

National Defence Act Amendment

word was "Nonsense." In other words, the Minister of National Defence implied that my remark was nonsense.

Mr. Hellyer: So it was.

Mr. Alkenbrack: The remarks I made at that time are substantiated by clause 5 of this bill. Is clause 5 nonsense? I claim that clause 5 is the most injurious clause ever introduced into military legislation in the history of this country.

Mr. Hellyer: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Alkenbrack: Yes.

Mr. Hellyer: Does my hon. friend think that the introduction of airplane engines into ships is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? Does he think that bridge control on our ships is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? Does he think that the pursuit of excellence is designed to do away with Anglo-Saxon traditions? I ask the hon. member to apply his common sense to this matter. We are trying to develop a force for the second half of the 20th century and the years ahead, not for the 1930's and the 1940's.

Mr. Forrestall: Surely you don't mean that, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Hellyer: We are taking a forward-looking approach and showing some leadership in the field of military organization which I am sure will be emulated later not just by Anglo-Saxon countries or Scandinavian countries but ultimately by countries all over the world. Does the hon. member feel this is in any way a reflection on our heritage? I am sure he would not want to give that impression.

Mr. Alkenbrack: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister when he is going to ask me a question.

Mr. Hellyer: I just asked you a question.

Mr. Alkenbrack: I am not surprised at the interjection of the minister. He interjects by asking about material things, the use of engines, the use of bridge control, and so on. I am not surprised that my remarks brought the minister to his feet because he now realizes the enormity of his error, especially with regard to clause 5 of this bill. The minister talks about material things such as engines. Is he referring to British engines? What the minister says may be the case, but I am not

debating the merits of material things. I am talking about our Canadian traditions, excellent traditions which have been handed down to us. We have many good traditions which have been handed down by both our mother countries. However, I am talking about the very valuable Anglo-Saxon traditions and practices, especially those of a military and defence nature, which have been our inheritance and which we have used so successfully in the past. In clause 5 of this bill the Liberal party betrays those Anglo-Saxon traditions and influences.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that on the page opposite clause 5 the legal advisers have attempted to give an explanation of this amendment. I draw your attention to the fact that clause 5 (1) of the original bill read as follows:

The Canadian forces continue, as a single service, the services known before becoming into force of this part as the Royal Canadian Navy, the Canadian Army and the Royal Canadian Air Force.

● (3:40 p.m.)

Apparently that did not suit the minister, the cabinet, the Prime Minister or the Liberal party's electoral interests. God only knows what electoral roads that party will follow in future, but at this time they are playing this game for all it is worth. They decided there must be a change in this regard.

Clause 5 as it appeared in the original bill was apparently not strong enough or definite enough in its pronouncement as to the dissolution of the three separate services. The government had to come up with what now appears on page 3 of the bill. This is obviously the death knell of the separate services and the names they have carried down through the past, thanks to the Anglo-Saxon influence.

I listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Three Rivers and I should like to remind him—

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. Let me remind the hon. member that the name "Three Rivers" does not even exist as the name of my constituency. It is "Trois-Rivières".

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, may I remind the hon. member that my grandfather was born in Three Rivers, Quebec.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Chairman, to our delight the son does not live there.

Mr. Cowan: Mr. Chairman, let me remind the hon. member that the son is now 90 years