

*Canadian Forces Act*

Official Secrets Act or any of the other acts that have been named as being amended, except the National Defence Act itself.

I therefore suggest that, when this type of legislation is introduced, it should be introduced as separate bills. Each amendment to each of the other statutes should be introduced as a separate bill standing on its own. After all, we do that in connection with the budget every year. We do not introduce one act amending the Income Tax Act, the Excise Tax Act and the Customs Act. Three separate bills are introduced, although they all stem from the one set of budget resolutions. In the same way here, I think it would be much more convenient, when more than one statute is to be amended, if the bills amending the statutes were themselves introduced separately or if the clauses amending the statutes were introduced separately as separate bills. I do not think it would make for any substantial increase in the amount of time consumed, any more than it does on the budget; because the main debate would take place on the resolution. At the present time, if there were any objection to the points which are involved in the amendments, the time will be consumed now on the clauses of the bill.

So that it would not, as I see it, make for any increase in time beyond the merely formal procedure necessary to be gone through which, after all, does not take a great deal of time anyway. I mean when the motion to leave the chair is put, and for the sake of convenience and clarity in dealing with statute law—I readily admit it is too late to do it this time—I would urge him in the future, when what I might call omnibus amendments are being introduced, to consider introducing the amendments in substance separately.

*(Translation):*

**Mr. Gagnon:** Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to tell the Hon. Minister of National Defence (Mr. Claxton) that I was surprised and astonished by the statements he made following my remarks of Monday last.

I was surprised by the manner in which these statements were made and by the terms the minister used. Of course I did not expect him to say that I was right but, to say the least, it was rude and unparliamentary to claim there was not an ounce of truth in my charges. However, I did not attach to the words of the minister as much importance as he did. It would be much better for him and for us if he were to take to task the French-baiting officers of his department, whom I will denounce just as long as they persecute the French Canadians.

[Mr. Fulton.]

My duty in this house is to defend and protect my fellow countrymen and I will unflinchingly fulfil this duty, whether the government likes it or not.

In order to do so, I do not need the approval of any minister or the assent of the whip of my party. All the statements I made in this house, since I have the honour of being one of its members, were true to the best of my knowledge and they have not been contradicted.

They may have been denied, as in this case, but those denials did not prove anything.

I said that I was surprised at the statement made by the minister. In fact I was surprised at how quickly it was made. At nine-thirty in the evening I disclosed that special consideration was shown to the French Canadians in Korea in that they were assigned to the most exposed battle positions and given the most tedious tasks and at three o'clock the very next afternoon the minister cried out that it was all false.

I am anxious to know what kind of inquiry the minister had made. He certainly did not have time to go to Korea to check my contentions on the spot. How, then, did he make sure I was entirely wrong? Did he phone, wire or communicate personally or through other people with the commanding officers of our units in Korea? Which officers did he consult? Did those officers tell him the whole truth? Or, as it may well be, was he convinced beforehand that I was wrong?

Can he assure me that he has never received complaints, either directly or indirectly, from French-Canadian soldiers about the way they were being treated in Korea? Can he assure me that his officers have received no such complaints? Can the members themselves swear that they have never been informed of such complaints?

How is it that the minister was so anxious to give me an answer on Tuesday last, and yet he will not do anything about the investigation I have been asking for months on the unwarranted dismissal of Flying Officer Desrochers? Have I not submitted to him all the evidence necessary for such an investigation? Why be so anxious on the one hand and so indifferent on the other?

When the minister answers my questions I shall tell him something else. In the meantime, the minister and others should not expect me to reveal my sources of information.