

National Defence

council. I think it is a pretty important body in our democratic procedure and it certainly has more responsibility to parliament than any single minister.

Section agreed to.

On section 55—*Expenses of the defence research board.*

Mr. Harkness: This section makes it possible to appoint persons to the board without reference to the civil service commission. Will these employees come under the benefits of superannuation, pension and everything else?

Mr. Claxton: They are appointed in the same way as civil servants, and the salaries are closely related. They have all the benefits of the Civil Service Superannuation Act.

Mr. Harkness: But all appointments can be made without reference to the civil service commission?

Mr. Claxton: That is right.

Mr. Harkness: That may be necessary as far as scientific and technical employees are concerned, but I cannot see the need for it in connection with cleaners, clerical workers and others.

Mr. Claxton: The provision is the same as that in connection with the national research council, with which we have close working relations. It permits of more flexibility in the carrying on of research work in isolated centres.

Mr. Graydon: What yardstick is used by the cabinet to decide whether appointments will be taken away from the civil service commission?

Mr. Claxton: The national research council and the defence research board are intended to co-operate closely with universities and industry and have close working relationships with them. As a matter of fact, they have salary scales that are worked out in conjunction with the universities and industry so as to arrive at a fair figure. I do not think there is much room for argument in the case of scientific and technical personnel, but in the case of others it has frequently been found that a stenographer may have some scientific training—I know of many in the service—and be more valuable because she is familiar with scientific terms or may be able to do a bit of research work herself. Such a girl does not fit exactly into the categories set up by the civil service commission. We think this works much better than it would if these people came under the civil service commission.

Section agreed to.

Section 56 as amended agreed to.

Section 57 agreed to.

On section 58—*No limitation.*

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): Is there anything in the act or the regulations to indicate where within Canada an offence shall be tried?

Mr. Claxton: Section 59, just over the page, reads:

Every person alleged to have committed a service offence may be charged, dealt with and tried under the code of service discipline, either in Canada or out of Canada.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): If an offence were committed in Alberta the offender could be tried in Ottawa?

Mr. Claxton: Yes.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): Do you think that is advisable?

Mr. Claxton: Yes.

Section agreed to.

Sections 59 to 63 inclusive agreed to.

Sections 64 to 66 inclusive, as amended, agreed to.

Section 67 agreed to.

Section 68 as amended agreed to.

Sections 69 to 78 inclusive agreed to.

Section 79 as amended agreed to.

Sections 80 to 82 inclusive agreed to.

On section 83—*Scandalous conduct by officers.*

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): This section reads:

Every officer who behaves in a scandalous manner unbecoming an officer is guilty of an offence . . .

I am asking whether or not that word "scandalous" has always been in the act?

Mr. Claxton: Yes, sir, that is in the existing naval service act, the army, and navy and air force acts.

Section agreed to.

Sections 84 to 87 inclusive agreed to.

On section 88—*Drunkenness.*

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): I should like to ask the minister if he is satisfied with this section which refers to drunkenness. The same language is used with respect to other offences. It says:

Drunkenness, whether on duty or not on duty, is an offence and every person convicted thereof is liable to imprisonment for less than two years or to less punishment . . .