

*Interim Supply*

humanity to remove itself from the association of the commonwealth of nations any more than we would ask that a nation within the United Nations that has undertaken an unjustifiable act should be expelled from the United Nations. We think the thing to be done is to take every feasible step to clear up the malady or the affliction and to remove this sore and this blight on the commonwealth and on humanity itself.

The easiest thing in the world, Mr. Chairman, is for anyone to be intolerant of others because of colour, religion or economic or social status. I think it is part of the conflict and the competition of life in every person and in every nation that we continue to work on the question of racial equality as well as economic equality, freedom of speech and the other rights that we all hold so dear.

The main purpose of my rising at this time, Mr. Chairman, is not to make a sweeping condemnation of the government, and I do not do that. From my associations with hon. members opposite and from the public statements of the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs I can say that I know of no one in this chamber who condones what is being done in South Africa. It is a question of emphasis. It is a question of practicability. I think it is also a question of how we view this kind of discrimination and of the importance we attach to it.

I hope the government will take a stronger position on this question that is not governed by questions of one nation being in or out of a given organization but is based on a type of fundamental conviction that all people are in fact born equal and should have equal rights in human society.

**Mr. Hellyer:** I feel that we cannot grant this interim supply without objecting to the inclusion of funds for the SAGE-Bomarc program. When the government cancelled the Avro Arrow a year ago last February the inference was drawn that air defence was no longer valid. The minister himself, in explaining this cancellation, suggested that the threat from manned bombers was diminishing and that the threat from intercontinental ballistic missiles was increasing. This was obviously true, Mr. Chairman, and was a fact which was well recognized. But at the same time the minister added that the threat from the manned bomber continues. Many times in the intervening months he has gone on record as saying that in any all-out war in the foreseeable future manned bombers would be used as well as intercontinental ballistic missiles and that they would be used at least for mop-up operations. In that event it was essential, the minister told

us, that Canada should continue with the defence against manned bombers. I see the minister is nodding his head, I presume in assent.

Almost immediately, however, a contradiction was introduced and the contradiction was the continuation of a half policy of air defence. The government clearly gave the impression that the Bomarc was a superior while at the same time less expensive alternative to the manned interceptor as a defence against manned bombers. The impression was conveyed to the Canadian people through the press, and was widely accepted at least for a time, that the threat from the bombers was diminishing. We could, the government told us, safely cancel the Avro Arrow, the world's most outstanding all-weather interceptor, but at the same time we had to continue with a defence against manned bombers. It was, of course, a defence only for a very small part of the Canadian nation, but we had to continue with a defence against manned bombers.

Not only did the government decide to proceed with the installation of the SAGE-Bomarc system, but it has also tried to convince us and the Canadian people, though not too successfully, that it should continue to operate its CF-100 squadrons even though that plane is subsonic and the latest Russian bombers which might be sent in in attack against the North American continent are supersonic.

The inconsistencies have begun to make an impression, but it has been a very difficult process to try and impress upon the government and the Canadian people the fact that the government's policy was no policy at all. As a matter of fact, I think it has been easier to convince the Canadian people than it has the government. The government's intransigence on this particular point is a mystery to all of us who sit in the House of Commons, at least on this side of the house, and I am sure to most of the press gallery and to thinking Canadians.

Why would the government cancel the first line of defence against the manned bomber, and continue with the second line? This question has never been answered satisfactorily. Time and time again those of us on this side of the house have said: All or nothing. The continuation of the SAGE-Bomarc program without supersonic interceptors makes no sense whatsoever to the Canadian people, and anyone should be able to see that.

The recent announcement from Washington that the SAGE-Bomarc program was being held up for a month for reconsideration was because the United States authorities were convinced that due to the present