

Inquiries of the Ministry

and members of parliament who intercede on their behalf, I think it is imperative that we should know how the government can recognize those who intend to stay here when they apply for visitors' visas.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not a question of privilege, and the point made by the hon. member is argumentative.

NATIONAL DEFENCE**CHANGE IN ARMED FORCES PROPOSED IN WHITE PAPER**

On the orders of the day:

Hon. Gordon Churchill (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In a public statement yesterday the chief of defence staff, with the approval of the Minister of National Defence, stated that the defence white paper of 1964 proposed a transformation in the role that Canada wishes to play in international affairs.

Hon. Paul Martin (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman, as an experienced member of the house, knows perfectly well that it is not within the rules of the house for any hon. member to ask a question in respect of evidence given before a committee which is sitting while the house itself is in session. That is the rule of the house, and no one should be expected to observe it more closely than the hon. gentleman himself.

Hon. Michael Starr (Ontario): I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. Since the Secretary of State for External Affairs brought this up himself may I say that when he was in the opposition he did more to evade the rules of this house than anyone else.

Mr. Martin (Essex East): If the hon. member wishes my discarded opinions he may have them.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am in agreement with the point made by the minister in so far as the rules are concerned. Perhaps if the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre is seeking information, which should be the purpose of asking questions, he might rephrase his question in such a way as to elicit information.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to infringe on the rules, but this was a public [Mr. Starr.]

statement made at a public meeting. However, I will pay attention to the susceptibilities of the minister and will rephrase my question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister will have to apologize.

Mr. Churchill: Was there a proposal contained in the defence white paper of 1964 that there would be a transformation in the role of Canada in foreign affairs, and that that transformation now requires the destruction of the identity of the navy, army and air force and the formation of a single service with a common rank structure and a common uniform?

Mr. Martin (Essex East): Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the white paper was brilliantly conceived and has been brilliantly executed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It has certainly been executed.

Mr. Fairweather: With apologies from those hanged.

Mr. Churchill: The minister supported the white paper in a public address made in September 1964. May I ask the following question. When he suggested that one of the proposals made in the white paper would be the formation of a small, highly trained force for effective deployment in peace keeping operations under the United Nations and for other purposes, was it his intention to provide intervention by force of arms in some trouble spot in the world?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister is speechless.

NATO—POSSIBLE CHANGE IN CANADIAN MILITARY CONTRIBUTION

On the orders of the day:

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I can address, I think, either to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of National Defence, because it refers to the responsibilities of both. In the light of the hopes expressed in the recent United Kingdom white paper on defence estimates that by the end of June, 1967 there will be discussions and revisions of NATO commitments which will produce an agreement on the size and composition of forces and the military roles of the various partners, has the government made any proposals to the other governments with regard to the size, composition or military role of the Canadian contribution to NATO forces in the future?