

*Supply—Privy Council*

extent those of us in this group kept saying that national survival is a national problem, a problem serious enough that we should give consideration to the question of freedom for this group who are taking these courses in order that we may have them ready in case of a national emergency. This is the kind of debate which is going on all across the nation and the problem is one which I think it would be well for us in this chamber to consider.

Is it simply going to create bureaucratization? After all, once you get a group of people involved the thing is going to escalate. You will have all kinds of people in it who will not be involved in the building of shelters. The thing becomes irreversible. What effect would this have on the promotion of war?

Some people are convinced that the Russians have a very highly developed system of civil defence. I have an article here published by a highly regarded journal, the *New Republic*, which suggests this is not true at all. On the other hand, there is an article in this morning's *Globe and Mail* which suggests there is a great deal of feeling that this may be true. I think this is a question which we should be considering before we go any further in dealing with fall-out shelters.

What effect would it have on our allies, on nations such as India and the nations of South America which have no possibility of building fall-out shelters or protecting themselves from nuclear blast? In concluding my remarks because I see my time is up, may I say I have nothing but the greatest sympathy for those who have to deal with a set of variables which are so difficult as those concerned with emergency measures, but I suggest that unless we take a national look at the problem and get some kind of national purpose in this chamber I do not think we are going to have very much effect on the building of fall-out shelters or, indeed, in any other area of activity going on under this program.

**Miss LaMarsh:** Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions I want to put to the Prime Minister. This vote, of course, is for a further amount required for the administration and operation of the emergency measures organization. It may be recalled that last year the Prime Minister, who had had it brought to his attention that there was another unfulfilled promise of his lying around, caused a committee to be set up to study the War Measures Act and the bill of rights and to report on any possible amendments. That committee was thrown together in a hurry in June. It sat three times very briefly and has not been heard of since.

[Mr. Pitman.]

At the time the Clerk of the Privy Council was called before the committee and a number of things were discussed respecting the emergency measures organization. There was one matter which caused me considerable concern, and this has been the first opportunity to inquire of the Prime Minister or of any other responsible person with respect to the answer. As found on page 41 of the proceedings of the committee on June 28 last, Mr. Boyce, the Clerk of the Privy Council, was explaining to the committee the difficulties involved in such exercises as Tocsin I and Tocsin II. He pointed out to the committee that the question of how to bring the War Measures Act into force was of great importance, and part way down the page he made this statement with reference to Tocsin I:

We tried out, in this exercise which we had in May, how long it took us to get the War Measures Act proclaimed in a legal way; and, from the time the Prime Minister received warning from the chiefs of staff, until we had the proclamation sealed by the great seal—

I draw particular attention to those words.

—it took us 23 or 24 minutes, or something of that kind.

First, I wish to know whether in fact there was any proclamation sealed. As I understand the situation, the only authority that this or any other government has to issue such a proclamation is that found in the War Measures Act which contains these words in section 2.

The issue of a proclamation by Her Majesty, or under the authority of the governor in council shall be conclusive evidence that war, invasion, or insurrection, real or apprehended, exists and has existed for any period of time therein stated—

There is absolutely nothing, of course, that permits anyone to have a mock war or trial war. It would appear to me that under the authority of this legislation there has to be a real or apprehended emergency and not a trial in order to put any machinery into operation. Indeed, this appears to have been the opinion of the Clerk of the Privy Council who explained that some means of bringing the War Measures Act into effect had to be ascertained. I do not know whether any such means has been arrived at by the government. If so, I hope the Prime Minister will favour the committee with such information.

I put a question to the Clerk of the Privy Council as to what was done in the United Kingdom and the United States, and he informed me that he did not know. Mr. Currie, the head of the emergency measures organization, also was a witness and he did not favour that committee with the answer. Perhaps the Prime Minister knows what they do and what might be done in this country.