

Supply—National Defence

who is it who uses them? Anyone living in this city knows that in the mornings cars flit here and there on unofficial business. We would like to have a record in this regard. The Canadian people want to know whether their defence dollar is bringing the greatest possible return. It is no wonder that the minister of manpower to be, said yesterday that he believes in a capital gains tax.

Mr. Knowles: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If hon. gentlemen opposite can win over the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, then they will have two of this belief.

Mr. Knowles: We will win him over to this side first.

Mr. Crouse: You have lost three already.

Mr. Diefenbaker: These are just a few matters about which I should like to know, as would the people, and I know the minister has the information available. Later we will get answers to these questions, and to other questions asked by hon. members which as yet have not been answered.

The hon. member for Greenwood pointed out with unusual clarity—I mean that; he is always clear but this time he made it pellucidly clear—that he wants information which all of us want. I would ask the minister to take off these cloaks and answer these questions. If there is one thing in military science that the hon. gentleman is qualified at, it is in creating a smokescreen to conceal facts. We want to remove that smokescreen and get the facts.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Chairman, I will only say a few words at this time because the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Diefenbaker) spoke a minute ago of the risks involved for the people of my riding affected by expropriations now under way for the expansion of Camp Valcartier.

I want to tell him that during the last election campaign, municipalities affected by the expropriations knew about this expansion project and supported me in a proportion of 9 to 1 as compared with the Conservative candidate.

There have never been any constituents without representation in the Quebec-Montmorency riding, now or at any time, and the editorial writer of the Quebec *Chronicle-Telegraph* has only to inquire of the mayors

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

of various municipalities who keep in constant touch with their representative to have their interests protected.

I merely wanted to point out to the Leader of the Opposition that, in my opinion, it is sheer play-acting and partisanship to refer to old churches when it is necessary to provide essential requirements to Camp Valcartier, an important military camp in the integration of our armed forces.

[*English*]

The Chairman: Shall vote No. 1 carry?

Mr. Horner (Acadia): Mr. Chairman, before it carries I would have thought that the Minister of National Defence would answer some of the questions put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps he is preparing these answers, in which case I can throw in a few more questions so that he can answer all the questions at the same time.

● (5:00 p.m.)

I think the member for Greenwood posed the real question which is that this house ought to be able to assess Canada's role with respect to nuclear arms. Where are we going?

The Minister of National Defence in his reply said that he could not see beyond this year. In other words, he knows where we are going this year. From there on he has not projected his vision, he has not looked into the crystal ball, or he dare not tell this house what he sees for the future. I think the question of nuclear arms is very important and certainly this house and this country should know what our role is. Are we going to continue to have a nuclear force? Are we to continue to have a nuclear role in NATO?

In yesterday's *Journal* there was an article to the effect that President de Gaulle will order everybody out of France or take over the forces. Surely this is not news to the Minister of National Defence. He has known of this for some time because I know that the members of the armed forces in Europe have known of it for some time. What decision is the department making on this matter and where are we going with our defence policy? In the January 1965, edition of *Canadian Aviation* the minister had this to say on the second page about Canada continuing a nuclear role:

Speculation that the Canadian forces would continue to assume a nuclear role, despite the traditional Liberal government's opposition to this course, was heightened by Canada's support of the French position of maintaining an independent nuclear force. Questioned in the House of Commons, Defence Minister Paul Hellyer said government