

The Address—Mr. Diefenbaker

occasion respecting the fact that the United States had, for too long, taken Canada for granted would have, if spoken by any member of this house, been subject to his condemnation. Even today, there is a step forward in that relationship. We Canadians have been most anxious to assure the maintenance and preservation of our sovereignty in northern Canada. Those areas are of maximum importance, not only from the point of view of defence but also from the point of view that they hold vast mineral resources.

Well, the D.E.W. line was built and little consideration was given to Canada. The hon. gentleman was secretary of state for external affairs when this was done. Today, we moved a step forward. The major stations on the D.E.W. line have been, in the past, manned by United States officers with a Canadian liaison officer. We have now reversed that and Canadian officers will man these stations and there will be one United States officer as liaison officer. What is more, we asked for that when in opposition and the answer invariably given was one of indifference. Now that the hon. gentleman is in the opposition he suddenly sees that in all the years he was a member of the government there were attitudes taken toward the United States which were not in keeping with Canada's sovereignty or the responsibilities of Canadian nationality. Furthermore, of the civilian personnel on these stations, 645 of the 790 are now Canadians and these civilians are paid by the United States. This is a step in the direction of ensuring that in the northern territories there shall be no misunderstanding as to whom those areas belong.

Today, a joint announcement was made by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Pearkes) and the secretary of defence of the United States along the lines that I indicated. Now then, I come to one other subject.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): That announcement should have been made in this house.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mention was made today of the Arrow. I have before me the vacillating record, if I may say with great respect, of the Leader of the Opposition with regard to this matter. I am sure there was not that measure of agreement between him and the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) during the by-election in that constituency in connection with this subject which one might have expected. Defence today is costly. I think this was well summarized by the President of the United States when he said this:

The over-all cost of introducing Atlas into our armed forces will average \$35 million per missile on the firing line. This year we are investing an

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

aggregate of close to \$7 billion in missile programs alone. Other billions go for research, development, test and evaluation of new weapons systems.

Our latest atomic submarines will cost \$50 million each, while some special types will cost three times as much. We are now ordering fighter aircraft which are priced at fifty times as much as the fighters of World War II. We are buying certain bombers that cost their weight in gold.

In other words, there has been a fabulous increase in those costs. In so far as the Arrow is concerned, in the month of September I made a statement on this matter. The responsibility to act rests on this government. The hon. gentleman suggests that a committee be set up for the purpose of determining this question.

Mr. Pearson: I did not say that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He suggests that a committee be set up. If it is not to determine, it is to recommend.

Mr. Pearson: I never said that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, it is just a committee to be set up. He just wants the committee to sit, Mr. Speaker. As far as we are concerned, we made our position clear in the month of September. The views then expressed have not been changed in the intervening months in consequence of the consultation that has taken place in this regard. It is the kind of decision that is not to be taken lightly. It has caused lengthy, almost endless discussions and consultations. What did the hon. gentleman say with regard to this matter? I have here a few quotations as to what he would have done. He starts off by a speech in Edmonton on the subject and he says this:

We decided when in office two and one-half years ago to go ahead with the CF-105 and review it year by year in the light of developments.

Then here is the statement that he made a little bit later on during the course of his tour:

Mr. Pearson said when previous Liberal government decided two and one-half years ago to authorize work on the CF-105 Arrow, the intercontinental ballistic missile seemed then to be "many, many years away."

The Liberal government had reviewed its decision every six months. Had the Liberals been in office when the first I.C.B.M. was fired Mr. Pearson said, "this would have been a major factor in possible revision of our decision."

Then he said this:

The Conservative government should have cancelled the Arrow production order this fall instead of waiting until next spring.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the statement that he made. That is from a Canadian Press dispatch.