

Supply—National Defence

Mr. Hellyer: But I do say that we might claim some credit for getting on with the job of accomplishing some of these things and in this area I think our record has been pretty good. The idea of integration of armed forces is 20 or 30 years old but only now for the first time is somebody seriously embarking on it. My hon. friend had a chance when he was minister—

● (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Would the minister permit a question in respect of unification? Would he answer the question of the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre last night. What does he mean by unification? Does he mean one force, one uniform? Would he explain this more fully?

Mr. Hellyer: Unification means one force. I think this is understood.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): One uniform too?

Mr. Hellyer: I think my hon. friend will agree there can never be one uniform that would cover all situations.

Mr. MacEwan: The kilt?

Mr. Hellyer: Yes, I could envisage no force without a kilt and I know my hon. friend would agree. I am quite happy to have the opportunity to answer hon. members' questions but, I would suggest that we might pass item one and get on with item 15.

Mr. Churchill: Why did you not come to the house in time today? Why were you in Toronto?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): There was the press release.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, the house will have viewed with pleasure the change in attitude of the minister since last night. I have known the minister over the years. I have heard him make statements of various varieties but I doubt that at any time any minister has done a more thorough job of casting doubt on his administration than he did last night by the arrogance and insolence of some of his statements and by his aspersions on those who had served as successive ministers of defence, coupled with ridicule and contemptuous utterances. I cannot imagine anyone, no matter how much he might disagree, casting specious and contemptuous aspersions against ministers like General George R. Pearkes, V.C., C.B., D.S.O., M.C. Yet that minister, as well as some of his successors, was mentioned. Mention was made

[Mr. Churchill.]

of Hon. Brooke Claxton, D.C.M. These ministers were rubberstamps; these ministers had no backbone; they had no appreciation of the needs. When one sets himself apart in that way as belonging to that select group who are certain that whatever viewpoint they hold is the right one, naturally a review of some of the statements made in the past by the hon. gentleman would not be remiss, because he was just as certain then as he is now.

The minister's attitude last night as I read *Hansard*, and I was not privileged to be here last evening, was that he would answer when he got to the standing committee. Mr. Chairman, he is going to answer here and now the questions of importance. If he has any idea of anything to the contrary, he will learn differently. His attitude toward this house and the committee was one of supercilious contempt. Today he has started to answer questions. If he follows that course, we at least will know what he stands for. His extramurally prepared document of last evening was not such as will commend itself to him, I am sure, in the years ahead. It certainly will not win the approbation of this house. Members endeavouring to obtain information were met by an attitude of pompous bluster. What does the minister say?

Mr. Hellyer: It is in the script.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Any time the minister wishes to interrupt I hope he will let me hear the interjection because I do not want to miss any of his words. I do not want to read his words in *Hansard* and not have the opportunity to answer.

I should like to deal with a situation at the moment which will commend itself to the Associate Minister of National Defence. It has to do with a serious situation in the area surrounding Valcartier. There is a village there by the name of Shannon which has been in existence for 100 years. The *Quebec Chronicle-Telegraph* and various people in this area have been in touch with me. I very seldom quote an editorial but I am going to quote this one in the issue of February 17:

Some 100 residents of Shannon face the prospect of being dispersed to the four winds. This is a fact about which little has been said either here or in Ottawa. . . . Their land was needed for enlarging Camp Valcartier, they were told. About 25 families have been told their land is due for expropriation . . .

Shannon's residents do not doubt they will be paid compensation. What they object to is being pushed around. They cannot understand why an army in peacetime, has to dispossess people in order to provide more room for itself. If this were a