

ing to levels of capability that offer more of a cadre or nucleus for expansion rather than "forces-in-being". Thus it is obvious that as the regular force declines in strength the reserve force must grow if we are to create the kind of trained manpower needed to meet our operational and administrative commitments.

I suggest the increase should be at least 10 per cent a year to a paid ceiling of 22,000. This, of course, is a great deal less than the 47,500 of 1947, but would go a long way toward creating the reserves I feel are necessary in our country at this time.

The white paper gave the role of the reserves as being "to support the regular force". It was stated that it was the government's intention to maintain the component at its current authorized size and to continue to depend upon it for an appropriate share of the manpower needs of the Canadian forces. It was noted that the reserve force had been designated as part of the "forces-in-being" and therefore the composition had to be adjusted from time to time to keep pace with changes in over-all force manpower and that it could not be considered in isolation from the regular force.

This is extremely important for it means acceptance of the concept of the reserve force as an integral part of the "forces-in-being" while rejecting the idea that the reserves should exist solely as a mobilization base as we have known in the past. In the light of the fact that the regular force has been reduced in total strength and altered substantially in composition and organizational structure, while at the same time there has been increased attention focused on the requirement for military activity in safeguarding of sovereignty, independence, and in the realization of national aims, a manpower gap has been created which the reserve forces should be in a position to fill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order.

**Mr. Robinson:** Of course, there are many tasks—

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order. Would the hon. member resume his seat?

**Mr. Sharp:** Madam Speaker, we have had some conversations, and there are so many members anxious to participate in the debate that we were wondering whether Your Honour could turn a blind eye until the clock reaches five minutes to five, at which time we will proceed to put all the motions.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Is it agreed that we continue until five minutes to five?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Stan Darling (Parry Sound-Muskoka):** Madam Speaker, it is certainly a privilege to have the opportunity of saying a few words on the budget, but before I go into detail on the provisions of the budget that cause me a tremendous amount of concern I should like to tell the Finance Minister (Mr. Turner) that we would consider lending him the services of our esteemed economic critic. It seems that the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Stevens) remembers more of what the Minister of Finance

*The Budget—Mr. Darling*

has said in the past about the Canadian economy that the Finance Minister himself remembers.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Order, please. The hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson) is rising on a point of order.

**Mr. Robinson:** Madam Speaker, I am wondering why I was cut off in the middle of my speech and another hon. member allowed to have the floor. I had not spoken for very long.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** Because it was agreed that, according to section (8) of Standing Order 60, speeches were to be ended by 4.45 p.m.

**Mr. Robinson:** Then perhaps the House could be advised why the hon. member who now has the floor is allowed to speak after 4.45 p.m.?

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** The hon. member may conclude his remarks only with the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore to complete his remarks?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Acting Speaker (Mrs. Morin):** There is no agreement. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

**Mr. Darling:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. When speaking on the budget and the cuts in expenditure of various departments, I hope there will be additional funds for the Solicitor General's Department in view of a news flash that I have just received, which states that a hostage was being held at knife-point in the British Columbia Penitentiary as of about an hour ago by an inmate, Robert Garry Hume. He is reported to be holding a barber as a hostage. Let us hope that this incident turns out better than the previous one.

If I may now resume my remarks on the budget, when I consider the statements the Minister of Finance has made from time to time about the economy, I am reminded of the doctor who told his patient that he wasn't really too fat, he was just too short for the weight he was carrying. He would be perfectly alright, the doctor said, if he were just seven feet tall. The Finance Minister has made some very excellent appraisals of the economy, but he simply has them turned around backwards.

As the member for York-Simcoe pointed out so ably, the minister brings in an expansionist budget at a time when he considers the economy is expanding, and a cooling-off budget when he considers that the economy is receding. Well, Madam Speaker, it has been demonstrated all too clearly in the last few days that this budget missed the mark on all counts. It seems to be intended solely as an instrument to raise still more revenue for a government that is spending money like it is going out of style, while at the same time pleading with us to believe that it is really practising restraint. If I practised the government's brand of restraint in my own business or in my household,