

Alleged Lack of Government Leadership

to most people. They are the strategic, the tactical, and the purely defensive. It is true that in the strategic field there is more than adequate under the control of the United States. But it is equally true that in the opinion of military people in charge of these matters, tactical and strictly defensive nuclear weapons are required both in NATO and in NORAD.

One point that is worth mentioning is this. In fulfilling our commitments to NATO and NORAD—

Mr. Fisher: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I should like to inquire of the hon. member whether he is reading from a speech or a text. If he is doing so I should like to draw Your Honour's attention to the point of order.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Benidickson: Every time you speak you are literary and read from a text.

Mr. Speaker: This matter of reading is a difficult one. Sometimes there are rather extensive notes and sometimes it is difficult to say whether what is being said has any relation to the notes. However, we will go along, as long as we are not getting into difficulty.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to send my notes to the hon. member later so that he can use them for the *Toronto Telegram*. In the meantime let me say to him that last night in this house I made a 30 minute speech without any notes whatsoever, and that is something that is very seldom done.

In being asked to fulfil our commitments to NATO we are doing what others of our allies have already done. Nine countries in NATO have signed bilateral agreements with the United States. Not all of them have nuclear weapons, but most of them in fact do have them. They are not considered to be members of the atomic club in the same sense that Britain, Russia, the United States and now France are considered to be. We are just asked to do what the Prime Minister committed himself to do in principle in December, 1957 when he adopted a NATO strategy which involved signing bilateral agreements between the United States and the respective countries in order to provide from time to time the tactical nuclear weapons required in NATO.

In our negotiations when we should have been demonstrating good faith we must have made some outrageous proposals to the United States to store nuclear weapons south of the border. Such a patently impractical suggestion

[Mr. Hellyer.]

must have driven the United States state department and the former minister of national defence to distraction. Is it any wonder that they both took the rather unusual courses they felt they must take?

The Liberal policy in this matter is clear. We are convinced that the only honourable way to resolve the present dilemma is to live up to our commitments in full. The leader of the Liberal party stated this clearly when he said:

The government should re-examine at once the whole basis of Canadian defence policy.

Later in the same speech he said:

However, until the present role is changed, a new Liberal government would put Canada's armed services in the position to discharge fully commitments undertaken for Canada by its predecessor.

In office, Mr. Speaker, we would re-examine our defence policy, but any new policy would be designed to give Canada the maximum contribution to peace and security and on no other basis. The Liberal party is proud to have at its head a leader—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Jones: Which one is it this week?

Mr. Speaker: Order. There is one member who has the floor.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Speaker, our leader is a man who is not afraid to take a stand on the great issues of the day even at the cost of losing votes. He is a man who can make decisions and who will make the decisions necessary to restore Canada to its position of influence and responsibility amongst the nations of the world.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is not for me today to get into the argument as between the hon. member for Trinity and the hon. member for York South, but as I listened to the hon. gentleman a moment ago I recalled an occasion in 1960 when he performed a feat which was never before performed in this house. A speech appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* in detail purporting to be what the hon. member for Trinity had said in the House of Commons, when he had not spoken at all. That was indeed an example that none of us, including the hon. member for York South, would ever want to emulate.

May I say that this afternoon I am going to review something of the situation as I see it based upon the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition, an amendment so general, so widespread, so obviously diffuse that one can only conclude that it was placed in such general terminology so that he would side away from the question of nuclear arms. He