

Interim Supply

we are losing all sense of proportion in this matter. Is it not a matter of concern that the survival of our nation is at stake? The article continues:

There are many more tests to come, he (the defence minister) indicated, and success is anticipated in them.

In addition, he stated that failures to date have not been of a basic nature but that of small components; that the United States is paying the lion's share of the cost of the Bomarc program, even in Canada, and that Canada so far has spent relatively little on the program.

Further on, the article states, under a sub-heading "80 Test Flights":

The Bomarc A, he explained, went through 80 test flights before becoming an operational weapon.

The implication was there that the Bomarc B might do the same and he was sure that failures experienced to date "can be overcome."

We know the story of the Bomarc A. Even after 80 tests, when it did become operational, it is still no good. Attacking bombers can fly over it, or under it, and it can be jammed by radar. It is an ineffective weapon, and what assurance have we that this new weapon will be of greater use even if it does become operational?

Again, after the seventh failure, another article appeared, this time in the *Globe and Mail* of March 8, 1960. The heading is: "Pearkes Again Voices Confidence in Bomarc". One thing one can say about the Minister of National Defence is that at least he appears to be a congenital optimist. We only wish he had something to be optimistic about. This report is from the Ottawa bureau of the *Globe and Mail*, and the dateline is Ottawa, March 7. It begins:

Following a telephone consultation with U.S. defence secretary Gates, defence minister Pearkes today again told the commons he was hopeful that mechanical failure in the Bomarc B missile would be overcome.

The weapon—scheduled for a key role in Canada's air defence—failed for the seventh consecutive time in a test launching attempt at Cape Canaveral, Florida, on Saturday.

Further on, the article states:

He (Mr. Pearkes) then reported his telephone talk with Mr. Gates, who gave him assurances that "if there is any change made at all in the defence program for the North American continent under NORAD, Canada will be consulted." Bomarc B is part of the program.

What we cannot understand is why, if the minister has been consulted, and if he has been informed of developments in the United States, he should continue to insist that Canada go ahead with this installation and continue to spend the taxpayers' money on a program which obviously has lost the confidence of military and scientific people in the United States. Why does Canada insist on throwing money down the drain? As this article says, \$6 million is being spent merely for a start on a base at North Bay.

79951-0—156½

This amount of \$6 million is far greater than the sum which was involved in other so-called scandals—horses on the payroll, the printing bureau and so on—and I am not for a moment suggesting that there is anything wrong in this latter case; I am merely pointing out that it is necessary to keep these things in proportion. The minister tells us that we should not lose all sense of proportion in these matters. This is a very important matter. Since when are we to be told: what is \$6 million? I say that \$6 million is a very important sum to the taxpayers of Canada. If it were spent in some other field it might be of real benefit. If it were spent, for example, on scientific research and development it might well achieve something of lasting worth in the military sphere, perhaps with derivatives of value to our industrial development and growth.

We would like to hear from the minister why he asks us to vote funds for the continuation of this program in the circumstances I have outlined. Why does he come and ask parliament to vote money for an expenditure which 95 per cent of thinking people know is going to turn out to be a complete and utter waste?

I was looking for another clipping reporting a meeting recently addressed by the Associate Minister of National Defence. As I recall it, it reported the associate minister as indicating his confidence in this weapon system and as saying he thought that after it had been tested a number of times it would prove to be successful. According to the report, as I remember it, the associate minister urged that Canada should continue with these plans for the SAGE-Bomarc system, and the hon. gentleman went one step further, he said that this missile should be established at other locations across Canada.

Mr. Sevigny: On a question of privilege, I most certainly never stated the last portion of the remarks which the hon. member for Trinity is imputing to me. I simply said that the Bomarc A was considered successful and that it was reasonable to hope that the Bomarc B would eventually prove to be a success, also. That is all I ever said. I deny having said what the hon. member is imputing to me at the present time.

Mr. Hellyer: I accept that correction. I am very disappointed to hear it. I was referring to a report in a newspaper, and I know that sometimes these reports are not completely accurate. But I had thought that the associate minister was for the first time showing evidence that he had some concern for the defence of people west of Toronto, that he was giving consideration to the needs of the