

Supply—National Defence

kind, a lack of understanding of the situation comes about in three ways; first of all, through a lack of knowledge of the facts; second a lack of ability to understand those facts if they are available; and, third, in spite of both ability to understand and the availability of the facts, a refusal to see or understand them.

I am just wondering whether all these allegations of muddle, considering where they may have come from, might not be looked at in that light. Did these people have a comprehension of the situation? If they did, would they write or say the things they did? I am always a little careful—by subscribing or even by referring to them—of appearing to adopt such comments.

I have only one passing reference, or a couple of passing references, to make to our own Canadian situation. There was no indication of our complete defence picture. It may be because of the limitation of the time that the minister could rightly say he was not making a complete review of our defence policy, but there is a question that has bothered me for some time and I trust the minister may be able to answer it. It may have been referred to yesterday. I refer to our own armed forces, particularly our brigade groups. It strikes me that the effective use of our manpower in the field, regardless of its weapons, would require not only mobility but dispersment. Therefore, just how mobile are our land forces in this country today? We have certain transport, be it by road or by rail. As one who lives far removed from the capital I fully realize the limitations of rail transport. Then, road and rail do not take us everywhere in this country. Road and rail do not take us in those areas where it may be necessary to engage the enemy.

This brings us down to air transport. I would be of the opinion that if it is economically possible—and I realize the difficulties in the financial limitations in this regard—we should look to a considerable accentuation of the provision of air transport which could be available for a number of uses. Not only would we keep them relatively fully occupied for training purposes but for other purposes as well, since those brigades would have to get used to moving by air much more than they do now. I recall that at the time of the Suez crisis the reliance on commercial aircraft to supplement military transport aircraft did not show up too well, besides which, reliance on civilian aircraft, commercial aircraft, would mean that civil activity, which would be just as important in many fields, would have to halt if the aircraft were taken away. We know we have to move our technical

people around as much as we do our soldiers. I should like to ask the minister whether we could have some indication in this connection at this time.

While I am on the subject of our military personnel, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted the indulgence of the committee I should like to draw attention to the presence in the gallery of a relatively large number of men of Her Majesty's Royal Canadian Navy. There are 138 officers, chief petty officers and men of Her Majesty's Canadian ship *Cornwallis* who performed on the lawns in front of the parliament buildings on Dominion day. These officers and men are from a training establishment; they are in the main relatively new to the service, and represent all provinces of Canada. I would certainly congratulate them on the very fine performance on Wednesday evening.

My last point, Mr. Chairman, concerns civil defence. Here I would not say too much because I would be merely repeating the views put forward by the hon. member for St. Boniface. I think it was long overdue that our civil defence be taken over by a force, and an authoritative force, able to set it in motion and see to its training. By saying that I do not wish to criticize or belittle the valiant efforts of so many volunteers in the past who, in the various communities of this country to very greatly varying degrees, gave of their time and effort without pay to the development of civil defence. I think this country owes them a great debt of gratitude for what they have done. Now I would say they have the leadership and the force associated with them to give them greater scope for the utilization of the knowledge they have developed.

There are many other subjects on which I wish to speak today, but in the interest of getting on with these estimates I shall raise my points as the items come up.

Mr. Bourque: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Defence concerning the Bomarc site. I was wondering whether I could ask him the question on this item. Will the farms on range 4 at Canton Nantel La Macaza be purchased or appropriated for the Bomarc site? If so, in what way will these farms be purchased or expropriated, by superficial measure or by municipal valuation?

Mr. Pearkes: To answer that question, the Bomarc site in northern Quebec, as I stated yesterday, will be in the area of Mont Laurier. I have not given the precise position of that Bomarc site, nor do I think it is advisable to pinpoint those defence positions. After all, they might be considered as targets for enemy