

Supply—National Defence

policy. I should be very glad to answer any question in connection with any of these matters which are outlined in some detail in the details on page 14, and which, as I have indicated previously, deal entirely with salaries, pay and allowances. As a matter of fact, as I indicated previously, over \$27 million of this \$35 million is for pay and allowances. I do not think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River was here when I made a brief statement at the start of this debate, and I think that perhaps I had better make the point again that the total additional amount of money which we are going to require for the Department of National Defence this year is \$16 million, not \$66 million as would appear from a casual glance at these estimates. We have a shortfall in various other items so that the total additional amount required is not \$66 million but actually \$16 million. As I say, I do not think the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River was here—

Mr. Benidickson: You want \$35 million for a specific purpose.

Mr. Harkness: —when I dealt with that and explained it in detail. I also explained why we needed in this particular vote some \$35 million more than was voted when the main estimates were put through. As I indicated in the house last September, we estimated at that time that to increase the strength of the army, to put into effect the various accelerated survival measures and to carry on the training of up to 100,000 men in the special militia training course we would require some \$37 million extra. That was stated at that time. The actual amount required is \$35 million because, as I have already explained in detail, there is a shortfall in some of the other items in this vote of some \$2 million odd.

Mr. Hellyer: As I understand your ruling, Mr. Chairman, it is that under this item we may discuss anything having to do with the operation and maintenance of the Canadian army either in NATO or here at home. I wonder whether the minister would tell the house if it is the policy of the Canadian government that before we can accept nuclear warheads for our forces we must obtain them under sole Canadian control?

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I have already said on three occasions that I am going to abide by your ruling and not get into a general discussion of nuclear weapons, nuclear policy and so on, which has absolutely nothing to do with this item.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, we have an item of over \$23 million for pay and allowances. Although the Minister of National Defence and the Secre-

tary of State for External Affairs do not seem to have ordinary cabinet solidarity so far as policy is concerned, can I get from the minister the assurance that if the committee passes this item no person in the army is going to be employed or paid or given an allowance under circumstances that would enable him to be familiar with nuclear weapons and their employment, if and when the confusion of the government is settled and these men are given some responsibility in this field? Are we assured that in 1961-62 we have not paid people who have been given some preliminary training in the use, if provided to them, of nuclear weapons, and can I be assured by the minister that in his forthcoming estimates we will not be obliged to debate this again, because expenditures are being made with the thought that there is the prospect that our army personnel may have to know something about such weapons and therefore parliament is being asked to expend money in the meantime for the purpose of giving them some advance training in this type of warfare?

Mr. Harkness: I have already dealt with this matter, and again I think the hon. member was not here when I did so.

Mr. Pitman: Mr. Chairman, I think we have come to a blank wall in this whole matter of nuclear weapons and possibly we might turn off in some other direction. I believe the minister will agree that a discussion of national survival would come within the limits of this vote.

Mr. Harkness: Yes.

Mr. Pitman: Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with your permission I think I will move in this direction and see if we can discover something about the purpose and the future of this program.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): And come back to the other question later.

Mr. Pitman: The hon. member for Essex East says that we will come back to the question later. I can assure all hon. members that we in this corner are just as concerned about the problem of nuclear weapons for Canadian forces in Europe as I am sure other hon. members are to the right and left of Mr. Speaker but, quite frankly, we have spent almost an hour and a half on that subject tonight and I do not think we have got very far. Therefore I think we might move away from that subject and come back to it later.

Mr. Hellyer: The minister denies us information which we should have.

Mr. Pitman: First I should like to congratulate the minister on the job that was