

Interim Supply

This should go well with the backbenchers on the other side.

—on the part of most of his cabinet colleagues—

The change I would make here would be a reference to back-benchers rather than cabinet colleagues. I always have been a back-bencher but I believe I have played a part in what my party has done. I urge the back-benchers opposite to rise and play your part. Do not be trained seals all your lives. The article continues:

—the unification proposals are little understood throughout the country. One thing is clear, though, and that is that a great many senior officers and men are extremely unhappy with it, and morale in the services has declined.

● (8:50 p.m.)

I could quote the whole editorial but I am trying to save time. Let us look at what was said in the *Calgary Herald* a few days ago:

Facts and figures are quite different from policy. Surely there should be no inhibition on civil servants against providing members of parliament with pertinent facts and figures upon which policy is to be based. Government, it is true, has the job of initiating policy. But parliament, surely, is the body which has the right to make the final decision.

I notice the hon. member for Leeds is paying close attention to these words and I wish to thank him for doing so because he occupies a preferential position so far as the Prime Minister is concerned.

The article then continues:

If parliament is only to get the information the government wants it to have, how can it be expected to make decisions which take into account all the facts and figures and information which apply to situations under review?

The papers are suggesting: Give parliament the facts and figures and the right to examine them. That is all we are suggesting because in this democracy we cherish the right to examine the facts and figures. Let me read from a statement made by Admiral Rayner which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of November 9, 1966. This man was in the service for 36 years so he must be considered by everyone to be an expert. He is reported as having said:

I am firmly convinced that a single service would be less effective in defending our country and co-operating with our allies than the three services we have today.

Then he is reported as having said:

Instead the changes necessitated by integration have been pushed through in bullheaded fashion with a lack of understanding of the rights of the individual.

That is a cherished right in any democracy. We must always have regard for the rights of

[Mr. Horner (Acadia).]

the individual at all times. The onus is upon the minister to break the impasse in which parliament finds itself.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I should like to have another five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the hon. member's request to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Chairman: There is not unanimous consent.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I regret that very much because now I may have to make another speech.

Mr. Herridge: Mr. Chairman, I intend to speak for only a few minutes to bring something I have just discovered to the attention of the committee. I was in France with the standing committee on veterans affairs when certain appropriation bills were passed last July. The hon. gentleman who just spoke said something about splitting the estimates. If I read the legislation correctly, we have already split the estimates by passing two appropriation bills which were assented to on July 11. I should like to ask the appropriate minister to explain this situation.

In looking up the acts I find that chapter 29 was assented to on July 11, 1966, and it says:

This act may be cited as the Appropriation Act No. 6, 1966.

It provides for the payment of the estimates of nine or ten different departments. The first paragraph of the schedule states:

Based on the main estimates, 1966-67. The amount hereby granted is \$825,462,241.67, being the total of the amounts of the items in the said estimates, as contained in this schedule, less the amount voted on account of the said items of the Appropriation Act No. 3, 1966 and the Appropriation Act No. 5, 1966.

This provided for the payment of the full estimates of the departments mentioned to the end of the year. Then I find that in chapter 30 there is another act cited as Appropriation Act No. 7, 1966, which was assented to on July 11, 1966. It provides for partial payment of the estimates of certain departments to the extent of four-twelfths in the case of one department, three-twelfths in the case of another, seven-twelfths in the case of another and so on.