

Business of the House

for private members during the session. Six of these are Mondays and two are Thursdays, and I point out this circumstance, that according to the rules these private members' days take into consideration a normal session which under ordinary circumstances today runs to six months or more.

The first private members' day, Thursday, November 21, was by unanimous consent given over for government business in order to complete the address. The second Thursday was November 28, and this was taken up under public bills, on a bill in respect of industrial relations.

As far as Mondays were concerned, the first Monday was November 25, which was taken up by a private member's motion to instal a system of simultaneous translation in the House of Commons. The second, December 2, was taken up entirely by a motion to extend the hours of sitting, which was debated, and also by the motion of the hon. member for Essex East to adjourn the house on an urgent matter. The third was December 9, which was taken up by a motion respecting the Canadian centennial. The fourth, December 16, was taken up by a motion in respect of increased pensions for some superannuated civil servants. The fifth Monday was January 6 and was taken up by a motion with respect to human rights.

There is only one further day and I would suggest—and I am going to ask for support of this motion—that having regard to all the circumstances and the very important legislation still on the order paper, the house accept this motion. It is not made with any desire to limit private members' days or private members' rights, but I feel sure that hon. members generally will agree that having regard to the time already taken on private members' days within the comparatively short period of this session, the request is a reasonable one, and I present it in that respect.

Hon. Lionel Chevrier (Laurier): Mr. Speaker, following the attitude of co-operation adopted by our leader during the early part of this session we on this side of the house will raise no objection to the adoption of this motion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I merely point out that the result of this motion, if it carries, will be to cut out private members' day on this coming Monday with respect to a motion that would have been moved by a back-bencher on the government side.

Mr. Solon E. Low (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I see no objection to supporting the motion. It does seem to me that if we are

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

to finish up the business of this session in a reasonable time we have to do something of the sort.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL DEFENCE**NUCLEAR WEAPONS—TRANSPORTATION BY AIRCRAFT OVER CANADA**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. James Sinclair (Coast-Capilano): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence but in his absence, since the question is of major importance, I shall direct it to the Prime Minister. Yesterday, as recorded at page 3123 of *Hansard*, the hon. member for Kingston asked the Minister of National Defence whether United States aircraft were permitted to carry nuclear weapons over Canadian air space. In reply the minister said that occasionally this did happen but that no blanket authority was given, and a specific authority had to be given for each flight.

Is the Prime Minister aware of a story carried in the *Toronto Telegram* last night originating from Washington, contradicting the situation described by the minister by saying that specific flight permission was not necessary, that the international defence agreement gave them blanket flight authority; and also that far from these flights being occasional they are so frequent that they are regarded as routine? If so, will the Prime Minister reconcile these two conflicting statements?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is no reconciliation necessary. One is an observation in the press and the other was a statement by the responsible minister. I might say with respect to the statement made by the Minister of National Defence that, as in the past, so now, there are no crossings of American aircraft into Canada conveying atomic or nuclear weapons without permission having been secured in advance.

Mr. Sinclair: I should like to ask a supplementary question about the nature of the flights. There are two types of flights, namely the actual transportation of inactive bombs to Alaska and to other foreign bases, and then flights of the strategic air command bombers which are always in the air to be able immediately to retaliate in case of attack. These aircraft, of course, carry live bombs. Are such flights of the second category, by strategic air command bombers carrying live nuclear weapons, permitted over Canada?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I know of no distinction between the two types of