

Supply—National Defence

out, as he mentioned, at three locations, possibly in others. This has been going on satisfactorily for years, throughout two great wars and the war in Korea. Why this great interest in Valcartier? Why dislodge 25 families? This is something the minister has not explained. If he would say right now: "We do not require a range at Valcartier camp for mortar fire, anti-tank fire and artillery fire", then the associate minister would have nothing to worry about, because those 25 families would not be in danger and need not be disturbed. That would settle it.

Mr. Pugh: If I understood the translation correctly—and the translation came through well—the Associate Minister said the department would renegotiate. I should like to know whether he meant it would renegotiate under the umbrella of expropriation. If this is the case, it would be very hollow renegotiation. The minister has been asked whether expropriation will take place. He has not answered that question. That is the whole point. It is a question which must be answered before this item passes.

[Translation]

Mr. Cadieux (Terrebonne): Mr. Chairman, here is the situation. According to the information I have, the people of Shannon are in a danger zone because the camp at Valcartier is being enlarged.

I now commit myself to reexamine the situation with them. If, at that time, we reach the same conclusion, namely that they are in a danger zone and, therefore, that it is useful and even necessary to expropriate them as we did others, I am ready to discuss it with them. That is all I can say.

I did not decide to enlarge the camp at Valcartier. On the other hand, it is my duty to transact with the people concerned in those expropriations. I do so with the greatest honesty and objectivity possible. Needless to say that, in a case like this, the human factor will be taken into consideration with all the objectivity and understanding required.

Since this debate began, the Conservatives have paid tribute to the fact that I did consider the human factor when applying the regulations. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that, in the case of the citizens of Shannon, I will be different from the man I was when dealing with individual cases.

[English]

Mr. Pugh: I believe all of us in this committee know the many great human qualities

23033—104½

of the minister who has just resumed his seat. He has told us in no uncertain terms that all his negotiating is based on the fact that the range is to be enlarged and that anybody who finds himself within the danger area will be told to get out.

Mr. Woolliams: Or have his head blown off.

Mr. Pugh: Nothing short of that. The minister says that he may renegotiate and give these people a few more dollars. The fact that they want to stay in the area has already been decided. They want to stay.

Now I wish to ask the minister a question I asked him earlier. Is it absolutely necessary for the safety of Canada and for the saving of a few dollars—if dollars are to be saved on this item—to go ahead and enlarge this camp so as to encompass a mortar range. That is the whole theme of the discussion which has taken place in this committee.

A good deal of opposition has been expressed with regard to taking over this area. I see the Prime Minister is just leaving. The Prime Minister, having just received a telegram on this subject can say: "I am sorry. I did not hear about it." Well, the telegram has been acknowledged. He has left the chamber without even listening to this discussion. My question to the minister is one which must be answered: Is it absolutely necessary to enlarge this camp to include a mortar range?

Mr. Hellyer: When one tries to define absolutes he is soon apt to run into difficulty. But after close examination over a number of years it was concluded that the expansion of this camp was essential in the national interest—that increased training facilities should be provided there and that a large area should be set aside for the training of a substantial proportion of the Canadian army which is stationed at this camp.

The area was laid out with these requirements in mind. One can always argue a little over where the boundaries must be. That is why I stated earlier that the associate minister would be glad to look at this question to see whether in fact the Shannon area is essential and whether or not it is a danger area. This is something which requires the most careful examination and I do not think we can give any absolute assurance, except to say to the hon. member that the expansion of this camp is definitely in the national interest.

Mr. Pugh: I think I must go further into this question. The minister has told us he will have inquiries made to determine whether it