he took