

National Defence Act Amendment

for the maintenance of their garments in question does show that the minister and associate minister ought to look into this matter carefully to make certain that this gross discrimination does not continue.

As I said before, this is a delicate and difficult subject. I promised the ladies in question that I would bring it to the attention of the house and I have done so, even though it has been difficult for me. I am sure you appreciate that, Mr. Chairman, knowing my usual modesty.

I also wish to deal with the question of disease and the population explosion, and here again I am somewhat embarrassed. I am informed that the men of the armed services are provided with certain devices to prevent disease and the population explosion. That information came officially from the department. On further inquiry of the women's services of the navy, army and air force, I find that nothing like this is done for the women of the armed services of Canada. While I would not suggest that a policy of providing these devices for our armed services women is necessary—I would not suggest that for a moment—I do think, Mr. Chairman, that as a matter of principle the minister, associate minister, and their colleagues in the department ought to inquire of the policies pursued in the defence forces of other countries. I understand that we have not gone as far as we ought to have in this respect, and here I refer particularly to policies in Great Britain, the United States and other European countries.

This is only a theoretical matter at this point, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to make certain that there is no discrimination in this respect. I will not suggest that pursuing this policy is necessary from a practical point of view, but in theory it ought to be pursued. The government might implement some policy in this respect.

In conclusion I urge the minister and the associate minister to inquire into the complaints I have advanced on behalf of the women in the armed services of Canada, so that they may share in the equality of women in all aspects of Canadian society, in accordance with announced government policy.

Mr. Horner (Acadia): I rise to take part in this debate after having listened with great concern to much talk on the unification of our armed services. I am still amazed that the minister wishes this house to permit unification of the services when he has not suggested the name that the new armed service of

[Mr. Herridge.]

Canada will have. Perhaps General Allard had a good name when he advocated it be called Finks, using the four letters to denote Infantrymen with naval knowledge. Surely the minister and his capable public relations man, Mr. Lee, can invent a better name.

This debate has shown how parliament may be hamstrung. Before Christmas, when the matter was before the house, I talked, trying to convince the minister that the principle of unification ought to be sent to the committee for study. The matter did not go to committee. It is now an accepted fact that nearly all senior officers of the three services are against unification.

While Air Marshal Miller was the minister's assistant he was prepared to support integration, but was against unification, which he alleged would cost the Canadian taxpayers more money than the old, three service system had cost them. The committee studies bore out Air Vice Marshal Miller's contention. The unified services will be more expensive, not less expensive than the three separate services.

It is interesting to note that the *Ottawa Journal* recently has said that this debate ought to be limited and that the guillotine will be applied for the first time on Thursday. Great haste is being made to cut short the debate or to limit the freedom of speech. One would expect that something terribly important hinges on the passage of the bill, that it must be implemented almost immediately, or that conditions are such that the passage of this bill is extremely important for the armed forces of Canada. On page 14927 of *Hansard* for April 14, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre, addressing the Minister of National Defence, asked this question:

Is it not a fact that in the committee General Allard told us that he would like to see the proclamation of the bill postponed for at least four months, and that until the bill is proclaimed no action can be taken with regard to the steps toward unification. That is the advice of the senior officer in the defence forces.

● (5:50 p.m.)

As the question shows, there is a demand that the bill be not proclaimed for at least four months after passage. He went on to say categorically that until the bill was proclaimed no action could be taken toward unification. I ask the associate minister this: Why in these circumstances should we have to read in today's paper that the guillotine blade will fall on Thursday? As to suggestions that further evidence may be brought out, is any further evidence necessary after all the