

*Supply—National Defence*

**Mr. Pearkes:** In answer to the first question, of course the Bomarc are fired from a fixed station. They are not mobile. The stations as designed will be interlocking so that the whole of the air space will be covered.

With regard to the second question, because there is possibility of that form of attack which the hon. gentleman was describing, it is one reason why interceptors are being retained in the armament for the defence of the North American continent.

**Mr. Hellyer:** And particularly the reason why interceptors should be used as far north of the Bomarc line as possible in order to intercept bombers as far away from our populated areas as can be achieved and also to get them before they release their ground-to-air guided missiles; is that correct?

**Mr. Pearkes:** We would like the interception to take place as far away from populated centres as is possible.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I should like to ask another question with reference to interceptors. The minister has told us that an agreement is being worked out with the United States whereby they will have the use of our bases. We will presume that there is an attack and there has been positive identification, which of course also presents a very difficult problem because it is sometimes difficult to determine what the identity of an aircraft is from the radar screens. But once there is positive identification is it not the plan that United States squadrons would not engage the enemy except from their own bases at the outset and that they would return for refueling to Canadian bases? Does that not present the problem which I raised earlier today, that in fact most of the fighting, most of the destruction and most of the fall-out would not take place until the attacking bomber force was within two or three hundred miles of the Canadian border and over our most populated areas? Would it not seem more logical, if Canada is going to make these bases available to United States interceptors, that the initial contact should be made at a more northerly point in order that the greater percentage of the destruction and fall-out will be over our sparsely populated areas?

**Mr. Pearkes:** The hon. member is describing a plan of attack. I do not know where he has obtained his information that United States interceptors must engage the bombers from United States bases first of all.

**Mr. Pearson:** On that point, I now have the reference which the minister made to this matter this morning, and could I ask

[Mr. Hellyer.]

him to explain exactly what he had in mind in his statement when he said:

We are maintaining nine squadrons of CF-100 all-weather interceptors and are making arrangements so that United States interceptors can operate in Canadian air space, and consideration is being given to providing facilities so that United States aircraft may be able to operate from Canadian air fields.

In those remarks did he have in mind some arrangement going beyond the present NORAD agreement?

**Mr. Pearkes:** Not going beyond the present NORAD agreement but to make the present NORAD agreement workable so that United States interceptors could have facilities for refueling and other facilities that might be required at Canadian airports.

**Mr. Hellyer:** This afternoon I mentioned the British operation Sunbeam and asked if the minister could give us any information about it. Does he have anything he can tell the house?

**Mr. Pearkes:** No, Mr. Chairman, I have no information that I can give the house on that exercise.

**Mr. Chevrier:** May I ask the minister the site of the second Bomarc station?

**Mr. Pearkes:** It is going to be located in northern Quebec in the Mont Laurier area.

**Mr. Chevrier:** Without breaching any secrets, is the minister in a position to give any more detailed information as to the site? As the minister remembers, many months ago it was announced that it would be in the Mont Laurier area and now the same answer is being given to the question. It has been made quite clear where the Bomarc station is going to be in Ontario. I wondered whether the minister could not give a more definite answer to the question in so far as the Quebec location is concerned.

**Mr. Pearkes:** I have not announced before that it is going to be in the Mont Laurier area. I know that newspaper correspondents have done so. I think that should be sufficient. It is not a very wide area and until further development has taken place I should not think it is necessary to pinpoint every defensive installation we have.

**Mr. Chevrier:** I would not want the minister to do so if he does not think he should. If he simply said that he thought it should not be done I would be quite happy to accept that. But the point I make is that the Ontario location has been pinpointed.

**Mr. Pearkes:** I said today, in the North Bay area.