

Supply—National Defence

be going for the actual provision in service of the Bobcat, or is it not likely to come into service until 1963?

Mr. Harkness: So far as this year which we are discussing is concerned, 1961-62, of course none will come into service. During the next year, 1962-63, the first 20 vehicles will have been completed and a start made on the run of 480 which we have on order.

Mr. Hellyer: Last evening we received an interesting confirmation. The minister confirmed to us that there was no continuing relationship between graduates of the civil survival training course and the armed forces of Canada. This raises the question as to why these public funds should be expended on their training, and whether in fact the training course was intended to be a survival training course or whether it was intended to be a combination recruiting campaign and unemployment relief measure. From the figures the minister gave us as to the success of the recruiting aspect of the course it would seem to have been a very expensive recruiting campaign, probably the most expensive that this country has ever undertaken. From the relationship that exists between the graduates and the armed forces of Canada, the minister has demonstrated that the course has been somewhat futile as well as the most expensive civil survival training that has ever been undertaken by Canada.

I think the minister's revelation points up also the lack of co-ordination between the armed forces of Canada and the emergency measures organization. This is not a new problem, but it is obviously a problem which has not been solved. The army is training people and returning them to civilian life. Once they are returned they have no responsibility to or direct connection with the emergency measures organization which is charged with certain aspects of national survival.

There is a great deal that the minister should explain in regard to this program. What he has told us so far seems to confirm the rumour which has been circulating that the first notice the Canadian army received of this program was when they read about it in the daily newspapers. Perhaps it is true that it was conceived in the Prime Minister's office as a measure to reduce the unemployment figures, which are published periodically in Canada, to a lower level during the year immediately preceding a general election. Is this the purpose? If so, the minister should advise the committee so that we can study it on its merits as primarily an unemployment relief measure. On the other hand, should the minister tell us it is part of our

recruiting campaign then he should also inform us what the cost is per recruit, and whether this is the most effective method of recruiting new men for the armed forces.

If the minister really expects us to take him seriously when he suggests that these people are being trained for survival operations in the event of attack on this country, then he should explain how the government, if not his department, intend to co-ordinate their activities with this conglomeration of survival organizations which has been set up, in such a manner that there will be some continuing benefit to the Canadian taxpayers who have footed the bill.

I hope that before we go any further the minister will explain in much greater detail the purpose, the results and the benefits of this whole survival training course.

Mr. Harkness: The remarks of the hon. gentleman merely serve to demonstrate his complete divorcement from the realities and actualities of the situation so far as this training program and these matters generally are concerned. The program was not conceived in the Prime Minister's office. It was conceived in the department of defence, and all these statements that the hon. member made about the army not hearing of it until they read about it in the newspapers are on a par with other ridiculous statements which he is constantly making—

Mr. Hellyer: It was not my statement.

Mr. Harkness: It was a statement with no basis of fact whatsoever. The accusation that it was designed as an employment scheme is also quite incorrect. The scheme was designed as a means of securing the largest possible number of people trained in survival techniques in the shortest possible time which we could see was practical to achieve. After looking at the matter very carefully the army considered that they could train up to 25,000 people on one course, and that they could not train any more than that. We gave consideration to training 30,000 to 35,000 men on a course, but after looking into what the capabilities were so far as army accommodation and training staffs were concerned it was finally decided that 25,000 was the maximum number who could receive practical training at one time. That is why that particular number was decided.

So far as this idea of the army continuing some control over these men after they leave the courses is concerned, unless you have some type of conscription that is just not possible. When the members of the regular army complete their term of engagement the army has no further control over them. They go their way and enter civilian employment. The army has no continuing strings