

*Proceedings on Adjournment Motion*

across the nation, it would seem reasonable for it to support each provincial plan financially. After all, these provincial plans are prepared by the elected people who are given the responsibility to bring medical care into each province of this diversified country. If the people of a province choose through their elected legislature to have one kind of a plan, why should the federal government impose another plan by the blackmail method of withholding support of those who do not submit to the plan of the government?

Finally, why do the government supporters oppose the principle of co-operation with the provinces, and the principle of immediate medical care for those who are in need, as provided in the amendment? I think that these two proposals in the amendment are worthy of consideration, and if adopted will make the passage of this bill much easier—and I say this sincerely.

If this amendment is adopted it will not kill the bill. There is plenty of time for consultation with the provinces, and there is plenty of time to put the bill on a proper basis so as to obtain the acceptance of the provinces, rather than to push it through as the government is doing now. I think the government could and should accept our amendment in good grace and say: "All right, we can accept it; it is a sensible amendment. We will consider it as our mandate to go to the provinces, and after a reasonable time we will bring the bill again before the house, after we have secured the co-operation and agreement of the provinces."

Mr. Speaker, it is now ten o'clock.

• (10:00 p.m.)

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Mr. Bell (Carleton):** What about the business for tomorrow?

**Mr. MacEachen:** The business as announced Friday will be followed tomorrow.

**PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION**

A motion to adjourn the house under provisional standing order 39A deemed to have been moved.

**NATIONAL DEFENCE—INQUIRY AS TO SALARY SCALE OF NAVAL LIEUTENANTS**

**Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax):** I understand that the Minister of National Defence is on his way again to partake of maritime hospitality. I am pleased to see the

[Mr. Aiken.]

Associate Minister of National Defence here, and I may say that the tone of my remarks will be entirely different since I have nothing but admiration and respect for the Associate Minister.

The point I should like to make deals with the pay increases that were recently announced by the minister for the category of non-commissioned officers, and the lowest rank of the officer group. If I may read these figures quickly into the record in tabular form, they are as follows:

	1964	1965	1966
WO 2	\$6,468	\$7,512	\$7,836
Lieutenant	\$6,792	\$7,140	\$7,416

The point I wish to make is that up to the present a warrant officer 2, the highest level in the non-commissioned end of the service, used to be paid somewhat less than the lowest rank of officer. For example, in 1964 the difference was \$6,468 as compared with \$6,792. However, under the new pay scale, the warrant officer 2 ends up with \$7,512, an amount greater instead of less than the pay received by the lieutenant, which is \$7,140. Then, this differential is carried into the next year, which I have cited.

I think I should like to make two points to the associate minister, if I may, Mr. Speaker. The first is that a certain amount of vexation, a certain amount of friction is bound to arise when two people are working side by side in the relationship of n.c.o. to officer, especially when the officer is normally the man to give the orders and he is receiving less pay. The WO 2 may have greater experience or a longer service, but I think there will be friction when the officer receives somewhat less pay.

The second point is that in Canada for many years we have tended to look to the senior n.c.o.'s as the class of people from whom we took our junior officers in the armed forces. There was an incentive when the n.c.o. could look forward to promotion and an increase in pay. I know how much the minister and the associate minister have done in connection with assuring proper pay for all groups in the armed forces, and for that I compliment them. However, I point out there is now no incentive for an n.c.o. to advance to lieutenant, because he would be suffering a loss in pay. I can say that I had many calls from people on the evening the new pay scale was announced, lieutenants who were simply enraged because they suddenly found that they had dropped in the pay range as compared with WO 2's.