

Supply—National Defence

which apparently indicates that the Department of National Defence did not plan ahead for any considerable period of time.

The other question I wish to raise, and unfortunately I do not have the reference with me but I have seen a number of comments in the press, is that officers in the survival exercise are unable to say exactly what would happen following a nuclear attack on Niagara Falls, which is one of those centres admitted by the Prime Minister in this house last fall to be a prime and primary target. If it were a primary target all its people, and certainly its survival group, would be completely destroyed; yet no arrangements have been made, as I read the press, for moving survival troops over destroyed highways from one centre to another.

I would ask the minister whether, in the interval from the first survival course, he has conceived any plan which would assist an area like Niagara Falls which would be largely decimated in the event of nuclear attack?

Mr. Harkness: First of all I am sorry to have to inform the hon. member that the department of defence does not postulate its policies on the armoury situation in Niagara Falls. In actual fact the armoury to which the hon. member referred was an old building, very expensive to maintain and not an economic building to keep in operation.

So far as rescue operations in Niagara Falls are concerned rescue columns would come from various places at a distance of anywhere up to 60 or 80 miles from Niagara Falls. There are quite definite plans in connection with bringing rescue columns into any particular area which has been hit.

Mr. Herridge: I want to raise a question that was put forward first by the hon. member for Trinity and then in another form by the hon. member for Peterborough. It has to do with the continuity of contact between the emergency measures people and the persons who have been trained. Although I do not know what percentage is involved it has been brought to my notice that among the persons who were trained there were quite a number of drifters, people who move from one place to another. They came into a city, took the course, and then went on again. I am told that there was quite a percentage of this type who certainly would lose all contact with the persons who had trained them, as against those resident in the district. Has the minister any idea of the percentage trained who were, shall we say, drifters or floaters and were not permanent residents of the district in which they were trained and available for service there?

Mr. Harkness: No, I have no record of that. I would merely point out to the hon. member that working under a voluntary system, as we do in this country, both for the regular forces and the militia forces, and this special militia force, we enlist people without regard to their race, religion, job, complexion or anything else along that line; as long as they meet the mental and physical requirements they are enlisted.

Mr. Herridge: On enlistment there was no requirement that the person who sought training was a resident of the district?

Mr. Harkness: No.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder if the minister can say whether he plans to carry on with this program next winter as well.

Mr. Harkness: This is a matter to which we are giving consideration, but no decision has yet been reached as to whether or not we will carry on with it next year.

Mr. Benidickson: Mr. Chairman, I am speaking from memory, but as I recall it last September the Prime Minister used his usual superiority by announcing a major program over the head of the minister, and I think he said that 15,000 additional people would be recruited under the national defence program. I do not recall what the purpose was for this additional recruitment of 15,000 people, but I assume this vote has some relationship to it. How many of the 15,000 people that the Prime Minister spoke about in September, 1961, have been recruited, and what are their duties?

The minister passed me off when I spoke earlier by saying I had not been in the committee when he gave some information with respect to the relationship of this vote of \$35 million to the training of people who might conceivably be engaged in nuclear training, or who might be engaged in the aspect of rescue and survival training that has been discussed recently. Could the minister break down, in these three aspects, how much of this vote relates to recruiting of 15,000 people under the defence program mentioned by the Prime Minister in September, how much relates to the rescue and survival program—which of course reduces expenditures in large part in connection with unemployment insurance payments—and how much involves people who may be wasting their time if the Secretary of State for External Affairs rather than the Minister of National Defence has his way and we do not need to know anything about nuclear weapons? Could we have a breakdown of these three categories?

Mr. Harkness: If the hon. member will look at the details on page 14 he will find just