

Interim Supply

many a man. I do not think pride alone should ruin the young and enterprising Minister of National Defence. I have given him a way out.

All the papers across Canada are speaking of arrogance. What does the *Ottawa Journal* say about integration and unification? The minister knows well. Up until last week the *Ottawa Journal* stoutly defended the minister's stand. What does it say now? Let me read from the *Ottawa Journal* of November 8 under the heading, "That Defence Bill—Let's Get At It":

Once again parliament and the country are obliged to suffer not so much because of the policy but because of the arrogant methods of a Liberal government.

It goes on to quote what the minister said when he introduced his bill:

"Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the amalgamation of the navy, army and air force into a single service and will provide the flexibility to enable Canada to meet in the most effective manner the military requirements of the future."

I especially emphasize these words:

"It will also establish Canada as the unquestionable leader in the field of military organization."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): This is the arrogant Minister of National Defence. He says that if this bill is passed Canada will unquestionably be away ahead of the rest of the world. The editorial goes on to say:

The key word there is "details." Before going into "details," the opposition would understandably have liked to have some basic reasons why the government is set on unification.

This is what the country is asking and what we are asking. Everybody over there claps their hands. Have they been concerned about the details? Have they been given the basic reasons?

An hon. Member: We have the bill.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): The bill does not give the basic reasons. Let me continue to read:

There is widespread country demand for such explanation, Mr. Hellyer seems only to say "Give me your approval of the bill now and I'll tell you later why we are doing it."

We used to think that the Liberals under Hon. C. D. Howe were arrogant but they cannot compare with the Liberals of today. Let us look at the *Montreal Gazette* of Wednesday, November 9, 1966. This is an editorial comment headed "Unnecessary Trouble":

Defence Minister Paul Hellyer has gone through a severe testing in the past few days of the debate on interim supply. But it is a testing which he could have avoided.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I plead with the minister to cease it now. The article goes on to say:

And as the debate dragged on this week and up to yesterday, it was beginning to become clear just how unreasonable his initial stand was.

"How unreasonable his initial stand was." It continues:

In fact, if Mr. Hellyer has as much faith in the measure as he appears to have, he should welcome the referral, not try to block it.

What is the justification? If I believe in any given situation that I am right, then I am prepared to let my cause be examined by anybody; I have nothing to hide. But right from the very time that the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona raised this issue, who has tried to conceal facts? The Minister of National Defence. As the *Montreal Gazette* points out, if the minister has as much faith in the measure as he appears to have, he should welcome a referral—we agree—and not block it. We give him three "outs".

Let us look at the *Globe and Mail* of November 9, 1966. I could quote from papers from all across Canada. The editorial is headed, "Speak Up", and reads:

An example of the new freedom to be found in the Canadian armed forces is contained in a notice which appeared recently on the bulletin boards at Camp Borden—

I do not have too much time left. The notice states that they may be interviewed by newspapermen and that they are at liberty to talk to the press. The editorial continues:

There was just one trifling condition: "It is contrary to existing regulations to make public statements criticizing Department of National Defence policy." It should make for a great sampling.

It is contrary to existing regulations to say anything which is contrary to defence policy. So there would be a great sampling there. Let us look at the *Hamilton Spectator* of November 9, 1966. It says:

It is a perfectly reasonable position to take.

It is referring to the Conservative opposition to the bill.

Thanks largely to the increasing arrogance of Defence Minister Paul Hellyer and the apparent disinterest in his handiwork—