

Supply—National Defence

better we can do than to rely on this skill and experience that is available. When we are considering a problem of this kind, one question with which we are always faced is the question of security. There is never a problem of security with the people participating in St. John's ambulance work. It seems to me the minister would be dealing with many of his old confreres in the army, and he could benefit a lot from their judgment and experience in the co-ordination of these activities.

Mr. Harkness: We work very closely with the St. John's ambulance corps. As a matter of fact they have the names of all the graduates of the special militia training courses who have passed the first aid examinations. These names have been supplied to them. They have them, and I have no doubt they are making good use of them in respect of St. John's ambulance work.

Item agreed to.

Royal Canadian Air Force—

645. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and major equipment—further amount required, \$31,000,000.

Mr. Hellyer: Will the minister explain exactly what this money is being spent for, for the benefit of the committee?

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, this particular vote is to make good an estimated net deficiency of \$31 million in the cash required for capital expenditure purposes, particularly for aircraft and engines for the Royal Canadian Air Force. The principal item contributing to the deficiency is the CF-104 aircraft. In the main estimates \$125 million was provided to meet the cash requirement in support of that program. It is now deemed likely that the actual expenditure will be upwards of \$174 million. This estimate includes expenditure of \$1¼ million for eight dual CF-104 trainers, procurement of which was authorized during the year and for which no expenditure during this year was anticipated. In other words, we are getting delivery more quickly than we anticipated would be the case.

Other items that contribute to the net deficiency are expenditures of \$2 million on support equipment for the CF-101B aircraft, for which no provision had been made in the 1961-62 estimates, and also expenditures for the Yukon, the C-106, of \$1.5 million. There were cash surpluses in other items so that the over-all deficiency by the end of March will be \$31 million.

Mr. Hellyer: What was the figure the minister gave for the 101B?

Mr. Harkness: The forecast at the present time is for \$174 million cash, whereas the estimates provided \$125 million.

Mr. Hellyer: Pardon me, the 101?

Mr. Harkness: The 101 was \$2 million.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder if the minister could advise the committee when the first CF-104's are going to the air division in Europe and if, when they arrive there, they will be armed with atomic missiles?

Mr. Harkness: We have no absolutely firm date on it but we anticipate it will probably be around March, 1963.

Mr. Winch: As the majority of this money is to make up a deficiency in the moneys requested for the purchase of the CF-104, will the minister tell us the fire control system of the CF-104 and what type of weapon equipment it carries?

Mr. Harkness: It is equipped to carry air to surface missiles. As the hon. gentleman knows, the aircraft is known as a strike-reconnaissance aircraft and is equipped to carry air to ground missiles which can, of course, be equipped with nuclear warheads.

Mr. Winch: Is it possible to equip those weapons with conventional warheads? Can the minister tell us that?

Mr. Harkness: Yes, anything along that line is possible, as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Winch: That is interesting, Mr. Chairman. That is most interesting. All one has to do is read newspapers and magazines, or talk to the chief of the air staff of the Americans under NATO, as I have done in recent months, and he will explain the fire control of the 104. The fact of the matter is that this aircraft is not designed for conventional weapons, that no conventional weapons are available for it, and no conventional weapons are on the draft board for it.

In view of that information in scientific and technical magazines, in view of those remarks from the highest authorities both in production and in the United States air force, will the minister explain the remark he has just made?

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, the actual fact is that the Americans have already used this aircraft with conventional warheads.

An hon. Member: That is a knockout shot.

Mr. Winch: It is not the same aircraft.

Mr. Pearson: During the discussion on the army estimate the minister said that there is no use giving massive equipment to a unit which has no means of using it. We are now discussing aircraft and I am thinking particularly of the C-104 which will be the plane to be used—the minister will correct me if I