

*Supply—National Defence*

will make it 26 families before we are finished.

**An hon. Member:** Arrogant statement.

**Mr. Churchill:** Smart Aleck, flippant answer.

**An hon. Member:** Can we hear from the house leader now.

**The Chairman:** Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre.

**Mr. Churchill:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We have heard from this minister a smart Aleck and flippant answer, which is typical of the minister and typical of this government.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Arrogant.

**Mr. Churchill:** Yes, it is arrogant. There are several ways out of this difficulty the government is in. I have pointed out two ways for the minister, and other members have mentioned the same—an order in council rescinding the earlier one, doing away with the expropriation. That settles the matter. If that cannot be done or if they do not want to do that, the second alternative is for the Minister of National Defence to declare that a mortar, anti-tank or artillery range which would put the 25 families in a dangerous position will not be established in the area. That is all he has to say.

So, there are those two courses which I say can be followed. Our duty here is to speak on behalf of those Canadian citizens who have put forward a legitimate grievance, have carried it as far as the Prime Minister, and still have not been satisfied. During the course of our discussion tonight we have found out that the Minister of National Defence does not know exactly what he wants at Valcartier camp; he does not know how many men would be trained there; he is not able to tell us how many regiments or battalions would be moved in and out of that camp during the course of a year. He has admitted there is a shortage of mortar ammunition. He is so ignorant of the problem that at one time he thought it was for a mortar range and then enlarged it to anti-tank, or self-propelled artillery, so the minister is in a state of confusion.

The Associate Minister of National Defence talks about negotiating with the people involved, but it has been pointed out time and time again that it is within the arbitration proceedings and that it is just then a matter of settling on how much time, what the price is, and things of that nature.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

That is not what we are asking for. We say leave the people there. Valcartier camp has been used for over 50 years and this is the first time I have heard it is not adequate for the desired purpose. Since the second world war an enormous training area has been established in the Atlantic provinces in order that we could train a whole division, and this is where the troops go for their training. The smaller camps are not put under the same pressure. That was in days gone by; that was the whole purpose of camp Gagetown, and I was here in this house when it was debated and set up. There is where you have the adequate training area for large bodies of troops.

The minister has pointed out the areas which have been used for years for artillery and mortar purposes. Why is he trying to create another and do it at the expense of 25 families? I hope no one will say that 25 families are not important: They are very important.

**An hon. Member:** They are laughing at it over there.

**Another hon. Member:** Nobody said that.

**Mr. Churchill:** Particularly when the families have been settled there for a long time in that area, why should they be dislodged in peacetime? If it were wartime they would not object and no one here would object, if it was done in the national interest; but this happens to be peacetime and the army is training for peace keeping purposes. There has not been much emphasis by the Minister of National Defence in the last three years on training for war. He talks about training for peace keeping exercises. Our troops which have been used abroad in the last several years in these peace keeping operations never have had to use mortar shells, so why the insistence suddenly on having training in the firing of mortars? What is the minister planning for? Does he have some expedition overseas that he wants to train troops for? This does not fit in with his white paper on defence. There was nothing in the white paper on defence which indicated we would have to do intensive training with mortars. The emphasis in the white paper is on mobility and realities. The minister likes to talk about realities. The reality of the situation is that this is peacetime.

Canada's policy with regard to her armed forces is for peace keeping operations, where mortars are not required. Why then do we have to extend the military camp and have