

*Canadian Forces Act*

minister's statement was an example of massive inconsistency. He said a lot, but at the same time he did not clarify what is being asked not only by the Canadian Council of Churches in conference yesterday but by people of all religious faiths across this country. When I spoke a while ago I referred to two of the organizations. I, of course, meant to include as well the work of the Knights of Columbus and the Canadian Legion. A general statement that this is not being done at the moment does not seem to be sufficient. If the parliamentary assistant was in a position to say that the government had changed its policy from what it was in this regard in the first and second world wars, then the question that would necessarily follow is: Why the change? Where was there any failure on the part of these auxiliary services that they should be denied the opportunity of voluntarily serving their fellow men?

I think the hon. member for Rosetown-Biggart covered the situation completely, and I am not going to go over what he said. People are asking why it is that a ruling such as this, which has every appearance of being arbitrary and unjustifiable, cannot and will not be explained by the department. Has the parliamentary assistant available the replies given to the Y.M.C.A. and to the Salvation Army when offers of assistance were given? Did the Y.M.C.A. offer to furnish the necessary facilities in Korea and at no expense to the Canadian government? What was the reply given by the department in response to that generous offer? The same question applies as well to the Salvation Army, to the Knights of Columbus and to the Canadian Legion. Certainly, in the past the course taken by Canada has always been, as I have understood the attitude of the government, one that they could justify as the course for Canada. Now the explanation is that other nations in Korea have not got this auxiliary service. The people of Canada are not interested in what the other nations have. They want to know why it is that Canadians, offering to serve and to do these things that were so well described by the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre from his vast experience in two world wars, have been turned down. If the parliamentary assistant cannot give the answer—and after all one does not expect omniscience from the parliamentary assistant, or a higher degree of knowledge than his minister betrayed—at least he should be able to place before the committee the record showing the replies given to those several auxiliary organizations that offered their services. I should like to

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

ask the parliamentary assistant—I keep elevating him to minister—whether he is in the position to furnish the committee with at least a copy of the reply given to one or more of those who offered their services.

**Mr. Campney:** I will have to look into the matter raised by the hon. member for Lake Centre. I have none of the correspondence before me.

**Mr. Green:** That information is surely available from the department, and the information as to whether or not there has been a change in policy should also be available. The bill cannot go through third reading today. I ask the parliamentary assistant to endeavour to get that information just as quickly as possible, and to furnish the house with it before the bill gets third reading. Can we have that assurance from the parliamentary assistant?

**Mr. Campney:** I shall endeavour to do so.

**Mr. Churchill:** There is just one thing that I should like to add to this. I notice that in his reply on October 29, at page 478 of *Hansard* the minister mentioned the fact that there were six welfare officers with sub-staffs of N.C.O.'s and men. In view of the representations which are being made with regard to welfare, if the policy of the department is to keep welfare solely within the hands of military trained personnel, it may be that in time we shall see an increase in the number of people devoted to welfare work. I suggest that is a very uneconomic use of trained officers. The six welfare officers are—what? Are they lieutenants or captains? I doubt whether they could be of the rank of major. If they are captains, after their long course of training and reaching that rank, I would say their job is elsewhere than in welfare. If they are lieutenants I would judge that they would be shifted about, moved about very rapidly, and would not become very expert at their welfare work.

Subsequently, I asked a question of the minister as to whether or not this welfare work was their special job, meaning, of course, their main job. Information was brought forward yesterday by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra that they have other tasks in connection with their welfare work. All I say is that when you add it up it is an uneconomic use of manpower. Six officers with sub-staffs of N.C.O.'s and men trained to fight are allocated to a different task. When we have available volunteers who do not have to be trained in the use of weapons and in all the expensive training required for officers, N.C.O.'s and men, we should make use of their services.