

Interim Supply

people of Winnipeg, Calgary, Edmonton, Saskatoon, Victoria and other western cities and towns. It is disappointing to hear him confirm that I was wrong and that he, too, has given no thought to how the air defence of Canada should be enlarged in order to include a greater portion of this country than just the area around the great lakes basin.

Mr. Sevigny: Will the hon. member for Trinity permit a question? Is the hon. member aware of the fact that the Bomarc program is part of an integrated program under the supervision and direction of the organism well known by the name of NORAD which is in charge of the defence of the North American continent?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, I am well aware of that, and that is just the point I am trying to make, that when this integrated program is being integrated out of the United States' plans it should at the same time be integrated out of the Canadian plans. If we have an integrated program we should be consistent and not insist that we go blindly ahead with our own installations at the very time when the United States, the senior partner in this NORAD agreement, has decided that the program is no longer valid. How can the two ministers put any other interpretation on the facts. A reduction in the amount of money to be spent this year from \$421 million to \$50 million is surely a clear indication that the program is going to be washed out and that any expenditures we make are going to be money down the drain? Do the two ministers deny that? Can they not see the handwriting on the wall? Can they not see that our friends in the United States have come to the conclusion that the expenditure of this vast amount of money on the SAGE-Bomarc program as they had set it up even as late as a year ago is no longer consistent with their objective and the amount of money they have available to spend?

If the two ministers cannot see that, I feel they should rise in their places and explain this matter to parliament and the Canadian people because as yet they have not done so. If any further reason was required we now have it to indicate that the fullest, frankest and freest discussion of defence policy should take place at the earliest possible date.

One further dramatic piece of evidence to indicate that the government has no policy and that it should seek the advice of all hon. members of the committee has now been presented to us. Again we urge the minister and the Prime Minister that when the defence committee is established every effort be made not to restrict the discussion there but that

[Mr. Hellyer.]

it take the fullest possible form and that we be allowed to discuss, not only matters of expenditure and particularly past expenditure but also matters of policy affecting this country, not only in its isolated sense, but in its relationship to its NORAD and NATO partners. This discussion is essential and we again urge the minister and through him the government to allow what the Leader of the Opposition asked for earlier in the year, a full and complete policy discussion.

In the meantime, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious to us that this SAGE-Bomarc system makes no sense whatever in its present form. As a single defence mechanism against manned bombers we feel it is a waste of public funds. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Essex East:

That the amount requested by the Minister of Finance by way of interim supply in item (a) of the proposed resolution be reduced by what fraction of the estimates for the Department of National Defence being requested in the present resolution is destined for the Bomarc and Sage systems.

The Chairman: It seems to me the Chair can hardly accept this amendment because it is impossible from its wording to determine the exact amount by which there would be a reduction in the main resolution. Unless the hon. member can find an amendment which would make it in order, I cannot accept it.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, my amendment in amended form would read as follows. I move:

That the amount of interim supply in item (a) of the proposed resolution be reduced by \$1 million.

Mr. Martin (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, not too long ago I had the privilege of visiting Halifax in company with the hon. member for Trinity. I am not sure who is the most effective missionary but on two days in succession I find myself in complete agreement with the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Kootenay West referred yesterday to the excellent C.C.F. speech made by the hon. member for Trinity and today I find myself again in complete accord with him. I do not wish to add too much to what has been said. In view of recent developments we are becoming more and more convinced that Canadian defence policy is just the tail of the kite of United States defence policy. When a kite is flying it goes in one direction but the tail may go in five or six other directions. They are tied together but the tail goes in another direction.

I do not know who is responsible for this. I hope the Minister of National Defence is not because I have great personal regard for him. I think rather this is the fault of the cabinet as a whole and unfortunately