

National Defence Act Amendment

implied, we can now enrol men on a second engagement for a fixed term of 20 years, or something along that line. I think this would be more acceptable and would at the same time enable us to offer an indefinite period of enrolment with the security that goes with it to servicemen who have chosen to stay in the armed forces as a career.

Mr. Churchill: Mr. Chairman, I have one short question. I presume the judge advocate general ranks as an expert and therefore in the view of the Minister of Transport his advice should be rejected. That hon. minister suggested that only the advice of amateurs should be considered.

Mr. Hellyer: I do not quite follow this idea. We did get into a discussion yesterday about the situation. I take it my friend is actually referring to the judge advocate general.

Mr. Churchill: Yes. I understand he is an expert. The Minister of Transport suggested we should reject the advice of experts and pay attention only to what the amateurs had to say. I take it the advice of the judge advocate general should therefore be rejected.

Mr. Hellyer: I would not agree. I have found the judge advocate general to be a very intelligent and knowledgeable officer. His services have been invaluable in the preparation of this legislation. I am sure he will be helpful in the drafting of regulations after the bill is passed by parliament. He is an exceptional public servant and should be given full credit in this regard.

● (2:30 p.m.)

Mr. Churchill: You would prefer to accept his advice rather than the advice of the Minister of Transport.

Mr. Hellyer: I prefer to accept his advice rather than the advice of the hon. member opposite.

Mr. Pickersgill: So that the gloss on the hon. gentleman's remarks will not be misunderstood, I think it would be desirable for him, knowing what a great student of history he is, to cite the place in *Hansard* where I ever said that the advice of experts should be rejected. To my knowledge I never said any such thing.

Mr. Churchill: I am sorry the Minister of Transport was not here before lunch because I said that his speech made about ten days ago was the silliest speech I had ever heard since I came to this house.

[Mr. Hellyer.]

Mr. Pickersgill: I would not altogether disagree with the hon. gentleman about that, but among the silly things I may have said I did not say anything quite so silly as the hon. gentlemen has said I said.

Mr. McIntosh: I may have gotten off the track, but I think I should say to the minister that I find the extensive study he says his department made into the inclusion of the word "indefinite" very alarming. We could not understand why the department had not made an extensive study of what the manpower requirements would be after the unification bill has been passed or what the cost to the country would be. We could not understand why the officials of the department failed to make a study of these important matters.

However, the minister now says an extensive study was made which led the department to believe this unimportant word should be included in the bill. This, in my opinion, was a waste of effort. I suggest to the minister that if it is not important and he takes the word of the judge advocate general he should adhere to the request of the members of the opposition and drop it. The minister says he doubts that it will ever be used. If it is so unimportant, why not drop the word and let us go on to another clause?

Mr. Hellyer: I think it would provide more flexibility to have it in. I am sure my hon. friend would not want to see anything put into the bill which would make it more rigid than is necessary in so far as the terms of enlistment and enrolment are concerned.

Mr. McIntosh: I think that by taking it out you would make the terms of the bill more flexible, not more rigid. This is the argument we are presenting.

Mr. Forrestall: There is a matter which I should like to take up with the minister, and for this purpose I should like to refer to the committee evidence, volume No. 36, page 2351. The hon. member for Edmonton West, in dealing with this particular section, raised a matter with the judge advocate general and the minister. I should like to put in on the record because I suggest it is applicable to the clause we are considering. We are requesting information on this point prior to this bill being proclaimed and becoming part of our law. At the bottom of page 2351 I find the following:

But what I am primarily concerned about is that the regulations which may be published in regard to this, be referred back to the standing