

*National Defence Act Amendment*

seems to me to be the parallel of what the hon. member for Leeds said in his speech about the information given by the minister, who still sits in this house though charged with tampering with the evidence of a witness. The purpose of the tampering was to make sure that we did not get certain information. The minister still has not disclosed this information. Yet the hon. member for Leeds has stated that more information on defence has been given to the house by this minister than by any other. For that kind of information we do not give much thanks.

● (6:00 p.m.)

I hope hon. members will read the speech made by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Harkness). To my mind it was a perfect, a classic example of a difference of approach. I have not always agreed with the hon. member for Calgary North, but he is honest and straightforward and he said what he had to say like a man. The minister of National Defence has hidden the evidence, has resorted to half truth, has kept the facts from the committee and has given us nothing but propaganda when all we seek are the facts.

It is my hope that some hon. members who so far have supported the minister will search their consciences at least to the extent to which the hon. member for Fraser Valley has searched his and reach the conclusion that they do not really know anything about this plan. They might continue to search their consciences before reaching the conclusion that we as members of parliament have at least ten times as much opportunity as our constituents to find out the facts. They might admit that it is our responsibility to ascertain these facts before disposing of the taxpayers' money in such large amounts.

I wonder whether we can succeed in spurring the minister into rising and telling us what he means by unification and what role Canada's armed forces are to play. Perhaps he might even say something about nuclear weapons. When in opposition he was skilful at selling the idea of our commitment. The Prime Minister (Mr. Pearson) has promised to reconsider that particular role. Perhaps the minister, little as we can rely on his word, will tell us what part nuclear arms will play from now on in the armed services. Just what kind of defence force are we to have?

I would suggest, if I thought the minister was the type of man who would take advice in the house—he has not taken it from his military advisers—that the hon. gentleman should put aside the arrogance referred to by

[Mr. Nugent.]

the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Martin) and try to see himself as others see him for a few minutes. I suggest too that he should look at the speech made by the hon. member for Calgary North, compare that speech with the pamphlet he himself put out, and try to follow the example of that member. He could still disagree with the hon. member for Calgary North, but he might gain a tenth of the respect in which the hon. member for Calgary North is held in this house.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret):** This might be an appropriate point at which to announce the proceedings on the adjournment motion tonight.

### PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

#### SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Rinfret):** It is my duty, pursuant to provisional standing order 39A, to inform the house that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Allard), Transportation—Montreal—Use of the French language in railway transportation services; the hon. member for Bow River (Mr. Woolliams), National Parks—Use of expropriation to halt court cases; the hon. member for York-Humber (Mr. Cowan), Administration of Justice—British Columbia—Commutation of death sentences of convicted murderers.

### NATIONAL DEFENCE ACT AMENDMENT

#### AMALGAMATION OF NAVY, ARMY AND AIR FORCE

The house resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Hellyer for the second reading of Bill No. C-243, to amend the National Defence Act and other acts in consequence thereof.

**Mr. Heber E. Smith (Simcoe North):** Mr. Speaker, the objects of national defence ought to be clear to everyone. They are to defend our territorial integrity and the political institutions of our country, or at least those political institutions which we value. Our defence policy should be the means by which we seek to accomplish this.

The 1964 white paper on defence ought to be a blueprint to guide us in this purpose. It is anything but that. It is both confusing and