

National Defence Act Amendment

without his consent be required to serve as a member of the crew of an aircraft or in a land force;

How can the judge advocate general say he will not be required to serve as a member of a crew of an aircraft or in a land force when he has just said he is going to be required to join the Canadian Armed Forces whether he likes it or not? There is nothing in this bill that says he will not have to serve as a member of an air crew or in a land force. In fact there is nothing in the bill to say an airman will not have to serve in a submarine, if the minister desires that he serve in it. That is why we say that this is compulsory transfer.

Another suggested regulation is:

No officer or man who immediately prior to the coming into force of Part I of the Canadian Forces Reorganization Act was enrolled in, or had been transferred to, the Canadian Army shall without his consent be required to serve as a member of a crew; and

no officer or man who immediately prior to the coming into force of Part I of the Canadian Forces Reorganization Act was enrolled in, or had been transferred to, the Royal Canadian Air Force shall without his consent be required to serve as a member of the crew of a ship or in a land force.

There is something funny here. They say that without his consent he will not be required to do certain things in the new service. However, they make it abundantly clear that regardless of what force he is in at present, he is going to be compelled to join the Canadian Armed Forces. That is why we say this is a compulsory transfer. We say this is the first step in conscription, the first step to compulsory service in Canada. I am not disputing whether that is good or bad, but if this is what it actually means then the minister should get up and tell Canadians that this is conscription. In that event I would be pleased to note the number of those members from Quebec who will get up and vote for this clause because I am quite sure their opponents in the next election will use it against them. We know the history of conscription so far as the province of Quebec is concerned.

I was very glad to see my colleague get up a few minutes ago and voice his opinion about the French matter. I say that certainly we believe you people of French stock are entitled to certain preferences under the B.N.A. Act, and I do not think we have objected too strenuously to your demands. But once you start stepping on the toes of other ethnic groups in this country then you are asking for trouble, and if it does come don't forget that you asked for it.

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Mr. Groos: Mr. Chairman, I heard a few remarks recently to the effect that somehow or other this bill has a sort of Anglo-Saxon bias. That is what prompts me to interject just a few words at this time because I just cannot understand that. In such reading of history as I have been able to do I have never noticed that the Anglo-Saxon race has ever been noted for its slowness or its reluctance to build on its past experience. After all, that is how the British nation achieved most of the greatness for Britain that we all admire today. They are the ones who gave meaning to the words "growing tradition."

I would like to point out to hon. members opposite that surely this is what we ourselves are trying to do with this bill. With it we are trying to build on past experience something new and something good for Canada. I am positive, just as positive as I am standing here in this chamber, that regardless of the gloomy forecasts which are coming from the officials opposition, the Royal Canadian Navy tradition, the Canadian Army tradition and the Royal Canadian Air Force tradition will live on, and on, and on in the traditions and the ways of the new Canadian Armed Forces.

Mr. MacLean (Queens): Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to agree with the hon. member who has just taken his seat. With all sincerity, without any bigotry or bias with regard to any racial group of people in any part of this country, I wish to say that over the last few years I have witnessed a series of events eroding much of what we have been proud of in our history. It is most unfortunate that during our centennial year celebration some departments of government are trying their best to celebrate appropriately the centennial of our confederation with attempts to make us, as Canadians, more conscious of our history, while at the same time other departments are whittling away at our traditions, good traditions, honourable traditions, traditions which most Canadians hold dear.

● (4:40 p.m.)

There may be other millions of Canadians who object to these traditions on some grounds which in my estimation are not valid. If they do object, they should state their reasons. Parliament should be a place where men reason together and not a place where, because they happen to have a voting majority, they force their particular biases and their particular desires down the throats of all Canadians who do not happen to hold their point of view. Democracy, in my judgment, is