

peacetime; I was not suggesting that in wartime the army should not have all the jurisdiction in the world.

**Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** Mr. Chairman, there is a matter which I should like to bring to the attention of the committee. In doing so perhaps I shall need something more than the latitude which we are allowed on the first section of a bill. I hope the minister will be patient with me, because I shall take only a minute or two.

I should like to take this occasion to bring to the attention of the committee a matter which I have often thought of since I was in the army and on service myself. That is the fact that in the British army a chaplain is a commissioned officer and a non-combatant. In the French army I understand that chaplains are non-commissioned officers and are combatant. My observation was that being an officer and a non-combatant put a chaplain in our army under the greatest possible disability. First of all, he was separated from the men. He was associating with the officers. A man who wanted to consult with him about the state of his soul had to be paraded before him by a non-commissioned officer; and that always struck me as an extremely odd way to enter upon an intimate conversation.

In the second place, my observation was that only those chaplains who persistently disregarded what was supposed to be the conduct laid down for them were able really to have influence among the troops; by that I mean only those chaplains who persistently went into the danger zone and who, to all intents and purposes, were combatants—that is, at any rate, to the extent of sharing the dangers of combat. But in a great many cases chaplains through no fault of their own, found themselves relegated to rear areas. Perhaps the most serious work they did, apart from conducting funerals—there were no marriages—was to act as secretary of the officers' mess. In general, this disability seemed to me to be a great pity. It seemed to me to deprive nine out of ten chaplains of the great influence which they might have had. I suggest that it might be well for us to consider whether what I understand to be the practice in the French army is not sound and worthy of consideration.

**The Chairman:** Before proceeding with the bill, may I suggest that we call clauses 1 and 2, and then that I might call the bill by parts instead of calling each clause. We have twelve parts of the bill and 251 clauses. Is it the unanimous wish of the committee that we proceed by parts?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some hon. Members:** No.

**The Chairman:** Shall clause 1 carry?

**Mr. Smith (Calgary West):** I am through, Mr. Chairman; but to suggest that we are going to call a bill of this length by parts and not by sections would immediately allow the critics of the House of Commons to say, and with some justice, that we were completely disregarding our duties here. Let us go through the motions anyway.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 15 inclusive agreed to.

On section 16—*Regular forces.*

**Mr. Wright:** This is the clause which regulates the size of our forces in the army, the navy and the air force. I should like to draw to the attention of the committee the fact that in this clause we are departing from a principle which has a long tradition in British history; that is the tradition that the numbers in our armed forces are directly under the control of parliament as distinguished from the governor general and the minister in charge of that department. Formerly, by act of the House of Commons, a limit was placed on the numbers of our armed forces in the army. Under clause 16 this matter is left entirely to the discretion of the governor in council. Formerly the air force and the navy were left to the governor in council, but the number of the men directly in the army was provided for by act of parliament. It is an old tradition in British history, dating back to the time of Cromwell if not before that time, that parliament itself should control the size of the army in the country.

I just wanted to bring to the attention of the committee the fact that here we are making a distinct departure from the customs that have prevailed down through history in Great Britain and in Canada. It is all right to say that we control the size of our armed forces through the vote we pass here each year for the carrying on of our armed forces, but this is an indirect way. In Great Britain today each year there is passed the army act—and I understand there is also passed every year what is called the mutiny act—which directly controls the pay and allowances of the armed forces. Thus parliament itself keeps within its control the size of the army at any time in that country.

I do not want anybody to misunderstand me and say that I am trying to restrict the size of the armed forces we may wish to have in Canada at any given time. Under conditions as they exist in the world today, I think we must be prepared to meet any