

Canadian Forces Act

certainly not to any great extent—on what has been said by the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra and the hon. member for Cape Breton South; but I want to back up fully what they have said as to the necessity for providing auxiliary services, as they were known during the last war, for the forces in Korea.

The picture appears to be confused, and under the circumstances I think we should not make any exaggerated statements until the minister has had a chance to make the further investigation which I understand he has now instituted as a result of reports of what is available to other forces. But I would urge upon the minister and the department that even if his investigation should show that other forces do not have auxiliary services, we should not take that as a compelling reason why we ourselves should not provide them, particularly as the Canadian organizations which provided those services in the past have indicated not only a willingness but an anxiety to do so at present. While it may be difficult to provide them in Korea on the same scale as was done in the United Kingdom, northwest Europe and Italy, nevertheless if they are willing to provide them at all it certainly seems to me that we should not discourage them and that we should not simply content ourselves by saying: No other country which has forces there does it either. I think it is a matter in which we might well set the pattern.

Then I want to bring to the minister's attention another matter which I think is of importance in connection with this question of morale. I had it brought to my attention shortly before coming down here to Ottawa, as a result of a conversation I had. This came fairly well direct; there was one secondary stage in between, but that is all. Some of the men coming back here from Korea find that the reception they are given is, to say the least, disappointing. This reaction came from a man who came back to Canada via the United States. On landing at the United States port he observed the exceedingly enthusiastic official welcome which had been staged by the United States authorities. Not only had the civil auxiliary organizations arranged a sort of turnout to make the men realize that they were welcome back and that their country was proud of them, but there was the matter of the whole official reception which they received from their own service. The same sort of rehabilitation advice and counsel which our men received after the last war was available in full measure to the United States troops when they returned from Korea. Then this man, coming from the United States up to Vancouver—which

was his official return to Canada—was greatly struck and terribly disappointed by the contrast between the atmosphere in which he was received in Canada and that in which the United States troops had been received in the United States.

It may be that perhaps some of these things can be rather overdone, but it is difficult to overdo the reception which should be accorded to our troops coming back from Korea. I doubt if the most elaborate official reception could be overdone in terms of what they merit. I think that we should certainly make sure that the military as well as the civilian reception, and the attitude shown to our men on their return from Korea, lacks nothing and does not in any way suggest to them that possibly their service and their sacrifice is not appreciated. I am not suggesting—and I would not do so for a moment—that it is actually indicative of the fact that it is not appreciated; but in these matters it seems to me that it is exceedingly important to be meticulous not to allow the impression to creep in that possibly the service is not appreciated.

Then with respect to the question of form, I should like to ask the minister to consider this suggestion. If it is too late to incorporate it into this bill, I should like to ask him to do so in connection with any future legislation of the same type. As I understood what the minister said, the bill will consist of twenty-eight sections amending a large number of the other acts.

Mr. Claxton: Twenty-nine.

Mr. Fulton: I am not sure whether I heard him aright; did he say sixteen other acts?

Mr. Claxton: I did not say.

Mr. Fulton: Anyway, it was a large number. As I understand it, it is all to be in the one bill. It will be one bill amending quite a number of other statutes. It seems to me that procedure certainly may make for inconvenience, if not worse, in the future, when someone is trying to find what statutes have been amended and what ones have not. Of the statutes which are to be amended, one is the Pension Act; another is the Visiting Forces (U.S.A.) Act; and the Department of Veterans Affairs Act is also to be amended. It seems to me that if all these amendments are consolidated in one statute it will be inconvenient, to say the least, for a person wishing to study the Department of Veterans Affairs Act. Looking through the index of statutes to find out the titles of amending acts, you would not normally expect to find an amendment to the Department of Veterans Affairs Act under the National Defence Act, or to the