

National Defence

With regard to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Greenwood that it was necessary that men be paraded by an N.C.O. before chaplains, that simply is not so in the armed forces today. The men and officers have access to their chaplains in exactly the same way as they would have access to their spiritual advisers in private life. May I add that I have met almost all the chaplains in our armed forces. We had none in the permanent force before the war; we now have nearly a hundred. They are chosen in consultation with their churches. These are men who have fine records, usually both academic and in the services. They perform an exceedingly valuable and continuing service from day to day not only as spiritual advisers but also acting as they would in their normal pastoral capacity as applied to the service personnel, their dependents and children, at the service camps. I can assure hon. members that this matter has received consideration; and on the basis of all the information received and recommendations made I believe we should leave things as they are.

Section agreed to.

Sections 22 to 27 inclusive agreed to.

On section 28—*Attachment and secondment, within the Canadian Forces.*

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): What is the difference between a member of the armed forces being attached and being seconded?

Mr. Claxton: The terms are defined in service regulations. When anyone is "attached" to another organization he continues to be paid by his own service and to form part of it. When he is "seconded" he is paid by the other organization and is really totally though temporarily detached from his own service.

Section agreed to.

Sections 29 to 31 inclusive agreed to.

On section 32—*Active service, placing forces on active service*

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): This section states that the governor in council may place the Canadian forces or any service, component, unit or other element thereof, or any officer or man thereof on active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof at any time when it appears desirable so to do by reason of an emergency.

Does the word "emergency" refer to defence measures, or is the word broad enough to cover, let us say, the recent Winnipeg flood? From a reading of the section I should not think it would be. Does the

[Mr. Claxton.]

authority reside within the army itself when forces are sent to meet emergency conditions such as those which developed in connection with the floods? I ask the question only to be sure that we have some authority for doing that splendid thing which was done at Winnipeg.

Mr. Claxton: The hon. member is quite right in his assumption. The meaning of "emergency" is set out in section 2(1), as meaning war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended. So that the word would not cover the Winnipeg flood. That would be covered by clause 35 in the bill. The legal justification or authority for using the armed forces in the Winnipeg flood, the Fraser valley flood or similar disasters, is in the power of the government to employ forces on training or exercises, or for any other national purpose.

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): Then the minister is satisfied that the authority is there? Then, what is the proper definition of the word "component" as it is used in this section? Has it any specific meaning?

Mr. Claxton: By clause 15 the Canadian forces shall mean—

—the naval, army and air forces of His Majesty raised by Canada and consist of three services, namely, the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

Clause 16(1) states:

There shall be a component of each service of the Canadian forces consisting of officers and men who are enrolled for continuing, full-time military service.

Then we have another component consisting of those enrolled for part-time military service, and a third component consisting of those who may be called out on active service. The word "component" is equivalent to the word "part".

Mr. Smith (Calgary West): It refers to the individuals?

Mr. Claxton: Yes.

Mr. Ross (Souris): Is it customary, where the army performs such splendid work as it did in connection with the Winnipeg flood, to charge up the cost of that work for the time being to the province affected? Is it customary to charge up the pay and allowances of the entire personnel who, in this instance, did such a splendid job in Winnipeg, to the provincial government for the time being, until a later adjustment is made?

Mr. Claxton: That is a matter for arrangement. In respect of the Fraser valley and Winnipeg floods it was arranged with those provinces before service personnel went in that the provinces would cover the cost. In the case of the Fraser valley flood, the cost of