

Supply—National Defence

item because, if we do, then this thing goes by the board. If we let it go by and wait for the Standing Committee on Defence to get together to hear all these witnesses, at that stage the renegotiation will have taken place and, against the will of a number of people, the village of Shannon will have disappeared.

I must re-emphasize this point, that this is being done against the will of those who have been there for generations. I want to have a little more information on this project before I will let item 15 pass.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, as I already explained, there will be up to 3,000 men training at this camp. They will be training in all arms and using the materiel and equipment available to them.

Mr. Pugh: You say 3,000 men will be training in all arms. I would say that is just a trifle vague. If they are training in all arms, how many would be trained in the use of this particular type of mortar—not all mortars but this particular type which has made Valcartier unsafe for the 25 families?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't get in a rush, you fellows.

Mr. MacInnis (Cape Breton South): Any chance of getting a change of ministers?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Pugh: The question was, how many of these 3,000 men will be trained to use this extension mortar?

Mr. Churchill: The old C.C.F. party would have been concerned about a thing like this.

Mr. Lewis: Don't you get so concerned about us.

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Pugh: We want the answer.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have the committee proceed? It is very nice to look at the hon. member for Okanagan-Boundary, but really there is no reason why he should make a farce of the committee. If he has any questions he wishes to discuss, they could be discussed or put; but just to take the floor, hold it, stand and refuse to speak, and refuse to sit down, obviously shows an intention to stall the committee. That is perfectly legitimate if that is what the opposition wishes. That is their

choice, but we do have certain rules applicable to debates in the house and in committee, and, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest they be observed. If the hon. member wishes to speak he may speak. If he does not wish to speak, then he should resume his seat and let the item proceed.

Mr. Pugh: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the words of a minister who has just arrived in the chamber. He apparently does not appreciate the situation that has arisen in the committee tonight. He says the hon. member refuses to speak. If he will examine *Hansard* tomorrow he will see that is not the case. It is the case of the minister refusing to answer.

I would say to the minister, who has tried to throw a castigation against me, that I am not standing here to be looked at. I am thinking of those people in that village who have asked parliament to do something about it, who have asked the Prime Minister to do something about it. The telegram which they sent to him was acknowledged by him. He was in the house and he was asked questions, but he did not answer. Now we are merely following through, and this is for the minister's ears who came in late and raised his voice in the middle of the debate. Procedurally I pay great respect to him, but when he comes in suddenly and says let us get on with this because of various and sundry, I do not agree with him one little bit.

● (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Chairman, you know I have been asking a question which I feel deserves an answer. I have no wish to hold up this committee in any way, shape or form, but I do want to get an answer to this question. Furthermore the Minister of National Defence, who stands on his two feet at the drop of a hat and pretends to know everything that is going on in National Defence and in foreign affairs in this country, does not know the small things which go to make up morale and so on in the army, navy, air force or in any of our services. It seems to me, in a matter which is as important as this—the moving of 25 families who have been there for generations—there is no reason why he cannot tell us why the range must be taken over under expropriation.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it clear that I am just as interested in these 25 families as is my hon. friend, but if he pursues his questioning, I am sure nature