

National Defence Act Amendment

able to turn out in all the brilliant finery they wear at the present time.

Mr. Herridge: Does that mean that the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as an honorary colonel, will be permitted to wear his kilt?

● (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Hellyer: Most certainly he will be allowed to continue wearing his kilt. This is an opportunity to pass on a piece of information I picked up at the Vimy dinner the other night and which may be of interest to the hon. gentleman. Whereas we propose that kilts will still be worn for ceremonial purposes we do not intend to reinstate the practice of having people go into battle wearing kilts as was done in the first world war. One of the veterans of Vimy told me the other night that he saw men going into battle in kilts with mustard gas going up their legs. I am all for reform, he said.

Mr. Herridge: I thank the minister for that information.

Mr. Forrestall: I thank the minister for his reassurance with regard to traditional naval ranks, that they will not disappear in the near future and, indeed, quite possibly will never disappear. If I have paraphrased what he said, I think the minister has now understood the point we have been trying to make for some months. It is a little difficult to accommodate a colonel on the bridge of a ship or in the engine room.

I should like to ask the minister whether he has given further thought to the making of what might be called intermediate appointments—private first class, private second class and so on up to corporal. The point was well brought out by two or three members of the committee whose questions appear in the proceedings of evidence No. 36. As to modes of address, there is no difficulty when we get to chief warrant officer. We call him "Chief". I suppose one would call a warrant officer "Mister". I am not sure what we would call a master. Has consideration been given to the classification of recruits? When does a private become a private first class? Has this been settled yet?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not think it has been settled but in the present pay schedule there is a differentiation which relates to qualifications. This is already in force. As far as I know there is no differentiation expressed in rank insignia as between the different levels of privates. As I understand it there is nothing to prevent the armed forces making

[Mr. Hellyer.]

recommendations that some sign be worn which would indicate the difference in qualifications. Indeed, they might wish to continue appointments such as lance corporals. I think this is within the power set out in the bill. It would be strictly up to the military. They could recommend what they thought was the most workable procedure.

Mr. Forrestall: Am I correct in assuming that today pay is tied purely to trade structure as opposed to rank?

Mr. Hellyer: It applies to both. There are different pay fields for the same rank. One applies to rank and one applies to particular qualifications of persons holding that rank.

Mr. Forrestall: Could the minister extend the treatment he has promised senior naval officers to other ranks in the navy and express the hope that they will never become corporals?

Mr. Hellyer: I do not want to try to outguess the future. The associate minister has just been travelling in Europe and he has found great interest in this reorganization in the capitals he has visited. This leads me to believe it is much better to watch and see how the history of the world develops than to make decisions which might not take account of the situation five or ten years from now.

Mr. Churchill: The minister has spoken of the interest which may be developing in other parts of the world. This could be interpreted in two ways—interest in commendation of an enterprise or the fascinated interest of horror when something is being done which is wrong. I do not accept the minister's inference that other countries are anxious to follow the lead which has been set by him.

Mr. Hellyer: Some of this interest is accompanied by commendation. If the hon. gentleman would like me to do so I might give him an indication on third reading of the interest which is being shown in other parts of the world.

Mr. Churchill: Why would the minister want me to accept any statement of his on that account when he has said it so often in the past and we have been given contrary evidence presented by people in other countries of the world? The minister may say that everybody is following our lead but experienced people elsewhere in the world say, no; they say this is a shocking thing to have done. The minister has no support from the United States, Australia, New Zealand or