

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I do not want to take advantage of the minister, because I realize the delicacy of this. I want to assure him at once that I am on his side in connection with this matter. However, the impression does persist very strongly in Canada that there is a very keen division of opinion at the executive level of government in Canada, in that the minister takes a pretty strong position, and the Minister of National Defence takes another, as a result of which there is some general uncertainty as to what should be the course that Canada should take. Is the minister in a position to give us some enlightenment on this very interesting situation?

Mr. GREEN: I think I explained this situation in my speech in the house, when I referred to the Irish resolution against the further spread of nuclear weapons. Canada supported that resolution, with the proviso that if no real progress was made on disarmament, then we would have to take another look at our policy with regard to the Irish proposal.

Mr. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, is that not similar to the question I asked yesterday, when I asked if Canada's policy on disarmament was compatible with that of its defence policy? I think the answer is yes, and until you get some agreement on disarmament in respect of Canada's defence policy, we have to go along with other NATO countries. It is one which we cannot think of until something happens to the other. There is no conflict.

Mr. GREEN: I think the position we took on the Irish resolution explains the situation more clearly than anything else.

Mr. HELLYER: Mr. Chairman, I think the simplification which we have just heard points up the gravity of the problem. Of course, we are all with the Irish in their proposal, but this is a matter of considerable concern, as well as relevance. Canada has committed itself to the expenditure of several hundreds of millions of dollars for defence equipment which, to use the Prime Minister's words, only reached their full potential when armed with atomic devices. Yet, no policy has been evolved for their use or control when these weapons are so armed. I think that we should be given some explanation as to just what the government intends to do when this equipment is complete.

Mr. NUGENT: Does that refer to the figure of \$15 million?

Mr. GREEN: We are hoping that real progress will be made in the disarmament negotiations. I would point out, with regard to defence equipment, that most defence equipment is never used and, I think it is the hope of Canada and every other country that it never will have to be used. However, that does not mean you do not go ahead and get ready, in case you do have to use it.

Mr. HELLYER: I agree with you. However, the problem which has been stated here, and which I pose again, is that we are spending a great deal of money, or we are committed to a great deal of money—not just the few millions referred to a moment ago, but very large expenditures for aircraft for use by NATO forces in Europe under NATO control, the purpose of which is to carry atomic devices. Now, what we wish to know is that if there is no effective disarmament agreement, what will be the ultimate use of these, and will they be armed with atomic weapons. If so, under whose control will they be, in view of what the minister has said about not delegating this authority to a directorate in NATO.

Mr. GREEN: I know it would be very interesting if I dealt with that subject. However, I do not think it is essential to answer hypothetical questions of that kind.

Mr. HELLYER: It is hardly hypothetical when we are talking of expenditures of over half a billion dollars of the taxpayers' money; it is very real.