

*Supply—National Defence*

speak with a united voice because we have to consider the three services as working more and more as one.

I should like to ask the minister whether he has received any memoranda from any of the chiefs of staff indicating that he has had difficulty in approaching the minister and presenting his point of view. If there is any substance in what was said by Lieutenant General Simonds it would seem that there is a very definite weakness in the headquarters organization. Surely the chief of staff of a service should have the right at any time convenient to the minister to make representations in the interests of his service. If that condition exists it seems to me it is the responsibility of the chief of staff concerned to put his representations in writing to the minister, and I would ask the minister whether he has received any such complaints in the past.

Another serious charge is made in that article in connection with the permanent joint board, in which it is claimed that it acts as a barrier to the free exchange of ideas between the chiefs of staff of Canada and the chiefs of staff of the United States. That board was established before the United States came into world war II, and it had a very definite purpose in those days. I am not certain that that purpose still remains. I feel that if there is any difficulty in way of the free exchange of views between Canadian and United States chiefs of staff any such obstruction should be removed immediately, because we have to play as a team and both sides must be able to make the fullest representations to the other parties.

These are the main points I wish to bring to the attention of the committee at this time. I am pleased to hear that the number of militia going to camp will be increased, but 20,000 out of some 50,000 is not an impressive figure. I should like the minister to explain whether those are going as individuals to receive training in schools of instructions, or whether they are going to be trained as units. Unless a militia unit is trained under its own commanders from the brigade and regiment down it cannot be considered as an efficient unit.

It seemed to be indicated in the white paper that there might be a change contemplated in the role of the militia. Emphasis is placed on the fact that they are to supplement the regular forces. Two years ago the regular army reserve was introduced, and we were told last year that it was to provide first-line reinforcements for the regular Canadian units. Unfortunately that scheme failed, and failed badly. I believe they

could not get any more than 100 to go to camp. Obviously there must be some means by which the regular units can be brought up to strength before they go on to an operation, and provision must be made to supply first-line reinforcements, either for regular units being employed in this country or on any other mission they may be required to carry out.

The militia are not well equipped. Reference was made to the fact that they are still hoping to have the 25-pounders replaced by the 105-mm and to replace the old Sherman tanks with more modern equipment. I wonder whether any attention is being given to the possibility of developing some form of armoured vehicle which could be used in our north country. The Centurion tank with which the regular armoured units are now equipped I would not think would be of much value in the north. It does seem to me that if we are to have an airborne force to operate in this country in the case of possible raids they should be supported by some armour. It might be a good line of research work to see whether a special light tank might not be developed for operation in our heavy and deep snow and under the cold weather conditions of the north.

The minister referred to the fact that another unit was going to be activated, but he did not mention which unit it was. I am sure it would be interesting to the committee to know what unit he has in mind if he is going to have a third regular armoured unit.

In closing I should like to call attention to the fact that apparently the minister has paid attention to what the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre has been saying for a number of years, and some steps have been taken to provide some form of armoured carrier.

I appreciate the extra time which has been granted to me to make these remarks. There will be many questions which will have to be asked on the various items as they come up, but I shall close my remarks now.

**Mr. Cameron (Nanaimo):** Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested this afternoon to hear the Minister of National Defence—I think I have his words correctly—refer to the profound effect of nuclear weapons and far-ranging bombers on our defence thinking. I was struck by that, because when I glanced through the white paper I could find little or no sign whatever of that profound effect upon the thinking of the defence department. It may be that the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich was correct when he said that this white paper had been drafted many months ago, perhaps before this profound effect had taken place.

[Mr. Pearkes.]